Louisiana State University
LSU Digital Commons

LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses | Graduate School

2001

Teacher Education Reform and Accountability: a Study of the Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality.

Patricia Ann davis Exner
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation

Exner, Patricia Ann davis, "Teacher Education Reform and Accountability: a Study of the Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality." (2001). *LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses*. 337.
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/337

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI®

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM AND ACCOUNTABILITY: A STUDY OF THE LOUISIANA BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON TEACHER QUALITY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction

by
Patricia Ann Davis Exner
B.S., Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1973
M.Ed., Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1980
August 2001

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UMI Number: 3021425

UMI®

UMI Microform 3021425
Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dedicated to my family . . .

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

So many individuals have provided so much support throughout this process—faculty, friends, family. To each, for the lessons, gentle nudgings, unending words of encouragement, and assistance . . ., a heartfelt thank you.

To LSU faculty . . . my distinguished committee—Dr. William Pinar, chair; Dr. Barbara S. Fuhrmann; Dr. Janice Hinson; Dr. Miles E. Richardson; and Dr. Thomas D. Lynch—, for sharing their knowledge and expertise and for encouraging me to uphold the same high standards which they hold for themselves; faculty with whom I have studied and worked, for sharing their passion for learning; and "the Dean," for sharing her wisdom, insight, calm guidance, inspiration . . ., thank you.

To former LSU faculty members who have helped me grow personally and professionally . . . Dr. Bonnie Konopak, for pushing me to begin doctoral studies; Dr. Flo Durway and Dr. Wendy Kohli, for sharing their friendship midst hours of discussing teacher education challenges and dilemmas; and, Dr. David England, for being my mentor and encourager from the beginning . . ., thank you.

To staff and colleagues to whom I am particularly indebted . . . Lisa, Annette, Jen, and Jackie, for their ready willingness to assume independently the many and varied responsibilities that cropped up daily . . . and for doing so with skill and humor; Beverly, Sindee, Linda, Jimmy, Don, Rita, Andrew, Karen, Bob, Joyce, Lois, and Kelly, for quietly enduring my "storm"; the m-lunch crew, for the cheer; Lawana and Casey, for being there however needed, with a hand and a smile . . ., thank you.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

To my family . . . my parents, for providing a loving, supportive environment that encouraged learning and excellence, allowing me to dream; Ben, Sara, Amanda (and Melissa), for always giving their best and upholding their values, thus allowing me to pursue my dream; and, especially Jerry, for the sacrifices, patience, tolerance, and love, allowing me to attain my dream . . ., thank you.

Thank you for sharing my dream.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABSTRACT

This study describes Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality, focusing primarily on Commission proceedings and the evolution of its recommendations within a context of standards-based teacher education reform history. Employing case study methodology contextualized in historical and ethnographic narrative, this nine month study examined policy recommendations for Louisiana's teacher education programs that resulted from Commission meetings. Aims of the study included describing the development of these recommendations, their relation to national teacher education reform movements, and their potential impact on university teacher preparation programs. The research provides not only documentation of Commission proceedings of some historical value, but also insights into reform implications for teacher education in Louisiana, as well as for the work of similar commissions in other states.

Issues raised by professionalization and de-regulation movements within a historical and political standards-based context formed a backdrop to Commission proceedings and decisions. The study reveals Commission recommendations as reflective of both professionalization goals and de-regulation attempts to remove "the profession" from professionalization. The juxtaposition of conflicting professionalization and de-regulation goals points to a blurring of the two movements as represented in the various Commission recommendations. This blurring is a critical finding of this study, for it illustrates increasing tensions between professionalization, a paradigm of thought of continued importance in the field of teacher education, and de-regulation, a movement characterized by increasing dominance in policy making arenas.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 1

REFORM AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Serving as "the button that allowed [Louisiana] to develop a system" of teacher preparation program accountability, legislation known simply as "Title II" sparked the creation of Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality (J. Burns, personal interview, June 16, 2000). Title II, one of several Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 105-244), was enacted by the 105th Congress of the United States and signed into law on October 7, 1998. This legislation is formally labeled "Title II--Teacher Quality." Its mandates include requiring each state to produce an annual "State Report Card on the Quality of Teacher Preparation." Partly because Louisiana had "no mechanism" in place to evaluate its teacher preparation programs in such a way as to produce the data required for such a report, the Commission[1] was charged with developing an accountability system for teacher preparation programs in the state's public and private institutions of higher education (J. Burns, personal interview, June 16, 2000).

Title II legislation adds teeth to calls from diverse groups for teacher education reform by mandating that state report cards include information on teacher certification and licensure assessments (see Appendix B for state report card requirements), as well as on other criteria as defined by each state. Each state is further required to identify and assist "low-performing" teacher preparation programs based on its own criteria (see Appendix C for labeling requirements). Additionally, Title II requires institutional report cards, holding entire institutions of higher education (IHEs), not just schools of education, accountable for teacher preparation programs—an accountability with purse strings

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

attached, for federal funds could be withheld from those institutions determined to have "at-risk" or "low-performing" teacher preparation programs (see Appendix C and Appendix D for institutional report card requirements and funding consequences).

With its focus on "teacher quality," Title II lists four purposes related to K-12 education: to

> (1) improve student achievement;
> (2) improve the quality of the current and future teaching force by improving the preparation of prospective teachers and enhancing professional development activities;
> (3) hold institutions of higher education accountable for preparing teachers who have the necessary teaching skills and are highly competent in the academic content areas in which the teachers plan to teach, such as mathematics, science, English, foreign languages, history, economics, art, civics, Government, and geography, including training in the effective uses of technology in the classroom; and
> (4) recruit highly qualified individuals, including individuals from other occupations, into the teaching force. (P.L. 105-244, Sec. 201a)

In response to these Congressional mandates and to a perceived need for teacher education reform in Louisiana, the Commission issued policy recommendations in May, 2000, that have since become state policy directives related to most facets of pre-service teacher education in Louisiana. Research exploring the history behind these national and state teacher education reform initiatives, the policy recommendations and directives resulting from these initiatives, and the standards on which these reforms are based is valuable to educators.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality, focusing primarily on Commission proceedings and the evolution of its recommendations within a context of standards-based teacher education

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

reform history. This research examined policy recommendations for Louisiana's teacher education programs that resulted from Commission meetings held at the Louisiana State University Pennington Biomedical Research Center in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, from September, 1999, through May, 2000.[2] Aims of the study included describing the development of these recommendations, their relation to national teacher education reform movements, and their potential impact on university teacher preparation programs.

Issues raised by professionalization and de-regulation movements within a historical and political standards-based context formed a backdrop to Commission proceedings and decisions. This study provides not only documentation of Commission proceedings of some historical value, but also insights into reform implications for teacher education in Louisiana, as well as for the work of similar commissions in other states.

Research Questions

The study explored the following questions.

- Where do current national teacher education reform movements fit in the historical and political development of teacher education standards?
- How do these national movements reflect professionalization and de-regulation debates?
- How did Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality develop its policy recommendations?
- Where do these recommendations situate the Commission in current national reform movements?
- How is standards-based reform reflected in Commission policy recommendations?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Background of the Study

To understand the evolution and implications of current Congressional and Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission mandates regarding teacher education programs, one must explore the historical and political development of teacher education reform initiatives. The "Age of Accountability" is an increasingly accurate name for the current era in education. Fueled by the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), attention to educational reform or renewal has built in momentum over the past two to three decades (e.g., Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999; Ducharme & Ducharme, 1997; Goodlad, 1990a, 1990b, 1994; Holmes Group, 1986; Kanstoroom & Finn, 1999; Kirp, 2000; National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; Ravitch, 1993; Rhodes & Bellamy, 1999). Pointing to concerns over the quality of education in the United States and negative comparisons to that of other countries, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) expressed a fear that America's economic development and growth would be negatively affected by problems in its schools. This "fear" still prevails.

The resulting reform movements reflect an increased policy focus on change and accountability in education, primarily in the form of standards and standards assessment. However, these were not the first signs of attention to standards in the educational scene, for its beginnings can be seen prior to the 1983 warning of a "nation at risk." For example, accountability of K-12 students, and of K-12 schools, was the focus of federal legislation in the 1960s.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> For more than three decades, under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, program evaluation through large-scale testing has been an integral part of federal support for the education of low-achieving children in poor neighborhoods. The minimum competency testing movement, beginning in the 1970s, gave large-scale, standardized achievement tests a visible and popular role in holding students (and sometimes schools) accountable. (Heubert & Hauser, 1999, p. 15)

The call for change and accountability in K-12 and teacher education has come from policy makers in multiple arenas—from district school boards to governors to the President. As these policy makers craft reform measures around standards movements currently sweeping the nation, mandates for kindergarten to the university level are prevalent. Former President Clinton called for "a national crusade for education standards—not federal government standards, but national standards, representing what all our students must know to succeed in the knowledge economy of the twenty-first century" (qtd. in Heubert and Hauser, 1999, p. 13). The mandate for accountability by all associated with K-12 education—the student, the teacher, the administrator, the teacher educator—has become the rule rather than the exception, with teacher "quality" a priority (Ben-Peretz, 2001; Cochran-Smith, 2001a, 2001b; Kohn, 2000; Nelson, 1998, 1999; Thiessen, 2000).

In *Why National Standards and Tests? Politics and the Quest for Better Schools*, John F. Jennings (1998) documents the political roots of education reform movements as he defines standards-based reform. The standards-testing movements that emerged in the late eighties began

> with the stated purpose of helping teachers know what they are to teach and helping students know what they are expected to learn. . . . This major change is generally labeled "standards-based" reform. It means that agreement will be achieved first on what students are to know and to be able to do—the standards.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Then progress through school and graduation from high school will be determined according to mastery of content. Teachers will know ahead of time what they are to teach, and students will know what will be expected of them. . . . This movement toward reform based on defining high standards for education began between mathematics teachers and in some states that had strong educational leadership. (Jennings, 1998, p. 6)

While perhaps not yet as widely publicized as K-12 standards movements, standards-based reform movements are evident in teacher education history. These movements have often followed actions by external political forces. In fact, implementation over the past ten years of K-12 standards-based educational reform in most states has been followed by calls for similar reform at the teacher education level—what some may view as a natural progression: what's "wrong" with K-12 education must be the "fault" of K-12 teachers, and what's "wrong" with K-12 teachers must be the "fault" of teacher educators.

Issues of standards and standards assessment dominate conversations regarding PK-16+ education reform. Some educators see these conversations as productive, fleshing out a new reform movement.

> Discussions of national content standards developed by professional organizations and state responses to the standards movement occupy many pages of space in journals and many hours of presentation time at conferences. The goal of these discussions is to provide an opportunity for knowledgeable evaluation and analysis of the standards movement. (Pitton, 1999, p. 383)

Other educators view these discussions as "essentially retreads of tried and untrue conservative concepts that have a history of failure" (Nelson, 1998, p. 679). Although such a history might prompt some teacher educators to sidestep the fray and await a repeat of failure, the rampant growth of standards-based reform precludes such (in)action.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Instead, teacher educators have been forced to confront issues underlying reform movements.

Among these issues is whether or not identification of standards and means of assessment should lie in the hands of individual teachers and teacher educators—or in the hands of educator or even noneducator policy makers. The traditional stated purpose of standards-based reform—to define what teachers and students should know and be able to do—implies that individual teachers and teacher educators must relinquish their autonomy over curriculum, in effect relinquishing their academic freedom. Further confusion arises from questions as to how one measures whether or not teachers know and are able to do what is expected. These issues focus in large part on control. Who will determine the standards, and who will measure the accomplishment of these?

Embedded in curricular decisions related to these issues are pedagogical questions as to what kind of education is valued: that resulting in performance or achievement related to prescribed standards or that related to understandings less conducive to such assessment. These questions perplex many teacher educators as they address standards-based reform issues—a task some educators find futile. In her discussion of external forces that impact teaching and thus teacher education, Ben-Peretz (2001) observes that, "given the potential conflict between professional autonomy and state demands on one hand and the intricacies of professional knowledge on the other hand, teacher educators are confronted with a dilemma" (p. 51). The source of this "dilemma" is evident in an examination of various education purposes.

> In some ways, we want education to promote democratic equality (preparing competent citizens); we also want education to promote social efficiency

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> (preparing productive workers); in addition, we want education to promote social mobility (preparing individuals who can compete successfully for social goods). Yet the kind of teaching and learning that will be effective varies radically depending on whether the primary aim is to prepare citizens or workers or social climbers. (Labaree, qtd. in Ben-Peretz, 2001, p. 52)

Ben-Peretz adds another goal to this list of what she sees as "nearly impossible demands": "to promote in-depth understanding of various knowledge domains" (2001, p. 52).

Teacher educators find themselves faced with a choice: either aggressively confront these complexities or ignore them. Some discard the latter as an option: "The time has come for teacher educators to pause and reconsider their vocation—to map a course of professional education that will serve simultaneously the needs of practitioners and more utopian ideals for society at large" (Ben-Peretz, 2001, p. 56).

Yet an awareness of reform history might encourage teacher educators to do otherwise. Like countless other K-12 and teacher educators, during my twenty-seven years as an educator I have observed and experienced the beginning, and the demise, of many of the educational reforms discussed in Chapter Three. Commonly, educators learn to give passing notice to, or even to ignore, changes proposed by others—often others indirectly (if at all) involved in the work of educating. Labeled by Nelson (1999) as the "history of education replete with Teflon reform—change that fails to stick," such failure owes in large part to "effort(s) . . . to 're-form' another into the image desired by the reformer" (Nelson, 1999, p. 389). Often seeing proposed, and at times legislated, reform as yet another attempt to politicize education, many teachers and teacher educators continue their focus on the work at hand: educating the PK-12 student and the preservice teacher the way they deem best while attempting to avoid the politicization of education.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

But education is inherently political (Ben-Peretz, 2001; Bruner, 1996; Cochran-Smith, 2000a, 2000b, 2001a, 2001b). And the steady crescendo of the cry for education reform grounded in standards-based education, performance assessment, and high stakes testing is difficult to ignore. What began as proposed standards for one or two groups has erupted into established standards for many constituencies: standards for K-12 students in the form of content standards, performance standards, opportunity-to-learn standards, "world-class" standards; for preservice teachers and programs in the form of Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards (see Appendix E for INTASC standards); and for in-service teachers in the form of National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) (see Appendix F for NBPTS standards), standards for individual disciplines (e.g., English/language arts, social studies, health). Though not yet as well developed and supported, standards for cooperating teachers, K-12 administrators, university teaching faculty, and Professional Development Schools are also under serious consideration.

Congressional mandates at the national level through Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) and related mandates established or at least under discussion at the state level have forced educators to attend to this latest wave of reform. While many educators are leading a march toward standards-based reform, just as many conservative noneducators are driving opposing reform proposals which are quickly becoming statutory. The philosophies behind and intended results of both movements vary greatly. On one hand, educators caution against what they view as the rampant

> de-skilling [of teachers] that results from top-down movements and centralized control. Mandates and prescriptions preempt initiative and creativity. On the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> other hand, if teachers are fully empowered as professionals, change becomes a product of professional responsibility. Teacher professionalism cannot be legislated any more than can morality or student achievements, but it can be taught. (Nelson, 1999, p. 390)

Nelson calls instead for the "re-skilling" of teachers through professional development, preparing them to become "researchers into the practice that they control" (1999, p. 390), rather than "de-skilling" them through mandates from above.

These are neither new concerns nor new promises. In fact, a historical review reveals that concepts considered by some to be revolutionary in education actually have roots, and were even fully developed, in prior decades. What differs now, perhaps, is the level of intensity behind the philosophical differences underlying the call for education reform—and the seeming success one point of view is currently enjoying.

Issues of teacher education reform are complex. Reform calls use verbiage related to issues of recruitment, preparation, and retention (Andrew, 1997; Kanstoroom & Finn, 1999; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996). But teacher education reform is much more far-reaching than this, stemming from agendas focused on more than these three areas and those related to the identification and assessment of standards at the school of education level. To some, the political underpinnings of teacher education reform reflect "the larger political issue of who should control American education," with "the matter of teacher education policy setting . . . becoming a national issue. . . . Just as the debate over school policy generates two distinct approaches about federal control, so too does the debate about teacher education policy" (Imig, 2000, pp. 3, 19).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Assuming center stage in this debate are two groups with highly contrasting agendas: one group supportive of a federalization agenda represented by the direct and extensive involvement of the Presidency and Congress, and one group advocating deregulation in support of the Constitutional basing of policy making at the state (local) level, representative of an increasingly vocal and powerful conservative group of politicians. These two approaches are well defined in the philosophy and actions of two distinct camps. "In contrast to those who advocate the federalization of teacher education, with its national or centralizing tendencies, there are those who promote greater discretion on the part of institutions in setting their own directions" (Imig, 2000, p. 19). Issues basically center around a topic of old: federalism versus states' (local) rights. The often embittered debates between these two groups cannot be dismissed, given implications for the future of teacher education and education as a whole.

While both groups ostensibly have the same ends in sight, i.e., the improvement of K-12 education through more "effective" teachers (often labeled as "caring, competent quality teachers"), they differ in their interpretation of how to produce and support "effective" teachers, and even of what "effective" teaching is. These differences have resulted in confusion among teachers and teacher educators as to what should be taught (Ben-Peretz, 2001; Imig, 2000; Sindelar & Rosenberg, 2000).

> In the confusion of our times, teacher education is a nearly impossible endeavor because what one is supposed to be doing as a teacher is vague, ambitious, and fraught with uncertainties. In spite of this situation, much of the perceived failure of schooling is attributed to teachers who are thought to be ill prepared for their task because teacher education is deficient (Ben-Peretz, 2001, p. 48).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

As these camps address issues in the political arena, an arena which perhaps never before has shined such a bright spotlight on teacher education, teacher educators find themselves wrestling with questions not only related to "quality" teachers and teaching, but also to power and control. However, unlike teacher educators struggling in the midst of accountability mandates, policy makers seem confident in their understandings of issues and resulting decisions, due largely to the efforts of de-regulation advocates.

> The conservatives have made this issue [of control] so understandable to policy makers across the political spectrum that "teacher education" is now a surrogate for debating the larger issues of national vs. local control of education. . . . (T)eacher education policy making is becoming a proxy for settling larger issues of federal vs. state control of education, including the role of the state vs. non-governmental agencies in setting standards or holding schools accountable to the general public. (Imig, 2000, p. 3)

All the while, the political light seems to shine most brightly and intensely on the purpose and role of college/university teacher education programs now and in the future (Ben-Peretz, 2001; Cochran-Smith, 2001a, 2001b; Fullan, Guluzzo, Morris, & Watson, 1998; Sindelar & Rosenberg, 2000).

Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality

These issues of "control" of teacher education programs were obvious in the proceedings and recommendations of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality. Indeed, even the label "blue ribbon commission" connotes membership consisting of individuals held in high esteem for their expertise and judgement. A "logical" assumption then might be that commission recommendations would reflect this same expertise and judgement. If those recommendations point to some overseeing authority, the underlying foundation is one of control. This was the case with the Commission, as it

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

developed policy recommendations that would become state policy directives for Louisiana's teacher education programs.

The Commission explored teacher education reform in other states and formulated policy recommendations addressing a perceived need for "quality and quantity" of K-12 teachers in Louisiana. Early in the exploration and discussion process, several members referred to a frame of K-12 standards-based reform recently implemented in the state—reform aimed at the K-12 school level and driven by policy makers at the state level. Here again emerge issues of control.

With two discipline-specific consortia (English/language arts and mathematics) meeting concurrently and guided by the Commission Director in the development of content-area standards for teachers, and similar consortia in other disciplines scheduled to meet the following year (2000-01), this Commission designed a new certification structure to provide schools of education (SCDEs[3]) with a frame for redesign of teacher education programs. It also created a new alternate certification program intended to provide a fast-track to certification for nontraditional students—a program to be offered by SCDEs and private providers alike. A third component of the Commission's work is an accountability structure for teacher education programs across the state—in part addressing the Congressional call for state and university report cards and in part confronting what the Commission saw as inadequacies in Louisiana's university teacher preparation programs. Just as with the recently mandated K-12 standards-based reform movement in Louisiana, teacher education reform was rapidly driven by policy makers at the state level.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Definitions of Standards

Standards-based movements are fundamental to many current reform initiatives. An awareness of what is meant by "standard" and of the history behind the term is important to understanding these movements. Yet this understanding may be difficult because "writers use the term in many different ways, seldom bothering to unpack the differences in meaning; standards become the answer to all questions" (Andrew, 1997, p. 168). (See also Kordalewski, 2000; Lockwood, 1998; Tuijnman & Postlethwaite, 1994.)

While some definitions of "standards" relate to evaluation and measurement, others more accurately explain meanings behind reform movements. Richardson states that a standard is "something that is established by authority, custom, or general consent as a model or example to be followed; a definite level of degree of quality that is proper or adequate for a specific purpose" (Richardson, 1994, qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 2). Using the same definition, Pearson uses synonyms to clarify: "criterion," "gauge," "yardstick," "touchstone," and "test" (Pearson, 1994, qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 2). Edelfelt and Raths continue their exposition of definitions of "standard" by pointing to Glass' 1978 essay on the common but incorrect use of "standard" synonymously for "criterion": "According to Glass, 'criterion' is a variable of concern in making a decision, 'standard' the 'amount' of the variable that is needed to meet the criterion" (pp. 2-3).

Similar to Richardson's and Pearson's definitions is Andrew's 1997 discussion of two uses of the term—"something common, or agreed upon" by all and "a degree of quality" (p. 168). Andrew further explains the "commonness" behind the term by exploring proposed national curriculum standards—standards which he sees as meeting

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

national needs, "not necessarily the needs of children" (p. 168), based on what is currently accepted by various learned societies as necessary knowledge.

Andrew (1997) sees parallels between the standards-based curriculum and the behavioral objectives curriculum popular in the 1960s.

> States are scampering to put in place *curriculum frameworks* that usually reflect curriculum determined by national professional groups. To further complicate the notion of a standard or common curriculum, the content to be learned is presently described as standards, thereby providing standard standards. These *standards-based* curricula involve describing the common curriculum in terms of *what students should know and be able to do.* This is much like the behavioral objectives curricula of the past 40 years—except that the standards and *performance assessments* of the 1990s are somewhat broader and more integrative than earlier definitions of behavioral objectives. (p. 168)

Pitton (1999), however, finds comparisons to be misleading. She warns that such comparisons, including those of differing states' movements, result in "looking at the standards out of context" (p. 384).

Nelson (1999) counters these cautions by reviewing the historical development of standards-based reform in Minnesota. He sees its seeds as the outcome-based movement of the 1980s.

> Then as now the standards movement was the favored child of the educational bureaucracy. The names keep changing—OBE (outcome-based education) to standards-based reform—but the smell of a centralized results-oriented, assessment-focused reform remains. Therefore . . . this reform should not be viewed as an innovation; it should be examined in the light of its long history. (Nelson, 1999, p. 389)

In his argument that standards-based reform as currently being defined in Minnesota is "less than innovative," Nelson (1998) cites a 1996 Minnesota policy definition: "statements of what a student should know or be able to do" (p. 680), a definition open to other nouns as well (e.g., "teacher," "preservice teacher"). Nelson

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

notes that this same definition was used for "learning outcomes" in the mid-eighties, with "the concepts behind these words [going] even further back in the history of curriculum" (p. 680). As an example of these much earlier beginnings, he cites Bobbitt's "classic [1918] model of curriculum development based on the specification of objectives for student performance" (1998, p. 680), a model considered by many scholars as marking the beginning of curriculum as a field of study (Jackson, 1992; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). Nelson also includes the 1940s and 1960s movements of Ralph Tyler and Hilda Taba respectively, as well as that of Benjamin Bloom and his "taxonomy of objectives," which encouraged "the use of student objectives in the development of sequential learning activities": "These well-known theorists contended that the task of curriculum development was to define clearly what students should know and be able to do and then to decide how to measure or evaluate whether or not the objective had been attained" (Nelson, 1998, p. 680).

Nelson's 1987 dissertation documents an even earlier example of performance-based learning in Britain—one that seemingly validates his claim that standards-based reform of today is not a new movement. Titled "Cheap or Efficient: A Study of British Elementary Education During the Era of Payment by Results, 1859-1889," the dissertation focused on British Parliament policy called "payment by results": "Under this system, local schools received government funding on the basis of the number of students who passed an annual examination in the basics of reading, writing, and mathematics" (1998, pp. 681, 684). Ironically in light of current movements, by 1905 British schools had moved to "unlimited autonomy for teachers" after 30 years of top-down centralized

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

curriculum control (Nelson, 1998, p. 684). "The only uniformity of practice that the Board of Education desires to see in the Teaching of Public Elementary Schools is that each teacher shall think for himself such methods of teaching as may use his powers to the best advantage and be best suited to the particular needs and conditions of the school" (*Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools*, qtd. in Nelson, 1998, p. 684). Clearly, issues of accountability that focused on specific student behaviors in the form of objectives, outcomes, results, or standards are not new. They are at least 140 years old.

Seeing the debate over curriculum approach as an alignment of behavioral psychologists versus cognitive and developmental theorists, Nelson (1998) describes these sides as attempting to rationalize curriculum into a science "from aims to objectives to activities to results" (p. 681) versus attempting to address the complexities of the classroom, as explained through Doyle's "multidimensionality, simultaneity, and unpredictability" (p. 681). The current problem with this debate, as Nelson sees it, is that some reform advocates have "sidestepped the debate over the purpose and form of education and launched a gargantuan implementation process . . . a perilous leap to standards implementation" (p. 681). In disagreement with this standards-based reform movement, he predicts that its top-down approach destines it for failure, given the history of similar approaches.

Context of the Study

This study explores and describes one segment of teacher education reform history: that of current reform initiatives in Louisiana. The study focuses on the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

proceedings and recommendations of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality against a historical backdrop of teacher education reform. Commission meetings were held monthly from September, 1999, through May, 2000, at the Louisiana State University Pennington Biomedical Research Center in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Following are brief descriptions of the Blue Ribbon Commission. Further detail is provided in Chapters Three and Four.

Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality was formed because of "an awareness of the need for universities and districts to work together to address teacher quality issues" (Burns, 2000). Representing the Governor's Office, Commission Director Dr. Jeanne Burns explained that collaboration towards this end had already begun among three agencies: the Louisiana Governor's Office, the Board of Regents, and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (J. Burns, personal interview, June 16, 2000). However, 1998 Congressional mandates in Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 provided the impetus the state needed to develop a system of accountability intended to insure this collaboration.

Research Methodology

This research employs qualitative methodology to provide a case study of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality. To understand where the Commission is situated in national teacher education reform movements and how the Commission's recommendations reflect standards-based reform, I investigated Commission meeting proceedings, materials, presentations, discussions, and policy recommendations from historical and ethnographic perspectives. I similarly studied pre-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and post-meeting materials distributed by the Commission Director, as well as proceedings, presentations, and discussions of related meetings of the Louisiana Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (SCDE deans).

This historical documentation of Commission proceedings which led to its recommendations was supplemented by attention to ways individuals involved responded individually and as a group. The methodology supporting the study derives from that of case studies, as well as from a modification of what Spradley might term a topic-oriented micro-ethnography (1980). This study is not a comprehensive ethnography focused on capturing the way(s) of life of others. It does, however, reflect the ethnographic aim of "learning from people" (Spradley, 1980, p. 3)—in this case, from the Commission and its planning committee.

The focus of the study is on the Commission itself: its actions and decisions. However, the Commission consisted of 31 individual members plus planning committee members—all of whose actions, and lack of action, resulted in Commission recommendations which have since become policy directives for teacher preparation programs in the state of Louisiana.

Participant observations, as well as formal and informal interviews, provided the basis for this study. Materials distributed prior to and during the meetings added to what I learned from these observations and interviews. Research methodology is detailed further in Chapter Three.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Positionality of the Investigator

I have arrived at this particular juncture in my teacher education journey due to choices and fortune. Unquestionably, who I am today as a learner and researcher is a product of the layers of my experiences and understandings—all through various lenses. Following ten years of teaching secondary English and social studies in inner city, suburban, and laboratory school settings and five years of supervising and administering clinical experiences for preservice teachers at the university level, I was encouraged to begin my doctoral studies to "validate" what I was already doing. Once into the program, I quickly dismissed the mere notion of validation as I discovered that my experiences informed my studies and my studies informed my experiences.

The timing of my entry into the field as a teacher educator in the late eighties and as a student once again in the early nineties was quite fortunate for me. This was the period in which 100 or so SCDEs had joined as The Holmes Group—a group intent on teacher education reform that questioned traditional means of preparing teachers. My institution was a charter member.

I was a participant in conversations among and between College of Education faculty, Arts and Sciences faculty, Basic Sciences faculty, and K-12 public school faculty and administrators. These were challenging and exciting times as together we created quite different (for us) master's-level teacher education programs: a five-year elementary education program and a fifth year secondary/K-12 education program. In contrast to the traditional "one-size-fits-all" four-year undergraduate program we had at the time, what we called the Holmes Program was designed around a general philosophical frame

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

grounded in a conceptual research base. This program emphasized depth and breadth of content and pedagogical knowledge as well as extensive and diverse year-long student teaching internships, with the flexibility necessary to allow the tailoring of expectations to discipline, grade level, and student cohort needs. These were to become our sole teacher preparation programs.

Among the most exciting results of these conversations were the collaborations forged among our own discipline-based faculty, as well as those with faculties outside the College. In my roles first as university supervisor of student teachers and shortly after as coordinator of clinical experiences (comparable to director of student teaching), I participated in all planning sessions. At the same time, in my role as a doctoral student, I studied under many of these same faculty members, allowing me to learn from and appreciate their research interests and varied backgrounds.

While there was limited success in involving colleagues from other colleges across campus in the conversations, there was much success in reaching out to and partnering with our colleagues in K-12 public schools. Even that level of conversation, however, reflected some resistance on the part of public school teachers, perhaps due in part to a history of not having been involved previously in teacher education program decisions and thus feeling some skepticism as to our "real" motives and in part to a history of being included at the district level in labor-intensive planning for change—only to see those plans rarely implemented.

Fortunately, while some teachers refused to participate in early conversations and others took a wait-and-see attitude, a few were willing to assume the role of risk-taker by

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

getting involved from the outset. The time was characterized by meeting after meeting. . . after meeting, often at the end of which draft proposals offered at the beginning had been revised and re-revised so that the original was barely recognizable. This was useful, for the changes reflected the consensus of all voices.

As we developed program frameworks, expectations, and requirements, at the same time we had to consider National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards, particularly since a Board of Examiners (BOE) visit for program accreditation was impending. This review would focus exclusively on the new programs, since all other programs were being phased out. NCATE standards at the time were designed more for traditional programs than for innovative programs, forcing us to describe our programs in terms acceptable to NCATE and understandable by the BOE. As an associate dean commented, we were designing and assembling a new car model on the assembly line while the quality controllers were examining what they expected to be the final product. My role in this process was aimed primarily at what NCATE then labeled the "world of practice"; i.e., the role and extent of K-12 school involvement in our teacher education programs.

The challenges of creating and recreating programs were great, and the numbers were small, as was the history for the first few years of other institutions which had already instituted similar programs. This was fortunate for us programmatically. Encouraging all involved to have a "tolerance for ambiguity," we intended for the programs to emerge from the needs and interests of the communities of learners involved—preservice teachers, in-service teachers, and teacher educators (including those

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in other colleges). It was much easier to plan and re-plan for—and communicate with—smaller numbers. However, the numbers soon proved to be problematic for others so that three years into the programs, the College was given a mandate from University administrators to reinstate four-year and alternate certification programs in order to boost its "productivity" levels.

Although aware of the need for certified teachers in the state and the nation, some of us entered into the planning of new programs with little enthusiasm. We felt that the master's level programs had already proven to hold tremendous advantage over what could be provided in four-year undergraduate and even shorter alternate certification programs and that, given sufficient time, student enrollments could be increased to acceptable numbers. Our K-12 partners praised the development and growth of the graduate-level students, with their employers describing them as comparable to second- and third-year teachers during their first year of teaching. Yet we had no choice. So we attempted to infuse into the reinstated undergraduate programs Holmes principles and expectations had been defined for the graduate programs, all in an environment of continual review and reform—and this time with an eye to the NCATE 2000 performance-based standards.

Once again, I am fortunate to be a part of the conversations and planning process behind these changes—changes more complex than the original process when we first designed the master's level Holmes Program. While the desire to involve our colleagues from other areas and levels of education remains as strong, the ability to do so with mushrooming numbers of students and now several programs rather than two has

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

been difficult at best. At the same time, the local school district has become increasingly unsettled in an environment of low teacher pay, poor working conditions and inadequate buildings, little public support for additional taxes for any of these areas, and forty-plus years of federal court control stemming from integration issues. Yet we have continued with attempts to develop meaningful partnerships with our K-12 colleagues—despite little stability among K-12 faculties, low morale, and student population uncertainties because of busing and the increasing proliferation of private schools.

Now we also find ourselves faced with teacher education reform initiatives in Louisiana at the state level. These initiatives, assuming the form of calls for teacher education accountability for K-12 achievement, have followed state implementation of reforms at the K-12 level: standards-based reform, assessment by standardized testing, and K-12 school accountability.

During 1999-2000, a governor-appointed Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality met to create guidelines for similar reforms in the state's teacher education programs. Monthly meetings of the 31-member commission, as well as of a smaller planning committee, produced recommendations for a complex teacher education accountability system as a companion to the Congressionally-mandated state and individual institution annual report cards, a revised teacher certification structure, and a new alternate certification program ostensibly intended to be a fast-track option primarily for mid-career individuals.

Throughout 1999-2000, as described in greater detail in Chapter Three, I attended Blue Ribbon Commission meetings and participated in discussions in numerous related

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

meetings. With job responsibilities that included recruitment, certification, curricular planning, retention, and accountability, I was involved in part for reasons that were job-related.

This involvement led to my research interests. I have studied the historical and political underpinnings of teacher education reform movements, focusing on standards-based reform and assessment. This study has deepened my understanding of reform issues through the exploration of teacher education reform history and its role in larger political debates. Just as I discovered upon beginning my doctoral studies, my studies continue to inform my experiences and my experiences continue to inform my studies.

Significance of the Study

A case study of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality and the development of its policy recommendations—the new teacher certification structure, the new alternate certification program, and the teacher preparation program accountability system—contributes to our understanding of the history of teacher education reform. It contributes to the fields of inquiry related to teacher education, history of education, and educational policy development, as will be seen in Chapter Five. The work of this and similar commissions and governmental agencies embodies this history-in-the-making as groups address reform issues and create policy.

This historical account set against a backdrop of standards-based reform and professionalization and de-regulation movements provides insight into Louisiana's educational and political environments as these are currently influencing teacher education

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in the state. Such insight can be helpful in determining implications and future directions for K-12 and teacher education and related reform initiatives.

This study also reveals the Louisiana Commission's situatedness in teacher education reform history and national teacher education debates. As seen in this study, the Commission serves as a vivid example of the myopic nature of current reform movements which are reflective of the efficiency movements of the 1920s. An understanding of this positioning can inform ongoing education reform discussions and planning in the state and elsewhere.

Perhaps more important, this study highlights how larger issues in teacher education reform are currently being played out in Louisiana. This investigation can inform similar studies in other states as a part of what is happening in the rest of the country regarding teacher education reform.

Nationally, teacher education reform reflects the conflicting thought and goals of advocates of professionalization and de-regulation. However, as revealed in this study, policy recommendations from Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality reflect goals of each movement rather than distinct allegiance to one movement over the other. This blurring of goals is a critical finding as it describes the results of the Commission's actions and potential impact on education reform in Louisiana.

Summary

This nine month case study explored and described Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality, with historical and ethnographic focus on Commission proceedings and recommendations. Against a backdrop of national teacher

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

education reform history and initiatives, this study centers on one state's reform initiatives by investigating the development of the Commission's policy recommendations for teacher education reform in the state of Louisiana. The study explored these national- and state-level teacher education reform initiatives against a historical and political backdrop, with an emphasis on standards-based reform and on conflicting professionalization and de-regulation movements.

Following this chapter's general overview of the study, Chapter Two provides an exploration of the interweavings of the history of teacher education, standards-based teacher education reform, and curriculum reform as these relate to the history and politics of teacher education reform movements. Chapter Three provides details regarding the research methodology followed. In Chapter Four, Commission meetings are detailed, including proceedings, materials, presentations, discussions, and recommendations. Chapter Five focuses on a summary of the results of the research and a discussion of the findings.

Underlying this research is the belief that current teacher education reform initiatives can be more fully understood when situated within the history of teacher education and curricular reform. An understanding of these initiatives within historical and political contexts is necessary to determine implications for education, as well as for the future of teacher education programs in colleges and universities.

End Notes

1. For brevity's sake, the Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality will be referred to as the Commission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2. The Commission held meetings in September, October, November, January, February, March, April, and May of 1999-2000. In December, 2000, the Commission Director presented a status report on Commission activities to a joint meeting of the Louisiana Board of Regents and the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.

3. Because of differing structures within institutions of higher education, teacher education programs are referred to here as SCDEs (schools, colleges, departments of education).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 2

REFORM FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Histories of teacher education and educational curriculum describe the evolution of expectations for teachers (see Cremin, 1961, 1964; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). An exploration of these histories, particularly in relation to standards-based teacher education reform, can be helpful in understanding the history and politics of current teacher education reform movements. Knowledge of this history allows one to determine where these contemporary movements fit in the historical and political development of teacher education reform and how these movements reflect contemporary professionalization and de-regulation debates. Such a historical background is necessary to identify the causes of the rapid growth of contemporary conservative teacher education reform movements at both the national and the state levels and the impact of their use by politicians for their own political ends.

This chapter explores the origins and history of major standards-based and curricular reform movements influential in teacher education. A study of the evolution of these movements provides the historical and political context needed to understand current reform initiatives. Such an understanding is of particular importance to this research as a case study of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality, particularly as it describes the emergence of teacher education reform initiatives in the form of Commission recommendations.

Historical movements are grouped primarily by decades according to movement origins and patterns. The reader is guided in relating these past movements to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

contemporary ones through the interweaving of past with present. Exploration of these movements is integrated with modern similarities and differences. Following this historical account is a discussion of contemporary professionalization and de-regulation movements and their influence on teacher education reform.

The importance of familiarizing oneself with this history lies in the foundation necessary for understanding the historical and political development of standards-based teacher education reform. Such a foundation helps one see where standards fit in current teacher education reform movements such as Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality.

Historical Overview

Scholars credit *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) as having "spawned what has come to be known as the standards movement" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613), citing cases involving "educators and observers . . . steeled to do battle in the nation's schools by (its) rhetoric" (Lockwood, 1998, p. 2). Similarly, some credit the recent Clinton administration with having revived the idea at the national level, while others point to even earlier beginnings and revivals.

Indeed, while the publication of *A Nation at Risk* "altered the education landscape for the final two decades of the (twentieth century) and will continue to influence education policy in the new century" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613), seeds of the standards movement can be found in teacher education reform history much earlier than the 1980s (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999; Nelson, 1998). In fact, "standards" have been an issue in teacher education since, evidently, the 1800s.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> In the last two centuries, there have been innumerable studies, pronouncements, and declarations on standards in teacher education—efforts to identify criteria for institutions preparing teachers, curricula in teacher education, prospective teachers, beginning teachers, practicing teachers, teachers in various disciplines, and teacher educators. (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 3)

The question has long been "What do teachers need to know and be able to do?," with answers varying over the past 200 years, heavily influenced by changing views concerning the role of schools. This question is still being asked, though now phrased in slightly different ways, as will be discussed later in this chapter. And it is this question that dominates teacher education reform movements of today.

The search for answers to "What do teachers need to know and be able to do?" has been somewhat inconsistent in complexity as well as in intensity. Early expectations for teachers were minimal, as Wise and Leibbrand (2000) describe: "When normal schools began in the 1800s, teachers knew little more than their students" (p. 613). This situation was acceptable to many in society and schools at the time because the focus was on basic skills; that was all that was deemed necessary for the economic needs of the time.

Understanding the role of common or public schools in the first half of the nineteenth century as providing education primarily for children of poor families helps one understand this early focus on basic skills. Teaching in the public schools at this time, therefore, required no professional background and reflected a high turnover rate since it was considered only a temporary job (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996).

1800s to Early 1900s

By mid-19th century, however, as public school populations in many states began to include all children, not just the poor, differing approaches competed for dominance in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

curricula. Among these was the classical curriculum grounded in faculty psychology and centered around the development of the mind, especially mental discipline, through repetition and memorization in subjects such as Latin. In contrast, Herbert Spencer's 1860 "What Knowledge is of Most Worth?" advocated a curriculum centered around opportunities for student discovery. Reflecting a shift from curricular focus on the spiritual to the social, Spencer's proposal represents a significant development in curricular history: the recognition that curriculum results from selection and choice (Hamilton, 1990, cited in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996).

But the curricular focus in the last half of the 1800s reflected the classical theory approach emphasizing Latin, mathematics, and other classical subjects, with the prescribed curriculum "organized arbitrarily into age-segregated groups, [as] an administrative convenience" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 74). This emphasis was upheld by outcomes from three committees appointed by the National Education Association (NEA) at the end of the 1800s—the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies, the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education, and the Committee on College Entrance Requirements.

With participants including Charles Eliot, Harvard University President, and William T. Harris, U.S. Commissioner of Education, these committees consisted primarily of subject-matter specialists, advocates of faculty psychology who assumed leading roles in curriculum development: "No study of pupil abilities, social needs, interests, capacities, or differential training found a place in their deliberations" (Cubberly, qtd. in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 75). In effect, any academic freedom enjoyed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

during the development of the public high school disappeared with the pronouncements of Eliot's Committee of Ten: "From that point the high school was dogged by college entrance requirements" (Tanner & Tanner, 1990, qtd. in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 76), a situation still pervasive today.

Similarly, the Committee of Fifteen focused on elementary education and reflected the philosophy of Harris, who advocated recitation over discovery. Seeing curriculum and method as residing in the textbook, Harris promoted methodology reflecting standardization, an emphasis evident since the humanist education movement of the early 1500s. "Rather than curriculum understood as an inner journey . . . [it came to be understood] as those policies and programs implemented institutionally" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 77). This, too, is an "understanding" still common among some today.

Until the mid-1900s, teaching was generally viewed as a collection of tasks to be learned "'on the job' with some supervision . . . a job one could 'fall back on' if nothing else worked out" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613). Curricula reflected arbitrary administrative decisions, such as course and class length, school organization by grade, and introduction of school subjects by grade levels. Less attention was given to academic and instructional issues (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). With society's acceptance of such low standards, policy makers were (and are) often able to pursue individual political agendas—a phenomenon, as will be seen, not uncommon even today.

> Over the course of the 20th century, policy makers' attention to standards waxed and waned, both in response to changes in pressure to fill teaching positions and because the product coming out of the schools was sufficient for immediate needs.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Frequently, political rather than educational considerations were foremost in the minds of local and state policy makers. (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613)

Origins of Standards in Teacher Education

The history of the development of standards in teacher education reflects this seesaw of attention from policy makers and parallels that of curriculum study in significant ways. In their self-proclaimed sketch of "the results of major studies and projects that have recommended standards for teacher education" (p. 20), Edelfelt and Raths (1999) review historical underpinnings and findings of teacher education reform and discover historical patterns related to the quest for standards in teacher education.

They begin by citing a motion considered at the Fifth Annual Meeting of the American Normal School Association in 1869:

> Whereas, The elements of our professional science exist in a chaotic state, and, whereas, we believe the cause of education would be materially benefitted by having these elements systematically arranged that there might be uniformity in all the Normal Schools, both in theory and practice. Therefore,
>
> Resolved, That there be appointed by the Association an Educational Council, or Committee, whose duty it shall be to report at our next annual meeting on the following, viz., 1. What properly constitutes the "Science of Education," as applicable to the normal Schools and the teaching profession generally? 2. What "Course of Study and Practice" in the Normal School is best calculated to elevate the standard of education and to reduce teaching to a uniform system and regular profession?
>
> Resolved, That the committee report through the educational journals of the country previous to the next meeting of the Association. (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 1)

This call for standards and a "scientific" methodology is similar to that heard today, with its focus on the "science" of teaching and the differentiation between best and worst practices, with encouragement of the former and elimination of the latter: "In short, the motion calls for alignment" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 1). Proposals at the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

conference the following year included teacher education admission criteria for normal schools, followed by a two-year course of study with proposed standards focusing on such topics as "ethical instruction" and "the theory and practice of instruction" in context. Even then, however, there was little consensus regarding the issue of standards; these proposals "met with fierce objection" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 1).

Although these objections prevailed for nearly three decades, they did not halt the standards movement. In 1899 the Department of Normal Schools in the NEA received a report developed over a four-year span defining standards for teacher education phases. Included in the report was a call for proficiency in course requirements rather similar to that expected in many teacher education programs today, as well as for clinical experiences considered necessary at the time.

> Admission: The applicant shall have finished a grammar-school course embracing the following subjects, in which he is reasonably proficient: arithmetic, English grammar, geography, United States history, physiology and hygiene, drawing, civil government, music, grade-school algebra, nature study, reading, penmanship, spelling, and English.
> Clinical Experiences: The number of children entrusted to a beginning student should be small, approximately ten or twelve.
> Administration: The training school should be practically under the control of the normal-school authorities to such an extent that the latter can formulate a curriculum, select text-books, choose and dismiss teachers, determine methods, and in general administer the affairs of the school according to their own best judgment. (qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 2)

Administrative, rather than academic or pedagogical, issues seem to take precedence here, just as in the dominant classical curriculum.

Early Curriculum Movements

During this time of teacher education reform, major curriculum movements of the late 1800s and early 1900s also influenced education. With thematic curriculum

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

organization, child-centered curricula, comparative research methodology, the quantification of intelligence, and social efficiency among the movements prominent during this time, the role of the teacher would undergo various transmutations.

This can be seen in the late 1800s with the emergence of the Herbartian reform movement. Drawing from the work of Johann Friedrich Herbart, whose pedagogy was based on building on prior knowledge, this movement stood in sharp contrast to the memorization methodology of the classical theorists. Others added to Herbart's theory, with two key ideas most popular among its advocates: concentration centers (curriculum by topics) and cultural epochs (guided by the slogan "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny"). With Herbartianism's interdisciplinary approaches focused on thematic curriculum organization rather than on compartmentalization, the movement served as a bridge between classical theory and child-centered study, a precursor of the later Progressivism movement: "Credited with undermining the dominance of the classical/mental discipline point of view . . . Herbartianism [also] functioned as a traditional theory toward child-centeredness" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, pp. 82, 83).

Transitional figures between Herbartianism and Progressivism include Colonel Francis Parker and G. Stanley Hall, both vocal opponents of classical theory and of the Committees of Fifteen and Ten respectively. With Herbartian influences evident in Parker's advocacy of "concentration centers" and in Hall's concept of developmental stages, both Parker and Hall were proponents of child study reform. Critical of classical curriculum focus he described as "word-cramming and word-recitation; of believing and conforming . . . [of] the method that keeps the mind from looking outside a certain definite

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

circle; the method of implicit belief" (Parker, 1894, qtd. in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 87), Parker viewed the school as "an embryonic democracy" (Parker, 1894, qtd. in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 87). This is a point where Parker and Hall differed. Parker saw child-centered curriculum's role as related to social needs and development, whereas Hall supported a "laissez faire curriculum . . . emphasizing individual values at the expense of social values . . . nearly ignoring the role of the school in social change" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 90).

Another classical theory opponent—one of particular import in an exploration of the development of reform movements embracing standardized assessment—is Joseph Mayer Rice. Following visits to several American public schools, Rice wrote a critical review of what he had seen. His comparative studies among schools resulted in his recognition as the creator of comparative research methodology, as well as the initiator of the testing movement that began in 1897. The latter title is particularly significant, as the next ten years saw the development of Binet's intelligence test and Thorndike's achievement test, thus beginning "the American obsession with testing and measurement" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 90).

Thorndike, a behavioral psychologist who also disagreed with mental discipline theories, saw education as a "form of human engineering" (Thorndike, 1922, qtd. in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 91)—a "means-ends, calculative thinking [which] would achieve widespread currency with those who understood curriculum as institutional text" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 92). Because his stimulus-response conception of learning was conducive to quantification, Thorndike

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

opened the door to statistics-based educational research and measurement focused on "effective" teaching and learning as scientific practice, as well as to the quantification of intelligence. (See Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996; Rippa, 1988; Seguel, 1966; Tanner & Tanner, 1990.)

With this blending of experimental psychology and social efficiency came such committees as NEA's Committee on Economy of Time (1911), charged with conducting studies to determine means of improving school efficiency and with examining curriculum within a frame of social unity. Standardization of time devoted to disciplines, without attention to instructional concerns and student needs, resulted from the first studies; little actual change resulted from the last, due in large part to the conservative use of existing practice as the backdrop (Cremin, 1961; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996; Tanner & Tanner, 1990).

This focus on social effectiveness and efficiency as defined in schools was common at the time, not surprising given the growth of mass production. For example, Frederick Taylor's scientific management theory hinged on task analysis—the reduction of "knowledge" to its smallest components or details. "Curriculum became the assembly line by which economically and socially useful citizens would be produced" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 95).

Similarly, Franklin Bobbitt advocated school efficiency through more economical use of the school plant (Saturdays, Sundays, summers, as well as community use) and standardized expenditures for academic programs according to results. "Like the work of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Committee on the Economy of Time, this is curriculum-making by common denominator" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 98).

Bobbitt's work related to curriculum is even more closely tied to the current education reform movements which are focused on meeting business and industry needs in school curricula. His belief "that curriculum must directly and specifically prepare students for tasks in the adult world" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 97) combined "directed curriculum" with "undirected experience" (Bobbitt, 1918, qtd. in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 98). The acknowledgment of the importance of experience was a harbinger of Dewey's work and the Progressive movement.

Emphasis on the child's experience as the foundation of curriculum is a basic tenet of Dewey's work (1902). With Dewey credited by some scholars as a founder of the Progressive movement (Cremin, 1964; Kliebard, 1986; Seguel, 1966; Tanner & Tanner, 1980), his "contribution to educational and curricular thought . . . is incalculable" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 104). Regarding schools as vehicles for democratic societal reform through children's active experience (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996), in contrast to the classical methodology of "routinization, memorization, and recitation" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 105), Dewey was concerned about traditional education's "passivity of attitude, its mechanical massing of children, its uniformity of curriculum and method" (Dewey, 1959, qtd. in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 106). Sharing the views of Jane Addams, founder of Hull House, Dewey saw "learning . . . [as] a continuous and vital process, not

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

preparation for a life to come later" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 107; see also Tanner & Tanner, 1990).

Of particular importance to standards-based movements and assessments is Dewey's thought concerning the construction of curriculum.

> All activities were planned and conducted in the frame of children's native impulses. That is, curricular activities and problems were constructed and presented so that the child was encouraged to utilize creativity and acquire basic academic skills simultaneously. So conceived, subject matter became a resource, not the center of the curriculum. (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 107).

The teacher, rather than standardization, plays an integral role in this type of curriculum (Kliebard, 1986; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996; Tanner & Tanner, 1980).

By the early 1900s, the focus in schools had shifted from basic skills as was characteristic of the early 1800s. The teacher's role had changed as well, to a far more integral role in the instruction of students than in the past. As seen in the next three decades, with this change came studies of teaching intended to define "effective" teaching. These studies led to further attempts to identify teaching standards.

<u>1920s, 1930s, 1940s</u>

Against a backdrop of rivaling reform movements, the social efficiency movement (Bobbitt et al.) and the Progressive movement (Dewey et al.), critical analysis—reflective of task analysis that was characteristic of the social efficiency movement and of business expansion (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996)—became the focus of 1920s studies of teaching sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Commonwealth Fund. The five-year Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study used this new methodology to determine through observation what "effective"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teachers did, with the observer then extrapolating what the teacher must "know and be to perform effectively. . . . (T)he Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study was thought to be timely because the preparation of teachers was deemed the most vexing of 'all the curriculum problems in higher education'" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, pp. 3-4).

The 1920s Commonwealth study also raised an issue still under debate, that of competency-based versus outcomes-based teacher education. This issue of teacher behavior versus teacher performance represents to Edelfelt and Raths (1999) a "conundrum" (p. 4) regarding the traits of an "effective" teacher: "One must either select teachers who possess the desired traits to begin with or develop the traits in the training school and during the first few years of service" (qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 4).

The dominance enjoyed by the social efficiency movement disintegrated with the economic crash of 1929, to be replaced by Progressivism, which intensified in the early 1930s. Its subsequent fall owed to the splintering of the social reform branch from the child-centered branch.

The social side, led by George Counts, who criticized what he viewed as the child-centered connection to the economically privileged, concerned many Progressives because of the growing "politicization" of the movement (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). Though Dewey and other Progressives supported Counts' belief that schools have a role in social change, they did not agree with him on the principle that schools must be the sole social change agent. To Dewey, all institutions together share responsibility for social change (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). Progressivism did not rebound from this split.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In 1946, the Commission on Teacher Education, created eight years earlier by the American Council on Education (ACE), established standards for teacher education because "the improvement of teacher education is of the greatest national importance in our times" (qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 5). With the teacher at this time at the forefront of curriculum development, owing to the progressive and social efficiency movements (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996), the Commission was "grounded in a democratic philosophy . . . strongly committed to the goal of aligning teaching and teacher education with basic social needs" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 5). The Commission focused on areas still emphasized today: "personnel services, selection and recruitment, placement and follow-up, curriculum, general education, subject-matter preparation, professional education, student teaching, five-year programs, in-service education for teachers, and preparation and in-service growth of college teachers" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 5).

Another study implemented during the forties resulted in *School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education*, also known as the Flowers Report, a 1948 publication developed by a subcommittee of the Committee on Standards and Surveys in the American Association of Teachers Colleges (AATC), the forerunner to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) which was established shortly after this report was distributed. Through its recommendations, the subcommittee's report set standards for laboratory experiences as part of the teacher education curriculum, standards still in place in many institutions. These recommendations included the following:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> that (1) laboratory experiences be an integral part of work in each of the four years of college; (2) before student teaching, laboratory experiences be integrated into other parts of the college program; (3) provisions be made for post-student-teaching experiences; (4) provisions be made for full-time student teaching; (5) assignments be made cooperatively by the people most acquainted with the student and his or her needs and the opportunities in the laboratory situation; and (6) the college faculty member and the cooperating teacher share in supervision. (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 6)

These became part of the accreditation standards for AATC and later for NCATE.

The resulting self-accreditation under the auspices of AATC stemmed from member identification of standards, with self-study arising because of the unique nature of the normal schools: they were not directly associated with existing colleges and universities and thus were unable to participate in regional accreditations. With accreditation long a topic for discussion, at least since the 1850s and the establishment of the American Normal School Association, acceptance of self-accreditation was minimal because of issues regarding the limited scope of governance: the possibilities for "objectivity" in such self-study were questioned by some. However, this issue of limited governance in accreditation was addressed in 1952 when various groups began to explore the establishment of an independent accrediting agency (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999).

The 1940s represent a time of transition in curricular history. The end of Progressivism during the World War II era saw the re-emergence of a reconstituted social efficiency movement. Focused less on scientific management and more on "life adjustment" education, for a brief time "the functionality of social efficiency asserted itself simply and forcefully in the Tyler Rationale" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 151). The Tyler Rationale, named for Ralph Tyler, reflects his influential principles regarding evaluation. "Tyler has been termed a prophet of evaluation. . . . All

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

educational evaluation is a commentary on Tyler's work of the 1930s" (O'Shea, 1985, qtd. in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p.150). It would be important to later testing movements.

But these testing movements would not prove to be the sole dominating force in teacher education over the next three decades. A decided shift in responsibility for teacher education would determine the directions it would next take. Shifting politics began to exert greater influence on educational decisions than before, resulting in the quick birth and just as sudden death of various education movements.

Once again issues of standards in teacher education gained in importance as teacher educators responded to these changes, with national accreditation becoming a focus. Accompanying this shift in responsibility was one in focus among curriculum specialists, a shift which would further affect the path of teacher education.

Surfacing approximately fifty years ago, these shifts still command attention today, for they represent a shift in control. An understanding of what sparked these changes is important to an understanding of the role of academic disciplines other than education in current teacher education reform movements and the further development of standards-based movements.

1950s, 1960s, 1970s

> The 1950s saw criticism of American schools and their curricula on a scale not seen again until the 1980s. . . . Life adjustment prodded the academic community [those with faculty appointments in science, social science, humanities, and the arts] to take a serious look at what was going on in elementary and secondary schools. A series of attacks on public schools and upon education professors would characterize the decade. (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 151, 152).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Disagreement among secondary, professional education, and higher education academic faculties as to what should constitute curriculum was common in the 1950s, with higher education external to professional education triumphing by the end of the decade. "Opposed by a loose but effective coalition of politicians, arts and sciences scholars, and the business community, the professional education community would lose control of curriculum development by the 1960s" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 153; see also Bestor, 1953; Kliebard, 1986, 1987). This loss of curricular control by professional educators was underlined by policy actions such as those of the National Defense Act of 1958, which excluded curriculum specialists from its chosen recipients of federal funding for curricular development, thus establishing patterns of status differentiation between professional educators and their academic colleagues (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996).

Perhaps as a result of this criticism, as well as of the return of the classical curriculum, scholarly activity increased, with a proliferation of synoptic curriculum texts placing teachers at the center of curriculum planning and development. Yet this central role of teachers and curriculum specialists diminished considerably, to be replaced by disciplinary movements in the 1960s (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). For all of these reasons, the fifties saw the beginning of a more formalized, collaborative, and ongoing attempt to establish and assess standards in teacher education.

As the roles of the teacher and the curriculum specialist changed, a move began to provide some uniformity in state teacher education programs and licensure requirements. Prior to this time, these were determined at the state level by state departments of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

education. The establishment of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) was intended to provide this uniformity among states, but that did not prove to be the case. The NASDTEC only "served to reinforce differences between states . . . with little coordination and articulation between the states and institutions" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613). The goal of "standards" in teacher education remained elusive.

With licensure for teaching based on number of course credit hours rather than demonstrated ability to teach, many teacher educators saw a need for "a stronger set of commonly agreed-upon standards" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613) assessed by some type of independent accreditation. Thus in 1952 the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (TEPS) of the NEA involved groups such as AACTE (formerly AATC), NASDTEC, and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in the creation of an agency charged with defining and assessing teacher education institutions. The result was the creation of NCATE in 1954.

Accreditation decisions would now be shared by diverse groups, as symbolized by NCATE's first executive board consisting of representatives from teachers, teacher educators, state agencies, and school boards. The change in accreditation focus shifted from one on "inputs (number and qualifications of faculty, library resources . . .)" to "more on the quality of the curriculum—what was offered to the candidates" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613).

Despite these attempts to provide consistency in standards and accountability measures, educators still faced a situation in which "no mechanism was in place in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

states, the institutions, or the accrediting agencies to determine the effectiveness of programs to prepare teachers or administrators" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613). The effect of programs' graduates on K-12 learning was still unknown.

The establishment of the TEPS Commission propelled NEA as a leader in the professionalization and standards movements, leadership that would later prove to be important to teacher education. In addition to earlier efforts concerning accreditation, TEPS focused its attention in 1959 on the Project on New Horizons in Teacher Education and Professional Standards. This Project had a profound effect on teacher education, with its report creating a "conception of the profession, which has in many respects carried forward to current times, reduced the voice and the authority of college and university faculty" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 7).

This "conception of the profession" is characterized by a differentiation between the profession's role and that of the state's—a contested differentiation still prevalent in policy making. The state would assume "statutory responsibility for certification of teachers and approval of teacher education programs" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 7). The "profession" as seen by the Project included K-12 teachers; university and college professors with responsibility for professional education; governmental agency staff, including those in the U.S. Office of Education (later to become the U.S. Department of Education) and in state departments of education; professional staff in various organizations; and professional staff in accrediting agencies. By merging professional education faculty into a much more inclusive group in the role of collaborator rather than

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that of policy maker, the Project helped to weaken their "voice and . . . authority" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 7).

The Project's goal focused on "reaching a consensus on what represented competent practice" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 7), with emphasis on "consensus" and "serious commitment" by those involved.

> An unrealistic vision of what it is hoped these competencies might become will not suffice, because the profession must be prepared to rise or fall in terms of progress made in requiring every member to attain them. Agreed-upon criteria of competence thus become an expression of serious commitment. (qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 7)

The commitment at the university or college level would be shared by the total institution, reflecting the "birth of the 'unit' concept that now dominates NCATE. In some respects the recommendation distanced teacher education from the normal school concept of professional education" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 7). This shifting of the seat of responsibility is proving to be a precursor of contemporary thought as national and state reform policies increasingly emphasize total institutional responsibility in teacher education, not just that of SCDEs.

The shift in locus of control at the university level may have been an attempt on the part of some teacher educators to address criticisms from and to align more closely with colleagues from across campus, a response to the increasing influence of discipline specialists over that of curriculum specialists. The influence of this shift in political and financial control, as well as in curriculum development, is evident in various events of the sixties. This was an era that can now be characterized as foreshadowing reform movements thirty to forty years later.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The 1960s opened with the Woods Hole Conference in Massachusetts, a conference of specialists in psychology, mathematics, and science. Out of the conference came Jerome Bruner's (1960) theory of academic discipline structures—a theory he rejected following various crises of the sixties (Bruner, 1960, 1966; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996; Tanner & Tanner, 1980). But Bruner's work legitimated discipline specialists as instrumental in the National Curriculum Reform Movement of the sixties.

Concurrently, various educational movements such as "new math," open education, and discipline-based education emerged. Several of these became popular in the early to mid-sixties—and just as quickly became trends of the past with the positioning of Richard Nixon in the White House in 1968 and the championing by the public of a return to "basics" in education. Debates over "old math" and "new math"; lack of funding for the humanities and social sciences due to the focus on military, space, and economic competitiveness to the exclusion of overall curriculum unity; and controversial social studies curricula dominated the era (Goodlad, 1964; Tanner, 1966). Open education, more popular in the literature than in practice, and discipline-based education, represented by what Edelfelt and Raths describe as "alphabet-soup progressivism" (1999, p. 11) because of acronyms for the discipline-specific organizations involved, became the castaways of the decade.

In their place emerged the behavioral objectives movement with its emphasis on identification of desired objectives to guide instructional planning. Attractive to proponents of life adjustment as well as to supporters of academic disciplines (following

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Sputnik "scare"), Benjamin Bloom's taxonomy of objectives (1956) elaborated the technical and scientific approach many had embraced in Tyler's Rationale.

Not new to the curriculum field, the objectives movement now focused on "behavioral" objectives with "measurable" goals and outcomes. The surface simplicity of this movement's reasoning was attractive to those demanding a return to "basics" and "accountability," as were its historical roots in the industrial and social efficiency movements of the 1920s. Federal funding provided impetus to the emergence of the objectives movement: "With the growing demands for government accountability in society at large came increased demands for curricularists to pre-specify what they planned to achieve, to directly strive to obtain it, and to prove that they did" (Schubert, 1980, qtd. in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 165). Citing the common "argument" of the time as that of a ship's captain needing to know his destination before he can chart his planned route, Edelfelt and Raths (1999) state that "this persuasive argument, which turned Deweyian philosophy on its head, seemed convincing" (p. 11). So convincing was the argument that, according to a "tale" that made the rounds during the 1970s, Texan legislators even passed a bill requiring teacher educators and all other Texas university professors to include behavioral objectives and a competency-based approach in their instruction—only to be blocked by the courts (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999).

An outgrowth of the behavioral objectives movement was the concept of "mastery learning." Once again, the simplicity of the concept found favor, as it focused on extent of learning equated to amount of time expended (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1996; Tanner & Tanner, 1980). This concept transferred to the competency movement that followed.

During the late 1960s, while the behavioral objectives movement was in decline, the U.S. Office of Education encouraged proposals for competency-based elementary teacher education. Known also at the time as performance-based teacher education, the competency-based teacher education movement focused on specified competencies representing desired teacher knowledge, skills, and behaviors.

This performance-based model relied on a task analysis reminiscent of Taylor's management theory which divided the "task" of teaching into a series of performances, or competencies. Elements of such programs included demonstrated competencies rather than "seat time" or specific course work. Unlike the more holistic outcomes-based movement with its focus on authentic assessment which emerged two decades later, the competency-based approach relied on the passing of indicators. With no research-based link to student achievement, "the rhetoric [of competency-based reform] was that of 'hard-headed' decision making . . .," but the reality was that the decision-making regarding competency identification was "arbitrary" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 11; see also Andrew, 1997; Cochran-Smith, 2000).

This arbitrariness was a point of criticism aimed at the competency-based movement. "There was wide acceptance of the criteria, but considerable disagreement on the standards" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 12). Also criticized was "the conceptual size of a proposed competency. Each competency advanced for consideration seemed to call for subcompetencies, which in turn called for sub-subcompetencies" (Edelfelt & Raths,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1999, p. 12). Clearly, meeting the demands of such sub-categorization was difficult at best for an experienced teacher, let alone a beginning one. As with other movements, critics also found fault with the movement's failure to connect competencies to K-12 achievement: "linking (of) any specific, narrow competency to school attainments was difficult—and the logic of the movement fell on its own high-flown rhetoric" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 12). Curriculum had been reduced to multiple, narrow competencies. Unable to overcome these factors despite federal support, competency-based reform as defined at the time lost its impetus.

Another issue that emerged in the 1960s, one that continued into the 1970s and has now re-emerged as an issue of concern, was the issuance of emergency teaching certificates. These certificates often placed in classrooms teachers with no teacher education background, resulting in "disastrous consequences" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613). Despite the negative impact on K-12 education, however, the practice of issuing emergency certification has never stopped, but instead has resurfaced as a mushrooming institutionalized practice, particularly in regions and areas of shortage—and often with the support of the conservative right.

Perhaps in response to the continuation of emergency credentialing, attempts to establish standards for teacher education increased. The Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching, appointed by AACTE in 1974, reported concern over the status of teaching as a profession despite its match to identified characteristics of professions. Additionally, as a precursor to modern reform emphases, the report focused on topics such as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> the role of governance in teacher education; the lack of autonomy of schools and colleges of education in the university (and the control of only 25 percent of preparation); the "absence of any outside force" to support teacher education politically or institutionally, notably professional organizations; the school of education's need to extend formal contact to beginning teachers (with a supervised internship); and the need to expand professional education beyond the school, creating a new kind of teacher, a "human service educator." (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 8)

The Commission also generated a recommendation related to "professional literacy—that is, acquisition of knowledge about important educational and sociopolitical issues and the capability of interacting effectively with concerned citizens in resolving those issues" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 9).

This report examined the education of teacher educators as well, an area acknowledged by the Commission as "largely ignored in the professional literature" (qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 9). Attention was given to "the admittedly inferior status of teacher education in higher education, the lack of a knowledge base for teachers, the low self-concept of teachers, and the tendency of teacher educators 'who question the importance of their own field [to] begin to seek ways to achieve conventional academic stature'" (qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 9). Interestingly, this call for attention to teacher education issues foreshadows a postscript recommendation by the original authors to a 1985 reprint of the report, calling "for collaboration in policy making to influence public opinion and public policy" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 9). Such attention is still evident in the literature, reinforced by efforts to unite groups interested in addressing these issues through professionalizing teacher education.

The sixties were an important era for education reform and change in curriculum study as well. This decade experienced increased federal funding and the emergence of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

academic disciplinarians as leaders in the national curriculum reform movement. Greater focus on scientific and behavioral reform in turn produced loud denouncements from curricularists opposed to behaviorism, quantification of learning, dehumanization, and bureaucracy in schools (Eisner, 1979, 1985, 1991; Greene, 1965, 1975; Kliebard, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1975d; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). These were the seeds of the Reconceptualization of the field of curriculum study in the 1970s.

As a result, the 1970s saw a paradigm shift in curriculum study, creating controversy among the "reconceptualists"; between "reconceptualists" and traditionalists; and numerous articles, presentations, and addresses (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). "The field would shift from a primary and practical interest in the *development* of curriculum to a theoretical and practical interest in *understanding* the curriculum" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 187).

Relatedly, and perhaps even as a result, public critique once again was loud, this time through the media of popular books as well. Outcries against technical reform were heard, in particular against the Tyler Rationale and discipline-based curricula and in support of humanistic concerns and specifically the joys and excitement of learning. The search for humanism resulted in new approaches evidenced in classrooms such as "values clarification" (see Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996; Tanner & Tanner, 1980).

In the midst of these shifts in educational control, curriculum study, and public demands, teaching as an organized profession gained some momentum with the spread of teacher empowerment movements and the increased political activity of teaching organizations, the latter primarily in response to financial cutbacks in education. NEA's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

activity in the policy-making arena took form as it encouraged the establishment of autonomous professional standards boards at the state level for the purpose of accrediting teacher education programs. Results would in effect be high-stakes evaluations, with decisions potentially affecting program continuation based on board approval.

This state assumption of accreditation responsibilities for teacher education programs weakened the influence of NCATE, forcing change in its focus. Unable to compete with state boards in the accreditation of programs, NCATE shifted to a focus on the institutional unit—a shift resulting from collaboration between NEA and AACTE. In retrospect, this change in focus built on the recommendations of the 1959 report from the Project on New Horizons in Teacher Education and Professional Standards for shared commitment at the institutional level (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999). Similarly, it set the stage for the current call to involve and assess the efforts of the total institution in teacher education, not just those of a school or college of teacher education.

The fifties, sixties, and seventies reflected tensions and uncertainties in education in general and teacher education in specific, much as in other segments of society. These were times of criticism of the education "establishment" and of wrestling over its control. Resulting shifts in this control have had a deep and lasting impact on the teaching profession, as well as on teacher education—an impact still felt today and evident in current reform movements. Attempts by teacher educators to regain control of the profession resulted in a search for standards within a system of accountability. However, these attempts were stymied somewhat by the quest for "identity" characteristic of much of this era. In education, this quest translated into a reexamination of its purposes and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

goals within an economic frame. The result would be critical to education reform movements and would further push educators to identify standards for K-12 students as well as the profession—all within an environment calling for accountability.

1980s, 1990s

By the 1980s, the Reconceptualization curriculum movement "had succeeded in delegitimating the ahistorical, atheoretical field of the pre-1970 period" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 238). Replaced by theorists who advocated such fields as autobiographical studies, existential study, phenomenology, feminist theory, and poststructuralism, the movement's "success was its demise as a movement" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996, p. 238). Not only was the Reconceptualization complete, but so was its detachment from K-12 schools—as the field had also shifted to an exclusive focus on understanding curriculum rather than on developing and designing curriculum (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996). Curriculum specialists had exited the K-12 classroom.

This theoretical shift was due in part to the emerging dominance of a new emphasis being thrust upon educators. The decade of the eighties can be characterized as a time of economic concern—both at the national and the global levels, fueling teacher education policy debates. Whereas critical examination of schools in the late fifties and early sixties centered on technology in the science and mathematics fields—that is, the ability of students to compete worldwide in these fields—, a comparable examination in the eighties centered on technology as related to the economy—that is, the potential of students to become citizens capable of contributing to the country's economic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

development. Thus the focus had narrowed even further to the preparation of citizens mathematically and scientifically capable of competing in the global marketplace (Lockwood, 1998; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1996; Ravitch, 1995). Relatedly, the eighties also saw a return to the classical curriculum. (See Adler, 1982; Hirsch, 1987.)

Following publication of *A Nation at Risk*, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy worked in 1985 "to draw the nation's attention to the link between economic growth and the skills and abilities of citizens" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 12). Quickly taking leadership in teacher education reform, the Forum's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession viewed the task of educators as one of holding high standards for all students: "If our standard of living is to be maintained, if the growth of a permanent underclass is to be averted, if a democracy is to function effectively into the next century, our schools must graduate the vast majority of their students with achievement levels long thought possible for only the privileged few" (qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 12). However, actual recommendations from the Task Force focused on mandates for preservice and in-service teacher education programs rather than on standards: graduate level programs only; admission standards requiring demonstration of basic skills and knowledge; incentives for exceptional and minority candidates; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to encourage and reward high standards for practicing teachers; and continuing education programs for in-service teachers (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Emergence of "Standards"

Even so, there was a renewed push for "standards"—the history of which reflects both external and internal conflicts. The focus in the 1980s on economic goals saw a heightened call for greater accountability in education, particularly from state legislatures. In response, educators turned to William Spady's outcome-based education (OBE) movement popular at the time—a movement which encouraged replacing counting of Carnegie units with achievement of outcomes, "with its [OBE's] promise of success for all students through specific definitions of expectations, assessment of student progress, and reteaching of outcomes not achieved" (Nelson, 1998, p. 680). However, as various groups began the task of identifying desired educational outcomes in terms of student attitudes and dispositions, "a disturbing thing happened. OBE fell from grace" (Nelson, 1998, p. 680).

Facing well-organized and rather vocal attacks from the increasingly influential Religious Right, which viewed OBE as "relativistic, secular, and anti-authoritarian" and opposed its inclusion of what members saw as values-laden outcomes, OBE also suffered from criticism from internal foes. "Some teachers disliked the frequent testing and reteaching required, others balked at the mechanistic practices of mastery learning that undergirded OBE, while still others saw the movement as just another outside force—a central office mandate that would soon fade away" (Nelson, 1998, p. 680).

Despite the demise of the OBE foundation, "many of the core concepts of the OBE movement lingered in altered form. . . . Begun as a 'design-down' process to identify 'outcomes of significance,' what emerged was a performance and assessment plan

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

packaged under the rubric more in favor everywhere—'standards'" (Nelson, 1998, p. 680). Standards-based reform and standards assessment, then, became the buzz phrases of the time.

Focus on standards in teacher education was supported further by its emergence in another familiar arena as well. That arena was NCATE. Wise and Leibbrand (2000) set as a backdrop for this change three standards movements related to content knowledge, K-12 students, and related teaching knowledge, crediting the standards movements with institutional changes as well as with related NCATE changes: "In the 1980s, [these] three standards movements that grew out of reformist ideas converged to shape today's redesigned school of education in accredited institutions. . . . Professionally accredited schools of education experienced an overhaul in the way they did business" (pp. 613-614).

This "overhaul" spilled over into NCATE accreditation requirements with the newly added standard requiring a knowledge base, a conceptual framework undergirding the teacher education program. While heralded by NCATE proponents as demonstrative evidence of "effective" practice, the knowledge base standard arose from reasoning that produced some skepticism among critics who saw it as an old idea clothed in new terminology.

> The standard for a conceptual frame was based on the notion that in 1986 there was new knowledge to guide education programming and planning. The irony that such an insight also motivated the 1870 reports (from the American Normal School Association) evidently was lost on the profession. Foregoing the familiar name "curriculum standard," with some conceit the authors of the redesign called the new standard the "knowledge base standard." (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 14)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Yet Wise and Leibbrand (2000) affirm the need for such a standard accompanying other NCATE standards as a mandate for fostering teacher education programs of substance and for creating an "accountability base" (p. 613). [See also Cochran-Smith, 2000.]

Crediting the standards movements with the rapid growth in the nineties of the professional development school and resulting changes in clinical education and state policy, Wise and Leibbrand (2000) see this growth as an important change agent in teacher education. "The advent of professional development schools has helped to transform some schools of education into exciting, leading-edge settings for clinical practice. . . . Some states are moving to a tiered licensing system that acknowledges beginning teachers as novices who need continuous supervision and assessment" (p. 614).

To some, a similar change agent is the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Aimed at fostering more "effective" education with its focus on "performance assessments . . . [and] standards of accomplished practice" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 614), clearly a product of standards movements, NBPTS holds promise, it is believed, to influence positively K-12 and teacher education. "Such changes have initiated new ways of thinking in schools of education, and a new school of education is emerging" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 614).

Cochran-Smith (2000) describes these "new ways of thinking" as a shift in focus from "What should teachers know and be able to do?," the question raised at least 200 years ago, to "*How* will we know when (*and if*) teachers know and can do what they *ought* to know and be able to do?" (p. 332, emphasis added). With these and other standards identified (INTASC, PDS, K-12, et al.), we enter the new century with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

institutions exploring redesigns of teacher education programs framed by an ever increasing number of standards for all constituencies and scenarios. Standards-based reform initiatives are at the forefront of many educational movements, sustained in large part by supportive federal and state policy.

Federal and State Policy

External forces will likely drive continued redesign of schools of education, for the late nineties are notable in teacher education history for a preponderance of state and national policy debates and reforms in K-12 education and subsequently in teacher education (Andrew, 1997). These debates at the state level have resulted in the creation of "blue ribbon" commissions, similar to that in Louisiana, intended to address issues and reform in education. The debate topic of critical importance is the substantially funded federalization of teacher education policy aimed at improving K-12 education by focusing on beginning and in-service teachers. Imig (2000) notes the active involvement of the Clinton administration in these initiatives.

> The Clinton Administration owns this agenda and has carefully articulated a federal teacher education agenda with their proposals for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Essentially those policies are designed to address the need for a high quality system of teacher education and to improve the learning of K-12 students. They would impose burdensome regulations in the name of making Ed Schools more accountable and call for "ending the Ed School monopoly on teacher preparation." (p. 17)

Various Congressional actions and proposals support this agenda, most notably the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, including the Republican version of the latter in the form of the Teacher Empowerment Act (HR 1995).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Focus areas of these legislations are teacher education program accountability, support of beginning teachers in their first three years of teaching, smaller student-teacher ratios, and district and state control of school-embedded professional development. Reauthorizations of HEA and ESEA serve as clear examples of extensive federal government involvement in standards-based reform, the empowerment of school districts, and whole college/ university accountability for teacher education. Bi-partisan support of these legislative actions, resulting in part in a shift in responsibility for teacher education program approval and teacher licensure from state agencies to other state, national, and professional agencies, reflects the growing federalization of teacher education policy (Imig, 2000).

It is this federal involvement and federalization of policy, some of which has played a lead role in the development of states' blue ribbon commissions on teacher education, that is the crux of the debates between the professionalization and the de-regulation movements. An exploration of these movements further informs an understanding of contemporary teacher education reform movements at the national and state levels.

Professionalization and De-Regulation Debates

Unlike many reform movements of the past, the growing federalization of teacher education policy in the late nineties and the resulting debates have captured the attention of teacher educators who believe these debates "are not likely to go away in the foreseeable future" (Imig, 2000, p. 3). With major implications for education in general and for teacher education in particular, these discussions and federal actions have brought to the forefront old and new issues involving teacher education. "Environmental scans" intended "to alert AACTE leaders, members, and others to emerging issues . . . likely to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

affect Ed Schools" (Imig, 2000, p. 1) frequently explain points of debate between two major groups which have come to be known as the professionalization and the de-regulation movements, as well as the spin given these issues by policy makers:

> While some would like to shape the debates on other terms, with some insistent that the debate should be about the merits of standards-based reform versus the alternative agenda of humanitarian concerns, the policy community seems certain to fix their attention on the goal of . . . placing a caring, competent, and confident teacher in every classroom. (p. 4)

At issue in these debates is what educators call the "three-legged stool" of teacher education: accreditation (NCATE), teacher certification (NBPTS), and teacher licensure (INTASC) (Andrew, 1997; Imig, 2000). Included as well are recruitment, entry, preparation, and retention policies of individual states. How to meet often mandated goals of policy makers in the midst of these debates is a challenge for teacher educators, a challenge further complicated by the ambiguity of meaning embedded in descriptors such as "caring," "competent," and "confident." One answer may lie in situating the debate against a historical backdrop of curriculum development and standards-based teacher education reform to determine meanings and motivations behind current national and state policy.

That there is disagreement among groups is hardly surprising. The age-old question "What do teachers need to know and be able to do?," described by Andrew (1997) as the "*know and can do* lingo that has emerged as the mantra of the standards movement" (p. 167), has had many and varied answers, particularly in regard to standards development, assessment, and policy making. The "sharp difference of opinion regarding how to improve teacher quality" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 612) is reflected in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

thought of the two camps now dominating discussions of "quality" teaching, taking form as

> two major approaches to the reform and renewal of teacher education . . . [both] national in scope . . . (with) strong adherents in the policy arena . . . and highlighted in various forums and publications, in public policy debates and legislative proposals. Each agenda has strong adherents . . . determined to press for adoption of their particular set of proposals. (Imig, 2000, p. 2)

The struggle seems to be one of paradigms: the professionalization agenda embracing primarily a constructivist, child-centered view of teaching; the de-regulation agenda advocating more of a technical rational, quantifiable view (Griffin, 1999; Murrell, 2001). Whereas both "sides" proclaim the goal of placing a "caring, competent" teacher in every classroom, each has a different philosophy and proposal for doing so. A description of each follows.

Professionalization Movement

The professionalization movement has emerged from the more historically traditional and dominant teacher education and policy maker circles.

> The publication of the report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) in 1996 has animated a new national agenda that places the improvement of teachers, the quality of teaching, and the professionalization of teaching at the center of school reform. This new national agenda is generally supported by professional organizations, public and private foundations, teachers [sic] unions, and departments of education at the federal, state, and local levels. (Murrell, 2001, p. 78)

Though not traditional in the sense of indicating satisfaction with and reliance on status quo, as is evident in its critique of and recommendations for educational reform, this approach draws its advocates greatly from the "society" of professional educators.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

It is most often connected with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, a "bipartisan blue-ribbon group of 26 public officials, business and community leaders, and educators representing major stakeholders in education" (Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1998), founded in 1994 and supported by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. Chaired by North Carolina Governor James Hunt, the commission consisted of nationally recognized educators and public officials, with Linda Darling-Hammond as its executive director (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999).

The professionalization agenda has been characterized as "premised on a set of supply-side remedies that its adherents believe will elevate teaching to the status of other professions" (Imig, 2000, p. 2; see also Darling-Hammond, Berry, Haselkorn, & Fideler, 1999; Kennedy, 1999; Sykes, 1999). Focusing on "research-based knowledge . . . gained through formal study and supervised practice over time in clinical settings" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 612), it emphasizes knowledge of content and how to teach it to diverse learners based on a "knowledge of child and adolescent development, instructional strategies for various types of learners, assessment and evaluation strategies, classroom management, strategies for teaching those of differing abilities" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 612; see also Ball & Cohen, 1999).

Championing the goal of placing a "quality" (i.e., "caring" and "competent") teacher in every classroom, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future calls for teacher education reform in *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (1996), joining a host of others (e.g., Association of Teacher Educators, 1997; Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Goodlad, 1994; Holmes Group, 1986,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1990; Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, 1992; Rhodes & Bellamy, 1999). According to the professionalization agenda, the means to this end include ongoing professional development programs emphasizing production and support of a "highly qualified teacher workforce imbued with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to encourage exceptional learning in all the nation's students" (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999, p. xv; see also Darling-Hammond & Wallin, 1999).

Through its support of accreditation efforts and provision of substantial financial support for the development and implementation of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards for in-service teachers and of national teacher licensure under the direction of INTASC, the Clinton administration and Congressional law have provided political validation to the professionalization agenda. This support at the federal level is likely in response to what Olsen describes as state systems of regulation and control resembling "'elaborate shell game(s)' with states setting 'standards for who can enter the profession on the front end' while keeping 'the door cracked open on the back end'" (Olsen, p. 8, qtd. in Imig, 2000, p. 2). The professionalization agenda espouses "a new form of accountability for teacher education" (Imig, 2000, p. 19).

With federal backing and the support of national associations such as AACTE and NCTAF (Imig, 2000; Griffin, 1999), this agenda seeks partnership arrangements with the states

> in setting standards for entry into teaching, investing in high quality preparation, calling for the mandatory accreditation of preparation programs, and giving greater deference to educational organizations in setting and enforcing standards, including standards for the evaluation of individuals [sic] teachers through peer review. It insists that professional groups and entities should hold responsibility for sanctioning teacher preparation and performance. (Imig, 2000, p. 2)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This approach to "performance assessment" or "results-based" teacher education emphasizes holding teacher education programs accountable for higher standards by requiring them to "provide evidence that their graduates are effective in helping all students improve their learning" (Imig, 2000, p. 19). Thus K-12 student achievement is a goal.

The advocacy of higher standards in the form of "performance assessment" represents a shift from current state "paper-and-pencil" policy mandates such as standardized testing of program completers, the establishment of cutoff scores, and required pass rate percentages to program completer effectiveness once in the field. Avowing the effectiveness of teacher education graduates, advocates of "performance-based" teacher education often focus on beginning teacher support related to "effective" standards-based instruction.

> Essentially, results-based teacher education shifts the point of accountability for the Ed School from graduation from the college or university and/or acceptable performance on a norm referenced test to some time in the second or third year of practice by the beginning teacher. The judgement then is based on the ability to "move" all students in a class or grade to higher performance on a local or state measure. (Imig, 2000, p. 19)

Validated by such varied groups as state legislatures, the University System of Georgia, the U.S. Department of Education, and Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Imig, 2000), "performance-based" teacher education is quickly gaining favor among educators and policy makers.

Some states and local districts have also taken steps to support the professionalization of teaching.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Steps are taken to support teacher knowledge, teacher development, and clinical practices. States that believe in the value of teacher preparation devise policies governing accreditation, state licensing, and meaningful professional development. Institutions that value teacher preparation demonstrate their commitment by meeting professional accreditation standards, by instituting and supporting professional development schools or clinical practice schools, by creating programs that help candidates develop competencies assessed through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and in other ways that embrace teaching as a knowledge-based profession. (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613)

However, this same professionalization of teaching seen by many as a positive educational reform initiative is viewed by others as just another attempt on the part of the "education establishment" to perpetuate its own existence. These critics are even more concerned with the federal government's extensive support of these reforms, seeing this support in terms of federal control. To combat this movement toward what they perceive as an intensifying federalization of education, a group that advocates de-regulation instead of further federalization has emerged.

De-Regulation Movement

In stark contrast to the professionalization agenda, the de-regulation movement is concerned with what it views as the rampant federalization of education. While also supported by prominent educators and policy makers, the de-regulation agenda draws primarily from the conservative right. This approach is most often connected with the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, a private foundation directed by Chester E. Finn, Jr., a former assistant to the U.S. Secretary of Education who serves as foundation president. Consisting of "a few members of the education community and some policy makers . . . conservative scholars" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, pp. 612, 616), de-regulation group members represent "conservative and moderate think tanks and foundations [which] have

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

banded together to offer an alternative way to transform teaching and to reform teacher education" (Imig, 2000, p. 2).

The philosophy and principles behind the de-regulation agenda are evident in the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation's "Manifesto," a policy statement released on April 20, 1999. Describing in business-like terms its recommendations for education as "the same approach that almost every successful modern enterprise has adopted to boost performance and productivity" (Kanstoroom & Finn, 1999, p. 1), the Manifesto embraces "standards-and-accountability" through results-based high standards, benchmarks to check progress along the way, and flexible means of achieving results—all of which are fundamental, it claims, to the controversial charter school movement. Seeing educational problems as resulting from teachers' poor preparation and lack of content knowledge, problems perpetuated by what it terms "the romance of regulation," the Manifesto offers what it calls "a common sense proposal: freedom in return for results" (Kanstoroom & Finn, 1999, pp. 3, 8). This freedom would be release from what it views as the constraints of federal regulation.

The tactics of de-regulation advocates at times include the use of emotion-laden terminology, as evidenced in accusations that schools of education are guilty of "'rampant faddism' . . . imparting 'pedagogical knowledge [that] is uneven, incomplete, highly disputed, and vulnerable to ideological and interest group manipulation'" (Fordham Foundation, qtd. in Imig, 2000, p. 3). In his "Foreword" to *Better Teachers, Better Schools* (1999), Finn accuses professional educators, particularly the NCTAF, of accomplishing nothing through continued additions of "hoops and hurdles . . . [actions

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that] resemble a classic definition of madness" (p. v). He offers an approach which he claims is "grounded in common sense rather than piety and that relies on evidence rather than supposition or wishful thinking" (p. v). De-regulation advocates further claim that the regulatory approach will block their standards-and-accountability means of effecting school improvement and K-12 achievement. By joining forces, de-regulation supporters and policy makers will be able to "break the Ed School cartel" (Fordham Foundation, qtd. in Imig, 2000, p. 3; see also Finn, 2000; Hill, 2000).

This view of a harmful "Ed School cartel" is key to de-regulation advocates' vehement disagreement with the professionalization agenda. They see the professionalization agenda as perpetuating the "monopoly" of schools of education, a monopoly they view as unsuccessful (hearkening back to the previously discussed "logic" of what some see as an inevitable progression: what's "wrong" with K-12 education must be the "fault" of K-12 teachers, and what's "wrong" with K-12 teachers must be the "fault" of teacher educators). Furthermore, they see federal governmental backing of the professionalization movement as further sign of the federalization agenda moving to the state level. (See Vinovskis, 2000.)

In contrast, the de-regulation agenda promotes its "common sense approach" emphasizing knowledge of content, in effect viewing a bachelor's degree "validated" by successful passage of content knowledge tests as sufficient knowledge for "effective" teaching. The implication, sometimes explicit, is that de-regulation advocates "think that teacher preparation is a waste of time" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 616).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Assuming a minimalist approach, this group uses supply and demand issues to argue that "additional requirements for prospective teachers will limit the potential supply of teachers 'by narrowing the pipeline while having no bearing whatever on the quality or effectiveness of those in the pipeline'" (Imig, 2000, p. 3). Increasingly successful in leading the current cry for education reform and for the transformation of teaching through deregulation of admission to the profession and teaching licensure, their call is "to simplify the entry and hiring process," "get rid of most hoops and hurdles," and "open more paths into the classroom, encourage diversity and choice among forms of preparation for teaching, and welcome into the profession a larger pool of talented and well-educated people who would like to teach" (Ballou & Podgursky, qtd. in Imig, 2000, p. 3; see also Koppich, 2000).

The focus of the de-regulation approach is a shift in "the burden of attracting more outstanding candidates to teaching to the demand side of the equation . . . premised on a market approach to the reform and revitalization of teacher education . . . call(ing) for much greater local discretion in the appointment of teachers" (Imig, 2000, p. 2). Indeed, the foundational publication of the Fordham Foundation—*Better Teachers, Better Schools*—labels the NCTAF approach as a "'regulatory strategy' . . . influenced by 'the romance of regulation'" (Imig, 2000, p. 2). In contrast, it calls for greater decentralization in all areas, including hiring practices.

This call for decentralization strikes at the heart of the goals of education. Critics of the de-regulation agenda see a worldwide paradigm shift, influenced by economic forces as to what these goals, and the roles of teachers, should be.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> The notion of a broad liberal education is struggling for its very survival in a context of instrumentalism and technocratic rationality. . . . Coupled with this is a worldwide move towards recentralising control over education through national curricula, testing, appraisal, policy formulation, profiling, auditing, and the like, while giving the impression of decentralization and handling control down locally. The image of education is also revamped by reconfiguring the work of teaching so that teachers appear more as deliverers of knowledge, testers of learning, and pedagogical technicians. (Smyth & Shacklock, qtd. in Ben-Peretz, 2001, p. 49)

De-regulation advocates have rather successfully described what they see as the problems of K-12 education in terms understood by and attractive to not only the conservative right, but also the increasingly influential and powerful business community. Their stance is strengthened even more so by disagreements among educators as to the potential of standards-based reform. Indeed, teacher educators do not all agree on the potential of an increased focus on standards.

Conflicts Among Teacher Educators

Conflicts between the professionalization and the de-regulation movements bring "a schizophrenic character to policy efforts and results" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 612). One side is encouraging increased requirements and regulation in teacher education, citing a need for better prepared teachers capable of instructing increasingly diverse populations, while the other side advocates fewer requirements and less regulation, claiming that content backgrounds "validated" by standardized testing are sufficient to meet the needs of K-12 students. These conflicts have further spotlighted calls from teacher educators for standards in teacher education—as well as a call from some for caution in viewing standards as the remedy for all educational woes.

This latter cautionary call points to what can be viewed as a schism among teacher educators. A review of this teacher education reform history reveals a consistency in this

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

lack of consensus among teacher educators as they try to understand changing policy environments. In her analysis of key questions that emerge in the history, Marilyn Cochran-Smith (2000) determines that

> many of the questions that drive the field during particular eras are periodically recycled, reemphasized, and rethreaded into the current intersection of research, practice, and policy in ways that may or may not appear to be different from their previous iterations. Old questions are never just "same old" old questions, however. They are instead "new" old questions because they have a different import and a different set of implications when they are woven into the tapestry of a changed and changing political, social, and economic time. (p. 332)

Cochran-Smith continues her analysis of these major questions by observing that they originate from "the priorities and goals of the profession (and even of the nation) and not simply . . . of research or of policy in teacher education" (p. 333). Murrell (2001) similarly considers the complexities and challenges that teacher educators face in their attempts "to understand the policy landscape at all levels to redesign teacher preparation curricula in synchrony with the new national agenda" (p. 79).

Reflective of the sentiment unsupportive of such an intense focus on standards-based reform, Andrew (1997) expounds on what he sees as omissions and contradictions behind the proposals of the NCTAF in its 1996 *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. While he applauds NCTAF's focus on issues related to recruitment, preparation, and retention of good teachers for school improvement, Andrew denounces what he describes as its "outrageous claims" that standards and standards assessment will solve educational problems: "The central difficulty with the report is the overemphasis, mis-emphasis, and uncritical emphasis on standards and standards assessment as the means for producing caring and competent teachers for every classroom" (p. 167). He

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

caustically questions Commission claims, calling these "inflated" and "magic" (p. 168). In fact, he ridicules what he sees as belief that "standards become the answer to all questions" (p. 168).

> They are thought to provide the magic ingredient to restructuring all of education. New curriculum standards will create better education. The United States will become globally competitive (as if it is not). New accreditation standards will produce better teacher education, and new licensing standards will provide better teachers. Standards for experienced teachers will change the present staffing pattern in schools and will professionalize teaching. Standards bearers think simple legislation of new standards and a system of assessment will make all things well. (Andrew, 1997, p. 168)

Andrew (1997) is similarly skeptical of the potential that standards-based redesigns of schools of education hold for creating meaningful change in "quality" of teachers. Criticizing what he terms the "*minimum* standards agenda" (p. 174, emphasis added) championed by NCTAF, Andrew labels the joining of forces among NCATE, NBPTS, and INTASC as the "new federalism . . . [a] "triumvirate"(p. 168). He sees these three as working together to focus on minimal standards for accreditation and licensure. The overall role of NCATE, NBPTS, and INTASC then would be that of gatekeeping (though Andrew does acknowledge that NBPTS plays less of that role and more that of a standard setter), most "helpful in putting pressure on the weakest [institutional members] to alter their programs to meet some sensible minimum standards" (p. 169) and necessary because of distrust in individual institutions' ability and/or willingness to assume this role themselves. While Andrew concedes that improved new standards will to some degree improve teacher education, he feels that much of this movement represents a minimalist approach which could succumb to a "teach-to-the-test syndrome . . . [which] will simply

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dumb us down to a new set of criteria—a set of standards that will become frozen in state and national systems" (1997, p. 176).

Andrew joins others in questioning the belief that the mere institutionalization of standards will overcome all educational ills. Ben-Peretz (2001) also cautions against viewing professionalization as a cure-all: "Professionalization is sometimes viewed as either the savior of teaching or a ruse to win teachers over into striving for and achieving state purposes" (p. 50). Cochran-Smith (2000, 2001a, 2001b) speaks to comparable concerns as she explores "the outcomes question": "Its various iterations rest on differing sets of assumptions about what teachers and teacher candidates should know and be able to do, what K-12 students should know and be able to do, and what the ultimate purposes of schooling should be" (Cochran-Smith, 2001a, p. 333; see also Lampert & Ball, 1999).

Adding to the confusion among teacher educators as to the role of standards-based reform in teacher preparation programs is confusion among some as to the role their programs should—and can—assume in support of their graduates in the field. Just as there are critics of standards-based reform who denounce sole focus on standards as the "solution" to education's problems and challenges, critics of "results-based" teacher education denounce using performance assessment of program completers two to three years out in the field to evaluate teacher education programs. Various criticisms have been levied against supporting such a practice, including the argument that "this exceeds what can be or should be expected of professional preparation programs" (Imig, 2000, p. 19). Another argument points to factors outside the control of teacher educators that can affect instructional "effectiveness" (such as district support, available resources, class size,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

salary, the "washout effect" common in induction and socialization), thus, to these critics, invalidating K-12 performance as a measurement of program "effectiveness." Cost and the subsequent shift necessary in resource allocations are seen as disadvantages of this approach as well.

Conflicts Between Teacher Educators and Policy Makers

Despite these criticisms within the ranks of teacher educators, "results-based" teacher education seems to be the preferred reform of many policy makers. Imig (2000) resigns himself to what he sees as the necessity for accepting and addressing such reform. "It seems imperative that Ed Schools embrace this movement because it may offer teacher education the only way to avoid being trapped between what many see as untenable positions and narrowly-based assessments of their graduates" (p. 20).

Imig sees the cost of a programmatic shift of this magnitude as minimal compared to the alternative. In fact, the required competition with other teacher preparers, including private providers, will likely force such a shift. For-profit providers such as Sylvan Learning, the University of Phoenix, software companies, and smaller local entities have already begun to enter the playing field, "contract(ing) with local schools and school districts to provide a range of professional development and [who] will measure their results on the basis of P-12 student performance" (p. 20). Already familiar with the arena of competition, many of these potential providers could enjoy an advantaged position over schools of education, neophytes to the game.

One point of contention between educators and policy makers at both the national and state levels relates to teacher licensure. Licensure is a key point in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

professionalization and de-regulation debates. The issuance of emergency certificates, a practice discussed earlier as beginning in the 1960s, continues even today despite research supporting greater instructional "effectiveness" of fully licensed teachers. (One such research study, that of ETS in its 1999 analysis of Praxis scores, is discussed later in this chapter.) The Clinton Administration has been credited with recognizing and attempting to eliminate adverse effects of emergency credentialing through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which calls for certified teachers: "For the first time ever, a federal Administration has called for fully licensed teachers to teach our nation's children" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613).

But the situation differs at the state level. Some states have worked to "create quick alternative routes to teaching" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613) because of a lack of belief in the value of teacher education, though sometimes the purpose is to address teacher shortages in certain localities or disciplines. The goal is often to "bypass 'those education courses' . . . seen as unnecessary hurdles that teacher candidates must jump over in order to gain a license" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613). Often institutions in these states support some policy makers' view of teaching as less than professional by ignoring current research and accreditation issues. "So schizophrenic on this issue are policy makers that it is not uncommon to find states proudly touting contradictory policies" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613)—that is, support of stringent requirements for teacher education programs in colleges and universities on one hand and support of fast, minimal alternate certification programs on the other.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The desire to circumvent education courses is understandable in part, given the decades-old reputation of their belonging to the "'Mickey Mouse' variety" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613; see also Darling-Hammond, 1996). Wise and Leibbrand (2000) connect this perceived lack of course rigor to the hundreds of institutions not accredited, an observation which, though it may be true, is not surprising coming from the president and the vice president of NCATE.

Discrediting critics who question the value of teacher preparation programs, Wise and Leibbrand (2000) accuse them of not being "informed by the latest research" (p. 616), citing as example the 1999 findings of a comprehensive Educational Testing Services (ETS) study of Praxis scores of 270,000 candidates. In this study, ETS found that the content knowledge passage rate of teacher education candidates was significantly higher than that of those not in teacher education (yet presumably content majors), with scores of graduates of NCATE-accredited institutions highest of all. "The results of this study echo those of hundreds of other studies that have demonstrated that well-prepared teachers 1) have a greater impact on student achievement, 2) are more attuned to students' needs, and 3) are better able to devise instruction to meet individual needs" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 621).

Yet some question whether or not such studies demonstrate teacher ability to increase K-12 student achievement in measurable terms sufficient to meet demands from policy makers. "Policy makers are looking for evidence that teaching has made a difference. In other words, they are looking for an increase in student achievement scores" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 615). These are the challenges facing teacher

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

educators. Are the data such that student achievement can be confirmed as a direct result of teaching? Would teachers be deemed "effective" should they be held accountable for K-12 student achievement? Relatedly, would teacher education programs be deemed successful should they be held accountable for the "effectiveness" of their pre-service students and graduates in improving K-12 student achievement? Should teacher preparation programs be held accountable in this area and, if so, how?

These are the questions dominating current teacher education reform initiatives. They are also among the questions addressed by Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality.

Summary

This chapter has explored the origins and history of standards-based and curricular reform movements influential in teacher education, reviewing patterns of evolution that have led to current national teacher education reform movements. Such a study reveals that educators have searched for professional standards for at least 150 years, but never as intensely and controversially as now. Whereas past attempts to identify necessary standards were at times less than fruitful as well as temporary, standards are now being created for almost every constituency in every given educational situation within a political environment calling for accountability from every side.

The chapter also reveals the sporadic and issue-oriented attention paid to K-12 and teacher education. Related patterns reflect attention from policy makers and other groups when most politically expedient.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

These revelations are important to an understanding of reform initiatives currently on the educational scene. Unlike some eras in the past, educators seem to be operating now within a glass bubble, vulnerable because of open exposure and control from outside, i.e., politicians. This is not a new phenomenon, as is evident in such movements as those fifty years ago when educational control began to shift to those in the disciplines and then those in government and business. However, the accountability environment of today exacerbates the seriousness of this situation for educators as they try to further the profession amidst conflicting views.

The search for standards has been successful in some venues, as some current national teacher education reform initiatives are standards-based, emerging from standards-based movements tracing their origins to early searches for standards. While the type of standard desired has varied according to an era's identified purposes of education and the subsequent role of the teacher, searches have focused on one key question: What do teachers need to know and be able to do?

Many educators believe that this question must be tweaked in this "age of accountability" so as to be more meaningful and useful, especially in relation to improved K-12 student achievement. These educators have begun to ask a different question: How do we know that teachers know and do...?

Those movements most closely aligned with the contemporary professionalization agenda have been actively involved in trying to answer this question by examining requirements and regulations appropriate for the profession. Professionalization advocates view standards as a means of maintaining high expectations for all teachers, as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

well as of answering calls for accountability. Thus many have been intensely involved in creating a proliferation of standards intended to support and elevate the profession.

But a historical review reveals that the "control" of education in general and teacher education in particular has been slipping away for decades from educators. Over time, frequent changes in educational purposes and teachers' roles, coupled with increasing influence from political and economic arenas, have weakened educators' voice in decision-making. Thus the attempts by professionalization advocates are not only being questioned but also are being contested.

Ironically, those who seem to be gaining control of education decision-making are asking many of the same questions as the professionalization advocates, but from a different perspective and often without seeking input from educators. Their questions seem to be framed in less lofty terms, i.e., elevating the profession, for this group seems most interested in meeting immediate demands related to the supply of teachers.

As a result, this group is most interested in removing what is viewed as obstacles to admitting more teachers. Those obstacles include standards and the companion requirements and regulations deemed necessary according to professionalization advocates. In short, this group wishes to de-regulate the profession instead of increasing the professionalization.

This study has shown that both groups, the professionalization movement and the de-regulation movement, bring to contemporary education characteristics of past movements. And each is substantively influencing current teacher education reform initiatives being proposed and in some cases implemented.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This chapter has explored the historical perspective necessary to provide a context for the study of current reform initiatives in Louisiana. Knowledge of where current national teacher education reform movements rest in the history and politics of teacher education standards and how these national reform movements reflect contemporary professionalization and de-regulation debates is important to an understanding of the development and situatedness of reform initiatives at the state level. In Louisiana, such teacher education reform initiatives have emerged from the work of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A study's questions and aims should drive the selection of research methodology. The variety of strategies now available within a frame of quantitative or qualitative methodology or a combination of the two requires that the researcher assume responsibility for selecting that which most appropriately and effectively addresses the study's questions.

Chapter Three focuses on the methodology selected for this study. This qualitative inquiry employs case study methodology contextualized in historical, political, and ethnographic narrative. Focused on Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality as a case study of Commission proceedings, discussions, and materials, this study is informed by historical and ethnographic perspectives. A section of this chapter reviews scholarship on ethnography, a subtype of the case study, and the appropriateness of using strategies associated with ethnographic research to support the historical research that forms the basis of the study. Finally, the chapter investigates issues of reliability and validity, objectivity and bias both within the larger frame of qualitative, particularly ethnographic, research, and then as specific to this study.

While quantitative studies have long dominated several academic fields, the emergence and growing acceptance of qualitative methodologies have freed social sciences researchers from constraints imposed by quantitative methods that are not conducive to addressing all research questions. Unquestionably, quantitative studies have contributed greatly to what we know. But not all studies address questions such as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

measurement and definition which may be most effectively pursued through quantitative means. Instead, many seek to describe and explain, goals often better served through qualitative means. The purposes, goals, and strategies of qualitative research are vastly different from those of quantitative methodology, and these differences serve well the interests of many researchers in the social sciences. A more extensive discussion of the efficacy of qualitative, particularly ethnographic, research can be found later in this chapter.

Goals of description and explanation characterize the basic aim of this study: an in-depth accounting and description of Commission proceedings leading to its recommendations. The study rests on the need for documentation of proceedings and results of policy-making agencies such as the Commission, a documentation further informed by data gathered via ethnographic strategies.

This study does not purport to be an ethnography in the sense of a comprehensive study focused on learning about another culture from that culture or, as Spradley (1980) explains, on "discover(ing) the cultural knowledge people are using to organize their behavior and interpret their experiences" (30-31). But the research does borrow from the ethnographic method of inquiry and its traditions. It adheres to ethnographic research aims and strategies related to learning from others. The exploration and description of the Commission follow basic tenets of ethnographic methodology. As a research perspective, this methodology offered the flexibility and adaptiveness necessary to address the study's research aims of historical documentation and description of policy making.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Research Strategies

The questions posed in this study demanded several strategies. Among these, a detailed investigation and reporting of Commission proceedings was necessary to produce a historical accounting of the Commission. An exploration of current professionalization and de-regulation movements within historical and political contexts was used as a backdrop to Commission proceedings and recommendations. As this study explored and described in detail Commission proceedings, it addressed the research goals of learning how the Commission's recommendations for teacher education reform in Louisiana had evolved and where these recommendations fit in national teacher education reform movements.

The focus of the study is on the Commission and its proceedings. The Commission, consisting of a group of 31 individual members representing various groups interested in teacher education, plus its planning committee, engaged in actions that resulted in Commission recommendations which have since become policy directives for teacher education programs in the state of Louisiana. I explored the Commission's background, proceedings, and positioning within a context of teacher education reform history, as well as its situatedness in national debates on teacher education reform. Of central importance to the study were the Commission's primary policy recommendations for teacher education in Louisiana: a new certification structure; a new alternate certification program; and an accountability system for the state's teacher preparation programs.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ethnographic methodology supports the study's goals by offering means of exploration. This methodology derives from a modification of what Spradley (1980) categorizes as the scope of ethnographic research. First describing ethnographic research as a continuum ranging from macro-ethnography, the describing of a "complex society consisting of numerous communities and with national institutions" (p. 29), to micro-ethnography, the describing of a "single social situation" (p. 30), Spradley then categorizes further when he cites Hymes' identification of specific modes of inquiry: comprehensive, or documenting a "total way of life"; topic-oriented, or documenting "one or more aspects of life"; and hypothesis-oriented, or documenting according to a "set of hypotheses" (p. 31). Following Spradley's reasoning, this study could be described as an interweaving of a historical case study with a modified topic-oriented micro-ethnography. It narrates 1999-2000 meetings of the Commission and, to a lesser extent, LACTE meetings ("social situations") from the perspective of their consideration of teacher education reform (topic-oriented).

Admittedly, this study is not a "pure" ethnography focused on capturing the way(s) of life of others. It does, however, reflect the ethnographic aim of "learning from people" (Spradley, 1980, p. 3)—in this case, learning from those involved with the Commission. The in-depth study of Commission presentations, discussions, and recommendations was enhanced by attention to individual and group actions and responses.

To understand where the Commission is situated in national teacher education reform movements and how standards-based reform is reflected in Commission recommendations, I investigated meeting presentations, materials, discussions, and policy

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

recommendations. I also studied the pre- and post-meeting materials distributed by the Commission Director, as well as proceedings, presentations, and discussions of related meetings of LACTE.

To accomplish descriptive aims of the research, the study employs many of the predominant strategies of ethnographic research (Spradley, 1980). Participant observations and interviews, both formal and informal, provide the basis for the study. Materials distributed prior to and during the meetings added to the observations and interviews, serving as types of artifacts.

Sources of Data

Multiple sources of information provided data: minutes of meetings; materials distributed to Commission members between meetings as follow-ups to prior meetings and as preparation for upcoming meetings; materials distributed to Commission members during meetings; personal notes on meeting proceedings and discussions; personal notes on post-meeting discussions among various groups, including Commission members, the Commission Director, other planning committee members, deans of SCDEs, and interested observers; formal and informal interviews of Commission and planning committee members, as well as of other observers and meeting participants; and personal fieldnotes. I used these sources of data for the historical accounting of Commission proceedings, as well as for describing the evolution of Commission recommendations for teacher education reform in Louisiana.

Sources of information on the Commission and its proceedings, as noted above, included extensive materials distributed to Commission members prior to and during

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

monthly Commission meetings. I gained access to these materials in various ways. As an observer, I received a packet of meeting materials provided to every public observer. Because of my affiliation with an SCDE, I also received a similar but somewhat expanded packet from a BoR staff member who was also a Commission planning committee member. In June, 2000, I was provided access to the Commission Director's complete set of materials (two full four-inch binders). These binders included correspondence to Commission members prior to meetings and all meeting materials, including Power Point presentations. I duplicated the contents for later reference.

Other sources of information included notes that I had taken as an observer at each meeting, as well as notes on formal and informal interviews I had conducted. These included a lengthy formal interview with Dr. Jeanne Burns, Director of the Commission. I also drew from notes that I had taken as a participant in informal and formal meetings of the Louisiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (LACTE), an organization of Louisiana's SCDE deans. At each of the LACTE meetings, Dr. Burns and Louisiana Department of Education staff members reviewed Commission discussions and invited questions, input, and suggestions from LACTE members, after which members further discussed issues and implications. At this time I was able to seek further clarification as to Commission proceedings and documents.

I sorted these materials by meeting date. Then I examined closely each meeting's materials in order to find some order and organizational system that would allow me to document in full detail meeting proceedings and materials. At times I combined information from several sources in an attempt to provide a coherent account of that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

segment of the meeting. Sometimes I condensed information from several sources to eliminate repetition. At other times I had to flesh out details from various sources to provide clarity.

I included members' written responses with other details of the particular meeting during which the responses were solicited, rather than with the following meeting during which they were shared by the Commission Director with members. During many of the meetings, Commission members were asked to respond in writing to varied prompts—a strategy used by the Commission Director to enable each member to have a voice and to allow her to manage the comments of such a large, diverse group in an attempt to minimize the domination of discussion by only a few. These responses were then collected and organized by the Director and/or other Commission planning committee members according to frequencies and, in some cases, according to patterns and themes as identified by the planning committee. The subsequent rankings, categories, and/or priorities were distributed to members either prior to or during the following meeting. I included these ranked, categorized, and/or prioritized responses in the section concerning the meeting during which the responses were written for purposes of clarity as well as in an attempt to capture members' immediate responses to presentations, materials, and discussions. I also described any discussion and/or use of these at the next meeting. In both cases, I stated when the responses were given and when they were reported.

Settings

Selection of a site can be important to research methodology. For the majority of this study, however, the settings were pre-determined according to 1999-2000

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Commission and LACTE meeting locations. The setting for much of the research was the Louisiana State University Pennington Biomedical Research Center in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where meetings of the Commission were held from October, 1999, through May, 2000. (The September, 1999, meeting was held in the Press Room of the State Capitol Building in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.) While connected to the state's flagship university, the Pennington Center provided a relatively neutral location for monthly meetings of the 31 Commission members. These members were selected to represent various constituencies interested in teacher education reform. (See Chapter Four for further detail.) Meetings generally began at 10:00 a.m., with Commission business completed by approximately 4:00 p.m., followed by opportunities for public input as requested by observers. Agendas for meetings were pre-set and full, with boxed lunches provided to Commission members as a convenience and a time-saver. Most meetings were adjourned by 4:30 p.m.

The Pennington Center is bordered on one side by a residential area of middle- and upper-class homes and on the other by high-rent office space. Named for a local family long known for major philanthropic contributions to the area, the Pennington Center is a sprawling complex of buildings housing research laboratories, offices, and conference rooms of various sizes. Once one turns away from the vast concrete parking area, the visitor is struck by a natural beauty and peace enveloping modern multi-floor buildings which are nestled in what feels like a pastoral setting, an architectural creation of well-established trees, manicured grounds, manmade lakes, and charted physical fitness courses.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The interior of the building at the back of the complex where Commission meetings were held is as inviting as the exterior, with broad expanses of glass looking out over decks, patio areas, and lakes. Halls and foyers dotted with inviting conversational seating areas and tasteful artwork led to Conference Room C where the Commission met. Just outside this area is a larger-than-life-sized oil portrait of the surviving nonagenarian benefactress. The conference room itself was luxurious, with plush carpeting and a u-shaped arrangement of wooden conference tables of deep mahogany hues. Commission members sat in upholstered high-backed executive chairs spaciously arranged around the conference tables. Observers sat in upholstered folding chairs lined in rows behind the base of the U just inside the room entrance.

Also important to this study were meetings of the Louisiana Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (LACTE). LACTE scheduled its 1999-2000 formal monthly meetings to coincide with Commission meetings, either the day before or the day after. This coordination of meeting dates served two purposes. It accommodated SCDE deans who traveled from across the state, allowing the dean representatives on the Commission and any other interested deans to make only one trip to Baton Rouge for both meetings. It also provided an opportunity for the Commission Director and various members of the planning committee to brief the deans on the Commission's proceedings that had occurred the day before or would occur the day after the LACTE meetings.

From November on, as the Commission began to develop its teacher education reform recommendations, LACTE held its meetings the day after each Commission meeting. This timing allowed members to discuss and react to Commission actions and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

decisions immediately following Commission meetings, ask questions and receive immediate clarification on issues from the Commission Director and various other planning committee members, and provide the Commission Director with responses to and suggestions regarding Commission proceedings and decisions.

These monthly LACTE meetings were held at the Southeastern University School of Nursing in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Though an adequate meeting place set in a heavily wooded area just off a busy major thoroughfare, this site was considerably more utilitarian than pastoral. Aluminum tables arranged in a rectangle, surrounded by aluminum folding chairs on the outside, provided sufficient space for the deans to conduct LACTE business. Usually beginning at 8:00 a.m. and ending as late as 5:00 p.m., these meetings enabled the deans to address matters related to their teacher education programs, including those resulting from Commission proceedings. These meeting agendas were also full, with members taking no breaks, even for lunch, other than snacking on light refreshments provided at the side of the room.

In addition to these daytime meetings, each month the LACTE President invited members to join him on the night prior to each LACTE meeting for Dutch-treat dinner at Ralph & Kakoo's, a local seafood restaurant. These informal gatherings, held usually from 6:00 p.m. until 8:30 p.m. or so in one of the restaurant's private dining rooms, provided an opportunity for the several deans who regularly attended to socialize, as well as to informally discuss items on the upcoming meeting agenda and other issues of interest. When LACTE meetings began to be scheduled for the day following Commission meetings, these dinner meetings allowed those deans who had attended

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Commission meetings to brief those who had not and provided an opportunity for the deans to discuss informally and "behind closed doors" Commission proceedings and actions.

Interviews

Formal and informal interviews were conducted in various locations and varied from planned interviews to spontaneous ones. Intended purposes for interviews included clarification of Commission proceedings and discussions, enhancement of documentation, soliciting and elucidating individual responses and interpretations of Commission actions, and validation of research observations and findings. Locations for planned and impromptu interviews included the conference room, foyer, patio areas, decks, and parking lot of the Pennington Center; the meeting room, hallway, and parking lot of the Southeastern University School of Nursing; the waiting area, dining room, and parking lot of Ralph and Kakoo's Restaurant; and various College of Education offices in Peabody Hall at Louisiana State University. Most interviews were conducted in person; some, by phone. These interviews provided clarification, personal perspectives, and added detail to Commission proceedings and actions.

There were many informal interviews throughout the year, including several with Commission and planning committee members, including the Commission Director, BoR representatives, BESE representatives, teacher and administrative representatives, human resources representatives, and LACTE representatives. Also interviewed were various Commission observers, including LACTE members, BESE staff, and interested members of the public such as a representative from the Academic Distinction Fund.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A two-hour formal interview with Dr. Jeanne Burns, Commission Director, provided information important to the study and illustrates the interview method I employed (see Appendix G for interview questions). This interview was conducted in her office in Louisiana's State Capitol Building. Just looking for this office added to my impressions of the interview.

Upon arriving at the State Capitol at the appointed time for the interview with Dr. Burns, I trotted up the 49 steps to the Capitol entrance (all the while reading individual state names and dates of admission to the Union etched into the steps), knowing that she was on the 5th floor. Once inside, as always, I marveled at the structure, with its rich wood and marble interior. As I stepped into the stately elevator with its wrought iron and wood, I felt as though I were stepping back into history. The richness and color of tales learned long ago, particularly those of the shooting of Huey Long, washed over me as the heavy elevator doors closed slowly and it began to move. Though the shooting had occurred in another location, I could hear the voice of the late Mark Carleton, renowned historian and Louisiana history professor at LSU several decades ago, regaling his students with stories about Huey and his brother Earl while masterfully teaching about Louisiana history.

As the doors slowly opened, I looked into a luxurious waiting area. Here again I was inspired and awed by the dark woods and tasteful appointments. Richly upholstered furniture and masterful artwork invited the visitor to remain. After asking for directions to Dr. Burns' office, I meandered around corners and through halls to find her.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Her office was large—and filled with papers, folders, binders, and books. Located in the interior of the Capitol, the office was quiet and dark. Looking across the hall into her assistant's office, Dr. Burns commented that she was moving soon to that side—the side with windows. As I began to ask questions, I could not shake the sense of history surrounding us. It was as though all of the "shakers and movers" of the past were still inhabiting the halls. Unquestionably, the location of her office supported the surface validity of Dr. Burns' position with the Commission as the appointed emissary of the Governor's Office. She explained that, as such, she was not constrained in carrying out her responsibilities by allegiance to or command from the other two agencies involved, the BoR and BESE (J. Burns, personal interview, June 16, 2000).

The interview with Dr. Burns provided history and context for the Commission. She described events that led to the Commission's charge from the Governor, the BoR, and BESE. She also related how she had become involved in the project. She clarified reasons behind the selection of materials and presenters for Commission meetings. She also described the developing relationships among the agencies driving the reform and how these were viewed as unique to Louisiana by many leaders in other states.

Roles of the Researcher

My initial involvement with the Commission resulted from job-related responsibilities. In November, 1999, my dean requested that I join her in attending Commission meetings. She had already shared with me Commission materials from the previous two meetings which had focused on orienting Commission members and providing them with background information and data. We knew that Congress' Title II

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mandates would potentially profoundly affect our programs and that the Commission was addressing the state's possible responses to these mandates. The remainder of the meetings would focus on the Commission's efforts in this direction, resulting in recommendations for changes in the state's teacher preparation programs.

Having been recently assigned new responsibilities encompassing teacher education from recruitment and admissions to school partnerships to program accountability, I would be integrally involved in implementing these changes at my institution. I needed to glean from these meetings the Commission's intent and direction as related to teacher education reform so that we could begin to make necessary changes in our teacher education programs.

She also asked that I join her at the monthly LACTE informal dinner meeting and the regularly scheduled LACTE meeting the following day. She wanted to introduce me to her fellow deans from across the state, as well as have me observe and participate in discussions directly related to my assigned responsibilities. So my first contact with these groups was strictly related to the "work hat."

I am a note-taker by habit. When I attend meetings, for some reason I just naturally take extensive notes on what I see and hear—including materials distributed, individuals present, discussions held (who said what, when, to whom, and even sometimes how), and various degrees of description of participants and surroundings. I generally do so in order to review my notes later, to develop a better understanding of what transpired, to use for reference as necessary at future meetings, and to share with others if needed. This technique also helps keep me focused on issues at hand, whether I am an observer or

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a participant, and adds to my interest level. In short, I enjoy "painting a picture with words." I also enjoy studying group dynamics and the interplay of participants in gatherings, whether formal or informal meetings, and I find that my note-taking often focuses my observations in this direction.

This is what I did at the first Commission and LACTE meetings I attended. Sitting in the October Commission meeting, I immediately set out to document proceedings and discussions. Given the diversity of member backgrounds, I quickly determined that I wanted to pay close attention to Commission members as individuals as well as a group attempting to come to a consensus on teacher education reform in Louisiana. I also wanted to have documentation of what was said and then ultimately decided upon regarding changes in teacher education programs. As was my inclination, I wanted notes for myself as well as to share with others at my institution if needed later on. I did the same in the early LACTE meetings.

Although during the actual Commission meetings I sat at the back of the room as an observer, I was an active participant in conversations during breaks and before and after the meetings. Similarly, though I sat at the meeting table with my dean at LACTE meetings, I was primarily an observer. But, just as with the Commission meetings, I actively participated in conversations prior to and after the LACTE meetings.

Then, in December, my involvement with both groups changed somewhat. Rather than accompanying my dean to these meetings and thus viewing my role as one of providing a second "set of eyes and ears," I was asked to represent her for the next few months. Now I had to assume a slightly different role, that of the primary "eyes and ears."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

I needed to take notes now not only for my own purposes, but also to share with her and other faculty.

I continued to record proceedings and discussions at both meetings, but I also began to play a more involved role at both, particularly at LACTE meetings. I still sat at the back of the room throughout the Commission meetings as an observer, but was recognized by some Commission members and the planning committee members as the dean's representative. I again sat at the table during LACTE meetings, but this time as the dean's proxy. Also adding to my more active involvement at both of these meetings was my growing familiarity with the groups and their proceedings, as well as theirs with me.

The addition of the "student hat" came shortly after. Very quickly I discovered not only an interest in and fascination with Commission proceedings, but a curiosity as to the origins of this group. Already familiar with teacher education reform movements engulfing the country, I began to ask questions and explore the background of this reform movement in Louisiana. Soon I found myself delving into educational reform, history of K-12 and teacher education, and governmental involvement in several areas and levels. I explored areas such as K-12 educational reform; standards-based reform; related teacher education reform; teacher education history; curricular reform history; federal government involvement in K-12 and teacher education; politicians' roles in reform movements; and professionalization and de-regulation movements. In my observations, conversations, and readings, I found link after link to history and politics; federal, national, and state involvements; and K-12 and teacher education reform.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

My dean recognized my growing interest and curiosity in these areas and encouraged me to continue this research at a more formal level. I would still be observing and taking notes at Commission meetings, as well as participating in informal discussions outside the meetings. I would still be representing her formally at LACTE meetings (including the dinner meetings before) and taking notes to share with her later. But now my involvement in these meetings would have added purpose: that is, to explore the research questions I had already been (unknowingly) developing.

I realized that my research had already begun in part because of my initial involvement with both groups. I had already begun detailed documentation of Commission proceedings. I had also already assumed varying roles of the participant observer (Spradley, 1980) during meetings, from passive (at Commission meetings) to active (at LACTE meetings). As I gained familiarity with individuals involved and they with me, the degree of participation increased.

My notes began to expand with fuller description, approaching what Geertz (1973) terms "thick description." Whereas before I had somewhat unwittingly documented the actions and dynamics of the group, now I was doing so with research purposes in mind. I began to note even more closely spatial characteristics, personal characteristics, and individual and group actions. I began to know who was speaking to whom, where, and when. I was still attending meetings of the same groups and taking notes for the same purposes as before. But now I was also doing this with more focused purpose as an overlay to the original purpose. I began to ask different, more pointed questions in informal conversations and interviews. My research questions began to drive the focus of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

my attentions as I began to formalize my experiences as related to the research, not "just" to work.

I also began to note my own thoughts, feelings, and responses to increase my self-awareness in the study. I did this as asides on my notes, as well as separate entries following the meetings. I discovered that I needed to do this as I engaged in each strategy, not just participant observation and interviews. Thus I kept side notes of my reactions as I researched reform movements and their history.

Issues of Evaluation in Ethnographic Research

As a prelude to specific issues in this study, this section examines issues of validity and reliability in regard to qualitative research, particularly that using an ethnographic perspective. Decisions made by the researcher should not only determine processes; they also should address evaluative criteria such as validity and reliability of these processes and resulting outcomes. Traditionally these are the areas that ascertain the verity of research, its truthfulness and authenticity. Yet the very nature and context of the research can affect the relationship between validity and reliability, a relationship set against the historical and political backdrop of qualitative research and warranting the attention of researchers.

The ethnographic researcher in particular must explore this backdrop while considering related issues in the context of ethnographic research. Thus this section begins with a focus on reliability and validity, objectivity and bias, using the context of the many faces of ethnographical research to illuminate these issues as related to the larger field of qualitative research. This focus then narrows to one on these issues in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ethnographic inquiry, using examples from the field to illustrate application. Finally, it examines these issues in light of this study.

Assessment issues in qualitative inquiry have created tensions among academic circles, reflecting what can be characterized as a distinguished, yet at times uneven and tempestuous history of qualitative research in its attempts to gain full recognition as a legitimate mode of inquiry. Ethnographic researchers must be cognizant of these tensions and their sources, as well as aware of potential impact on the ethnographic study. Such awareness is critical. The mission of the ethnographic researcher is not simply to learn truths about others: it is to tell those truths. The ethnographer's success in telling, in sharing with an audience willing to listen, could be greatly limited by the efficacy of resistance to qualitative research.

Ethnographers must be able to provide substantive and meaningful responses to accusations of being "soft scientists" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), not simply to answer charges from outside, but, more importantly perhaps, to answer questions or doubts they themselves may have because of socialization. To do so requires more than the rhetoric quickly learned concerning the lofty goals of ethnographic research. Required instead is an understanding of prevailing views of social research and their approaches to data, the meanings of methodological validity and reliability as interpreted by different paradigms; the nature and intent of ethnographic research; and issues related to the ethnographic search for meanings and truths. Such an understanding provides a foundation for an exploration of issues regarding validity and reliability within the context of ethnographic research in particular, qualitative research in general. Ethnographers can then proceed on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

their journeys, supported by an informed, academically (and personally) defensible perspective regarding criteria for data.

Within social science research can be found three prevailing views—positivism, naturalism, and reflexivity—each with its own approach to the relation of data.[1] It is important for the researcher to determine which of these views she finds most useful.

The positivistic researcher's relation to data, characteristic of traditional scientific research, can be seen as one of sterility. In effect, the researcher stands outside, looking onto a laboratory setting through the equivalent of a one-way mirror to eliminate interference potentially created by the presence of the investigator. The investment of the researcher is extended in the methodology of naturalism, evident in the "fly-on-the-wall" approach attempted in hopes of achieving an inconspicuous relation by spending much time with those being studied. Malinowski, considered to be the father of modern ethnographic methodology, is credited with this research innovation following his intensive, long-term study of the Trobrian Indians, during which he lived with them (though at the edges of their village).[2]

In contrast, the reflexive view takes Malinowski's approach several steps further, providing for researchers to live among and constantly observe the people with whom they are working. Reflexive researchers become part of the context, with their presence accounted for in the process as part of the social construct, part of the pursuit of truths. These views provide ways to gather data.

One must also look at evaluation of these data and of the research procedures. Among the criteria most commonly used are reliability and validity. The frequency of mention of these two terms in methodological works reflects their status as "benchmarks

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

by which data analysis and collection are measured" (Briggs, 1986, p. 23) and as "the conventional benchmarks of 'rigor'" (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 114). This status reflects traditional definitions of each. Reliability, commonly defined as repeatability or the probability of repetition of procedures by the same or another researcher, points to stability of methods and/or findings. Validity, on the other hand, refers to accuracy and truthfulness. Briggs (1986) further defines validity as the conformity of findings to the characteristics studied, what Denzin and Lincoln (1994) define as internal validity, both providing a deductive slant to the research. In effect, these two terms refer to the degree of accuracy of research findings.

Paradigms interpret and extend the meanings of these terms variously according to their methodological purposes and needs for specificity. Denzin and Lincoln (1994) describe the four criteria used by positivist social science: internal validity, assuming the traditional definition; external validity, referring to generalizability; reliability, following the traditional definition; and objectivity, relating to the elimination of bias. Using similar delineation and definition of evaluative criteria for positivism and postpositivism, Guba and Lincoln (1994) extend their description to the paradigms of critical theory and constructivism. Critical theory relies on criteria related to the "historical situatedness of the inquiry . . ., the extent to which the inquiry acts to erode ignorance and misapprehensions, and the extent to which it provides a stimulus to action, that is, to the transformation of the existing structure" (p. 114). Criteria value seems to lie in their support of critical theory goals.

Constructivism also advocates use of criteria focused on its goals. However, constructivist criteria ties to positivist standards by paralleling terms: "trustworthiness

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

criteria of credibility (paralleling internal validity), transferability (paralleling external validity), dependability (paralleling reliability), and confirmability (paralleling objectivity) . . ." (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 114). Additional criteria related to various types of authenticity similarly tie, according to Guba and Lincoln, to critical theorist standards.

Objectivity as related to bias is another issue addressed by researchers. Alternative strategies to the treatment of bias within positivism, naturalism, and reflexivity provide additional insight into reliability and validity issues. Positivists attempt to eliminate bias altogether by removing the observer from the research setting. Naturalist researchers adhere to the same strategy, but by attempting to become nothing more than perceived nuisances within the setting—once the people being studied have become accustomed to their presence. In both the positivist and naturalist views, the ethnographic self is seen as a nuisance. Conversely, reflexive investigators accept the presence of the ethnographic self, attempting to be alert to possible biases as they become part of the ethnographic process. They consider the bias-free goal to be unattainable, an impossibility. They use their ethnographic selves to reveal truths, truths that by definition recognize bias.

These issues and approaches have profoundly affected the field of qualitative research, as is evident in a historical review of qualitative research. In describing effects, Denzin and Lincoln (1994) state that "academic and disciplinary resistances illustrate the politics embedded in this field of discourse. . . . Their [qualitative researchers'] work is termed unscientific, or only exploratory, or entirely personal and full of bias" (p. 4). An age Denzin and Lincoln label as the "Crisis of Representation," the 1980s saw a "profound rupture" in qualitative research due to a proliferation of works that "made research and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

writing more reflexive, and called into question the issues of gender, class, and race" (pp. 9-10). This rupture saw the re-emergence of controversy over evaluative criteria. Should traditional criteria—reliability, validity, objectivity—be used in qualitative research? If not, how should qualitative studies be evaluated?

Nature of Ethnographic Methodology

Before delving into the conflicts and tensions between and among the various camps, the qualitative researcher needs to explore further the special nature of this methodology—its definitions, descriptions, explanations, theories. I found this review helpful early in the research process as I attempted to understand issues related to methodology and to the advocacy of certain criteria of evaluation.

Qualitative research in the form of ethnography as a subtype of the case study, defined literally as writing about people, is an act of description, allowing one to learn through a sense of patterning evident in the description. Those in the field are quite familiar with the usefulness of Geertz's (1973) concept of "thick description" (p. 6): "a style so well balanced between anecdote and explication that it permits us to develop our own insider's view of the events descried. Such a style involves the reader in the dynamic aspect of culture—the vivid, streaming, kaleidoscopic experiences of life as it is lived" (Langness & Frank, 1991, pp. 98-99).

Thick description is possible because the researcher gathers data primarily through fieldwork (Langness & Frank, 1991) focused on understanding the culture of others. Observing how people make experience meaningful, how they respond, supports ethnographers' attempts to learn what being human means, to understand others as they understand themselves, with a focus more on learning from them than on studying them.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(The use of *as* incorporates both a sense of outcome and of process.) Spradley (1980) recognizes the promise ethnography holds: it offers "the chance to step outside our narrow cultural backgrounds, to set aside our socially inherited ethnocentrism, if only for a brief period, and to apprehend the world from the viewpoint of other human beings who live by different meaning systems" (p. vii). He offers the metaphor of "a pathway to understand the cultural differences that make us what we are as human beings" (Spradley, 1980, p. vii). From ethnographic research we learn about people, about their culture.

Just as culture is a social construction, so is ethnography. "Doing" the ethnography is a social process, with the ethnography itself a social product. The task of the ethnographer is by no means simple, for meaning is ever changing as a social construction: the ethnographer attempts to discover what cultures mean; what interpretations underlie culture; how it is that people are. A journey into the field from one's own culture to the culture of the other for the purpose of finding and telling truths affords an opportunity to learn—from and with others—what they do within their own habitat. The ethnographic journey is a collaborative effort with others to tell the human story as they see it, to tell their truths.

At times this journey requires more than observation. Altheide and Johnson (1994) state, "A key part of the method . . . is to see first-hand what occurs; failing that, ethnographers would ask informants and others for their recollections, points of view, and interpretations" (p. 487). Relying on one or more informants (Munro prefers the title "collaborators"[3]; Briggs, 1986, "consultants") to provide an insider's perspective, the ethnographer expands the ethnography, recognizing that truths of the informant are key to what is learned. Meaning is jointly constructed, particularly as the life histories of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

researcher and the informant, and others, blend during the encounter. The interactions, the interplay that result produce the ethnography.

Ethnographers become part of the context, reflective on their situatedness. They live in richness. Focusing on the narrative of the other, the ethnographer observes the unfolding of this narrative even as it occurs. Yet the unfolding still belongs to the other. The process reveals awareness of constant reflection, constant change—as a work in progress. The unfolding is never complete, however: "each life harbors a mystery" (Langness & Frank, 1991, p. 88).

The ethnographer, as the authentic reflective practitioner, is ever listening to what others say, watching what they do, hearing their interpretations, and providing interpretations from the ethnographic point of view. Geertz (1973) recognizes the interpretive nature of the ethnography as one of its characteristics, with others including the interpretation of the flow of discourse, the discourse, the extracting and fixing of the "said" of discourse from the "saying," and the microscopic nature. Ethnographers seek to tell the truths of the people under study, the truths about what they are learning, with particular understanding as the heart of qualitative research, in contrast to the general understanding sought in quantitative research (Pinar, 1988). The unfortunate overshadowing of particular understanding by a positivist quest for generalization can be remedied somewhat by attention to autobiographical theory (Pinar, 1988). Autobiography and biography are valuable tools available to the ethnographer, offering additional means of learning from others and about self. As ethnographers learn from lives, both those of others' and their own, they experience the process of humanization. They add to their search of what being human means.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Validity and Reliability, Objectivity and Bias in Ethnographic Research

Ethnography, a subtype of the case study, is clearly a subset of qualitative research. As such, ethnographic research by its nature falls in the same group of methodologies criticized, according to Denzin (1994), for implied "emphasis on processes and meanings that are not rigorously examined, or measured (if measured at all), in terms of quantity, amount, intensity, or frequency" (p. 4). He contrasts this emphasis with that of quantitative research: "the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes. Inquiry is purported to be within a value-free framework" (Denzin, 1994, p. 4).

Altheide and Johnson (1994) speak to what they term "the social fact of ethnography" in which humans observe the layering of contexts "upon—and through—the other" (p. 487). As a result, the voice of critics grew as they decried that the "essential reflexive characteristics of all ethnographic accounts renders [sic] them not only 'nonobjective' but partisan, partial, incomplete, and inextricably bound to the contexts and rationales of the researcher. . . ." (p. 487). The situation has become one of multiple choices, in which "research is no longer coupled with knowledge . . ." (p. 487), reflecting change in the purpose of research and standards for assessing the purpose. Thus research is defined according to one's choices.

Ethnographic inquiry is not intended to be value-free. It is not intended to focus on cause, the why. Instead it focuses on the how. It is minimally quantifiable, if at all. Emphasis is indeed on processes and meanings. But do these characteristics necessarily mean that qualitative research is not rigorously examined or measured? Given the nature of ethnographic research, how can one measure and determine causal relationships? Or,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

even, should one? Are there causal relationships to be measured and determined? Should the standards for one field of inquiry become those of another? Should traditional standards be the sole criteria followed? These questions seem to be the crux of a dilemma faced by qualitative researchers, including, of course, ethnographers.

Qualitative researchers have assumed a variety of stances in regard to this dilemma. On the one hand, some have chosen to deny the applicability of traditional criteria, for these "criteria of methodological adequacy and validity were formulated and essentially 'owned' by positivism . . . seeking development of universal laws . . . whereby actual or real events in the world are explained in a deductive fashion by universal laws that assert definite and unproblematic relationships. . . ." (Altheide & Johnson, p. 487). The contextual nature of knowledge should not be condemned to a sterile exploration: "Knowledge occurs in the experience of situation, in the context of daily life. Knowing is not properly a specialized activity practiced by technicians isolated from the mainstream of life" (Pinar, 1988, p. 147).

But Denzin (1994) attributes "academic and disciplinary resistances to qualitative research" (p. 4) to something other than methodological debates, theory, or even attempts at scholarly one-upmanship. Instead, these resistances "illustrate the politics embedded in this field of discourse . . . [reflecting] an uneasy awareness that the traditions of qualitative research commit the researcher to a critique of the positivist project" (p. 4). This critique of positivism centers on seeing positivist sciences "as the crowning achievements of Western civilization, and in their practices it is assumed that 'truth' can transcend opinion and personal bias. Qualitative research is seen as an assault on this tradition, whose adherents often retreat into a 'value-free objectivist science' model to defend their

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

position" (Denzin, 1994, p. 4). Some view the perpetuation of such a view as a potential means of control. Similarly, attempts toward fostering techniques aimed at generalization can also be seen as further attempts to control (Pinar, 1988). From their critical theory perspective, Kinchloe and McLaren (1994) question the conflict and contradictions that arise from the use of such criteria as validity in light of the emancipatory purposes of critical theory. The dilemma, while not solely so, is partly one of political difference.

How does the political nature of the conflict affect consideration of validity and reliability in ethnographic research? Is the situation one of a proverbial standoff in which purists on both sides refuse to yield, while those in the middle attempt to straddle issues for various reasons, including perhaps to obtain acceptance and legitimacy? How do qualitative researchers address the dilemma, demonstrating through their own research their attempts to find appropriate and substantive evaluative criteria?

Division, reflected in multiple answers based primarily on paradigms, characterizes qualitative researchers as a group when looking at their beliefs on the need for some form of assessment. Some continue their search for criteria "relevant to guide and judge our work so according to standards developed within and appropriate to other approaches" (Wolcott, 1990, pp. 147-148).

A similar search is evident in modern researchers' attempts to address the reliability and validity of their research, or at least adaptations stemming from paradigmatic foundations. Denzin (1994), for example, asserts that "a good constructionist interpretation (text) is based on purposive (theoretical) sampling, a grounded theory, inductive data analysis, and idiographic (contextual) interpretations" (p. 508). Critical theorists also prefer such criteria as trustworthiness, valued for its perceived

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ability to "signif(y) a different set of assumptions about research purposes" and "anticipatory accommodation" as it relates to varied contexts (Kincheloe & McLaren, p. 151). Denzin (1994) espouses the use of triangulation of data to determine trustworthiness—credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability—, constructionist versions of positivist criteria. Laurel Richardson (1994), however, prefers the postmodern term "crystallization" in place of triangulation, circumventing such concerns as triangulation's assumption of a "fixed point."

Clearly, there is much diversity in beliefs concerning use of evaluative criteria in qualitative research. Two seemingly (at least at first) simple criteria, reliability and validity, with their competing companions bias and objectivity, convey varying meanings, restrictions, and responsibilities for researchers.

Whereas issues of reliability and validity, objectivity and bias have resulted in conflict between quantitative and qualitative circles, and even within these circles, surprisingly this conflict is less evident within the qualitative branch of ethnographic research. Instead, ethnographers seem to be confronting the issues of evaluative criteria as appropriate for their research without compromising the goals of their profession. There seems to be less of a revolutionary spirit of change and more of a spirit of collaboration in working together to define further means of assessing validity and reliability. Perhaps this collaboration is an extension of ethnographers' training and inclinations. Perhaps the nature of ethnographic research lends itself to more effective assessment using some or all of the standard criteria. An examination of ways ethnographers and those who study ethnography address the standards within the context of their own research provides a framework for understanding issues in the field.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

General consensus points to a high level of validity of ethnographic research. There are several possible reasons for this. With its combination of observations and interviews, the ethnography lends itself to high validity ratings. Validity can grow from many observations, many interviews, and the progression of question-building and question-answer pairs. Interview validity can be further determined by the meaning it has for the informant, the ethnographer, the study in process. Consequently, this criterion can be considered a strength of ethnographic research.

Owing in part to the legacy of Malinowski, the researcher spends much time among the people s/he studies. This in itself points to a valid study. The more time the ethnographer spends in the field, presumably the richer the ethnography. Andrea Fishman (1988), Doug Foley (1990), and Harry Wolcott (1967) all spent considerable time in the field as they developed and wrote their ethnographies: *Amish Literacy, Learning Capitalist Culture,* and *A Kwakiutl Village and School* respectively. All were able to include details and information that spoke to the validity of the account. Wolcott (1990) states, "I always try to present issues in terms of concrete and complex illustrations, guided by Geertz's maxim that there is no ascent to truth without corresponding descent to cases. . . ." (p. 144). His ability to provide illustrations, contributing to the validity of his study, results from time in the field. Supporting use of triangulation to test for validity, he recommends that the research inquiry be long enough and utilize numerous and varied multiple data sources and techniques. Wolcott shares what he considers to be the anthropologist's trade secret: "never for a minute rely solely on a single observation, a single instrument, a single approach" (1988, p. 192).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Indeed, the very requirements of the ethnographic task—to write down everything initially, as many details as possible, without trying to determine importance—contribute to validity. The ethnographer's code of ethics states as the first rule—write it down in the informant's words, with the purpose of telling truths. Spradley (1980) encourages extensive record-keeping as the ethnographer develops awareness "of things usually blocked out . . ." (p. 55), using a "wide-angle lens" approach. Ongoing and complete recording is necessary as the researcher experiences "alternating between the insider and outsider experience, and having both simultaneously" (Spradley, 1980, p. 57). Guides such as Spradley's seminal work, *Participant Observation*, offer such techniques as condensed and expanded accounts to aid the investigator in recording details. Spradley provides detailed specific procedures and suggestions intended to supplement and extend the ethnographer's own understanding of the field.

Another common means of assessing validity is to have informants read and respond to the ethnographer's recorded data and interpretations, and to incorporate their responses. Ethnographers have utilized this method not only during the process and before completing the initial ethnography, but also after some time (in some cases, years) has elapsed since the ethnographic study. Foley (1990) includes in his ethnography, *Learning Capitalist Culture,* an account of what he learned upon returning to North Town approximately ten years following the completion of the study. He interviewed some of the same informants, gathering additional data pointing to high levels of validity and reliability of the initial study. Wolcott (1967) tells in *A Kwakiutl Village and School* of his return to Kwakiutl twenty-five years later, enabling him to extend his understanding of the culture through further observation and interviews.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

However, ethnographers must be wary of over-reliance on certain techniques intended to address validity and reliability issues, even when motivated by purposes of evaluation. For example, allowing informants to read and respond to the text does not relieve ethnographers of responsibility for findings. They must ultimately rely on their own insights, training, documentation in their interpretations. Such reliance on informants could be due in part to attention to validity issues. Yet the resulting lack of substantive ethnographic interpretation in some ethnographies, as well as the failure to describe lived experience and to provide for the ethnographic self, have met with criticism (Pinar, 1988).

Geertz (1973) warns about a danger inherent even here. As ethnographers extract the "said" from the "saying," they risk allowing the "said" to take on a life of its own, thus losing validity. Consciously attending to this danger adds another means of attempting validity.

The act of looking, with implications of examining and inspecting, has objective qualities. Ethnographers develop confidence in their ability to look, in their own knowledge of what others know from the perspective, from the point of view of the other. This development, too, leads to validity. Yet there is some assumption required. One of many Geertz (1973) maxims states that the ethnographer cannot get inside the informant's head. Thus ethnographers accept in part the truthfulness of the encounter, the observation, the discourse, the construction of meaning. This acceptance can be supported, however, by various tests of validity. For example, the ethnographer can test validity of an interview by determining the meaning it has for the informant, the ethnographer, and the study in progress. Throughout the resulting written account, then,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the reader should be able to "see" what is being described, finding validity in the description.

Foley (1990) uses the structure of the text, separating his theoretical findings from the text of the story, in his attempts to achieve validity. In the story he presents the student point of view as to what students are accomplishing in their game-playing in the classroom, describing what is happening. Later in the text he discusses the same game-playing, but here from a theoretical perspective of capitalist-based meaning: practice for games of deceit later in life. Foley takes a step toward claims for validity in bringing to bear the larger theoretical insight.

These examples demonstrate that many ethnographic techniques lend themselves to validity. However, there are several factors preventing the same from being said for reliability. Examination of the relationship between reliability and validity in ethnographic research presents some of these factors.

Increased validity is likely accompanied by decreased reliability. The validity is higher with a stronger relationship between researcher and informant, a relationship developed over time and based on understandings and meanings constructed by the researcher and the collaborator. To achieve reliability, another ethnographer has to devote much time to establishing a high degree of validity, time to develop a strong relationship, time for the two to construct understandings and meanings. Even then, the nature of the relationship and the individual personalities provides no insurance that this is even a possibility.

Relatedly, reliability in the interview is difficult to achieve. The underlying issue, according to Cicourel, is "the idea that procedures can be designed that will be both

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

reliable *and* valid" (qtd. in Briggs, 1986, p. 24). In *Learning How to Ask*, Briggs (1986) deftly lays out guidelines regarding the interview process. He warns against assumptions that all participants understand the process, methodology, and relativity of the interview. Briggs goes on to discuss Cicourel's treatment of the concept of ecological validity, or "the degree to which the circumstances created by the researcher's procedures match those of the everyday world of the subjects. Standardization, a crucial device for promoting reliability, leads interviewers to attempt to present each in exactly the same manner to each respondent" (p. 24), even to the point, as Bailey suggests, that "the interview's inflection and intonation should be the same for each respondent" (qtd. in Briggs, 1986, p. 24). But, Briggs asks, are meanings the same for each interviewee? How does the researcher factor in interviewee response to the interview situation as a whole, responses noted by Cicourel and Dexter (Briggs, 1986)? Finally, Cicourel attributes problems encountered in negotiations in which the interviewer must "(narrow) the gap between the standard questions and the background knowledge and communicative norms of the interviewee" (qtd. in Briggs, 1986, p. 24) to what he sees as the incompatibility of reliability and validity. However, many ethnographers show their disagreement with this possibility of incompatibility between reliability and validity as they continue to seek some degree of both in their work.

Another technique aimed at achieving reliability is asking the same questions in attempts to get the same answers. Although anyone can ask the same questions, consideration of the possibility of getting the same answers in return ignores understandings about Briggs' (1986) treatment of metacommunication. If meaning is constructed through our discourse, this construction occurs at a certain time, in a certain

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

place, under certain conditions, with certain people. In short, it occurs in context. How then can research focusing on such construction of meaning lay any claim to reliability as defined traditionally? While obviously the discourse would not involve the same people, is it possible for another investigator to set the same time, place, and conditions and account for all metacommunicative speech events? Not likely. Does this mean that information gathered from interviews is unreliable and should therefore be discounted?

Researchers agree generally on the likelihood of truth in what others share with the investigator. Foley (1990) expands on this assumption by using several investigators for reliability, for corroboration of interviews and observations. He mentions at one point the role female investigators play/could play in addressing issues of reliability and objectivity with female participants.

Briggs (1986) discusses how an awareness of the effects of context on interpretation and of the full role played by the interviewee in the interpretation process should help prevent distortion of data. Also necessary is seeing the interview as a "communicative event" (p. 26). He points out the need to determine whether distinct differences in backgrounds—class, ethnic, cultural—prevent sharing of meanings. Cicourel, according to Briggs, suggests that the researcher extend learning to common understandings and to the "sociolinguistic backgrounds" (p. 26) of the participants.

Opportunities for ethnographers to address both validity and reliability are acknowledged by Langness and Frank (1991), who categorize the two criteria in interrelated ways. They see anthropologists as advantaged in achieving reliability and validity in their research due to their presence and interaction over lengthy time. They believe strongly that the time ethnographers and life historians spend with others is a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

method far superior to reliance on questionnaires and surveys. "It is difficult to sustain a web of falsehoods over a long period and anthropologists also have the advantage of often being able to match up statements and observations on the spot" (Langness & Frank, 1991, p. 44), an observation supported by Foley (1990). The longer the researcher spends in the field, the greater chances for reliability.

One test of this reliability is the ability to understand and to make accurate predictions regarding behavior. The expected confirms working hypotheses, while the unexpected points to need for further consideration. For such testing, Langness and Frank (1991) suggest a combination when possible of observations and interviews; they do, however, admit the possibility of interviewer presence affecting behavior during the observation.

Techniques for assessing reliability of data while in the field include observation, to confirm reliability of previous information as well as to fill in gaps; checks for consistency of response by interviewing another; and repetition of questions over time, rephrasing often (Langness & Frank, 1991). Langness and Frank suggest repeating interviews and interviewing others when necessary to monitor constantly the gathering of data. When necessary, the researcher admits to differences in accounts from informants.

They also recommend adequate sampling, working with the largest number possible and spanning age, sex, and social position, seeking similar information from each group. This technique decreases distortion due to individual idiosyncracies. The ethnography should include information on why and how participants were chosen, as well as suggestions as to types of inferences and generalizations that can be drawn from the sample.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Much as Foley (1990) does in *Learning Capitalist Culture*, other ethnographers rely on varied methods to check the reliability of the informant's statements: checking with others; observations; asking for examples, often resulting in additional information; repetition; and learning more about the situation so as to develop better ways of communicating information. Acquiring "metacommunicative speech competence" (Briggs, 1986, p. 61) allows the researcher further means of achieving validity and reliability. According to Briggs, it is not so much the questions asked, but how the interviewer listens that is important. In his model for interview analysis, Briggs focuses on the necessity for recognizing the importance of the distinction between referential and indexical meanings.

Various types of documents provide another means of addressing questions of reliability. These include taking notes, photographing, recording conversations and sounds, and writing journals (beneficial actions by both the ethnographer and the informant). Other documents of potential help are letters, artifacts, and legal/official papers.

In addition to concerns related to validity and reliability, part of the dilemma qualitative researchers face revolves around the issue of bias. Whereas quantitative researchers believe in and seek value-free methodologies, qualitative researchers discount the possibility. They suggest confronting and using biases in inquiries, though at varying levels. Bias is seen by some qualitative researchers as a potential tool for the qualitative researcher. To assess validity, the ethnographer can examine biases, with their relationship to the past and the present, to determine what is shaping the account. Feminists in particular see biases "as resources to guide data gathering or creating and for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

understanding her (the feminist's) own interpretations and behavior in the research . . . (requiring) sufficient reflexivity to uncover what may be deep-seated but poorly recognized views on issues central to the research and a full account of the researcher's views, thinking, and conduct" (Olesen, 1994, p. 165). Olesen then relates the criteria of adequacy and credibility to validity. Somewhat differently, Greene (1994) describes the interpretivist goal of finding guidelines to foster empirically based research rather than "biased inquirer opinion" (p. 537). These guidelines include triangulation, negative case analysis, member checks, peer debriefers, and audits—that will result in increased credibility of inferences.

Langness and Frank (1991) identify bias as part of the "unique skills and perspectives" (p. 97) the researcher brings. Margaret Mead recognizes the necessity for acceptance of the presence of bias: "Articulateness about the observed, unrelieved by articulateness about the biases and blindnesses of the observer, gives us arid material . . .," material "either devoid of all meaning or so heavily weighted with unacknowledged emotions that they are meaningful only to those who share the same biases" (qtd. in Langness and Frank, p. 98).

Briggs (1986) explores bias theory, related particularly to "the influence of one or more of a range of independent variables, such as the age, gender, race, political views, personality, or interactional style of the researcher and/or interviewee. . . ." (p. 21). The focus of his text is not simply ways biases affect data, but how attention to these actually covers what he terms "the real problem—the dialogic, contextualized nature of all discourse, including interviews" (p. 13). A result of this problem, according to Briggs, is reliance on the interview without awareness of its Western influences, with potential for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

control: "Just as interview techniques contain hidden theoretical and ideological assumptions, they are tied to relationships of power and control" (p. 123). Researchers should be alert to the presence of and possible distortions of "communicative hegemony" (p. 124). The ethnographer must be particularly conscious of Briggs' warning, as the ethnography focuses so greatly on discourse.

Journals reflecting the opinions and responses of researchers are particularly important for they provide an opportunity for researchers to examine their own cultural values and to confront judgmental or ethnocentric views. By doing so, ethnographers attempt to avoid making uninformed interpretations in terms of their own cultural biases. Foley (1990) admits to and confronts his own implicit and explicit pro-Mexican, classicist biases in his ethnography. He relates detail concerning how he attempts to confront and use these, rather than ignore them. The reader has to determine whether or not he was successful, based on he reading of the ethnographic account. The reader can also use the interpretive portions of the ethnography to determine authorial bias and its potential and realized effect on the account.

Matters related to bias and objectivity have been evident throughout much of ethnography's history, with much variation evident in methods of presenting details to achieve objectivity. For example, Leslie White provides an objective cast to *The Pueblo of Sia, New Mexico* by inventorying a series of Pueblo objects, organized by category. Oscar Lewis, on the other hand, allows his informants to tell their own truth in their own language in *The Children of Sanchez.*[4]

Getting life histories, allowing others to tell their stories in their own words, is an effective means of focusing on the ethnographic goal of telling the truth from the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

standpoint of the people themselves. Lewis expanded the roles of his informants by allowing them to speak directly through the ethnography, providing an inside view of one Mexican family's life through their own voices. Similarly, Radin allows Crashing Thunder, in the ethnography by the same name, to describe his culture in his own words.[5] The ethnographer focuses on objectivity by telling the truth from the standpoint of how the informant presents it.

The importance of validity and reliability for ethnographic research lies in the many purposes ethnographies serve. Foley (1990) provides a reflexive ethnography in *Learning Capitalist Culture*, his critique of education and the educational process in the United States. He reflects on problems in North Town; tells the stories of those living there; alerts the reader when he is making generalizations; and, at the end, provides a theoretical framework. He reconstructs stories in such a way that the reader sees the classroom from a class perspective, from the angle of the students in the classroom.

Consciously using the structure of the text to address explicitly and implicitly issues of reliability, validity, objectivity and bias, Foley (1990) presents first his ethnographic account, followed by two essays, or "extended reflections" (p. xviii) on theory and methodology. He asserts that this structure allows him to address his own perspective and how it connects with personal experiences.

> This arrangement makes the text easier to evaluate and criticize. I have tried to portray enough of how I worked in the field and the library to reveal the constructed character of this account. Ethnography is the craft of writing critical, reflective empirical accounts of your personal fieldwork experiences. . . . (T)his ethnography is myself trying to think critically and imaginatively about my country and how these youth and I have been shaped. (p. xix)

Yet Foley supports the goal of objectivity in ethnographic research.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> As subjective as that definition of ethnography may seem to some, I still believe in the ideal of objective ethnographic accounts. There is a historical and cultural reality that we inherit and must critically reflect upon, if we are to evolve as a species. On the other hand, I can only believe in a kind of consensual, perspectivist view of truth and objective accounts of this historical reality. We can at least grope around in disciplined ways to figure out the meaning of the shadowy, ever-changing social world we inherit. We can give our approximations of what is true about North Town and ourselves. Ideally, the point is to produce a text that is open enough that even non-specialists can engage it critically. (p. xix)

The ethnographer must continue to be alert to potential problems arising from the nature of the work—problems often related to validity. The sociological definition of situation, as described in W.I. Thomas' *In Bells Ringing* (1932), refers to the concept that the perception of the situation as real becomes real in its consequences. This concept undergirds the concern of many educators who denounce the practice of identifying children from neighborhoods of poverty as "at-risk children"; much as a variation of self-fulling prophecy, often children labeled in this way ultimately find themselves "at risk."

Potential dangers could similarly manifest themselves in an implied assumption of understanding another culture. This implied assumption "often masks reliance on stereotypes. Children come from cultures, but they are also special individuals, each in need of a particular relation with his or her teacher" (Noddings, 1992, p. 108). An ethnographer should carefully attempt to avoid contributions to implicit and invalid assumptions.

These concerns related to evaluative criteria of ethnographic research procedures and products, while less controversial than those within the broader field of qualitative research, demand the attention of the ethnographer. Summarizing the importance of critically examining procedures and evaluative criteria, Briggs (1986) offers advice related to criticisms of the field:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Our neglect of methodological questions and refusal to examine our role in generating the data preclude any departures from the status quo. . . . Only by considering methodology in the light of theory and pondering the theoretical baggage hidden on the methodological plane will we finally be able to chart a new course. . . . What we need is a specific, concrete focus for our initial efforts. I submit, by way of conclusion, that the most fruitful point of departure is learning how to ask. (p. 125)

This focus on ethnographic research, examining its more narrow perspective within the broader, political framework of qualitative research, encourages the beginnings of one's own consideration of methodology as Briggs (1986) suggests. "Learning how to ask" while mindful of issues raised and relationships regarding validity and reliability is a critical task of the qualitative researcher.

Analysis of Data

I attempted to remain mindful of these validity and reliability issues throughout the process of analyzing data gathered from this study. The data analysis generally followed the methodology of constant comparative analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1986).

Soon after each observation and interview, I recorded personal notes and reviewed and expanded my fieldnotes. My note-taking, following a personal short hand system developed over several decades, allows me to capture most details; however, because this system is based on idiosyncratic, sometimes spontaneous abbreviations, I wanted to insure that I could decipher what I had written. So I read over my notes as soon as possible.

The constant comparative analysis method allowed me to look for patterns that continually shaped and reshaped my research. It also elucidated areas that needed further development. Throughout the research, I looked for recurring patterns and trends in the meetings, interviews, and readings that I wanted and needed to continue to explore. I

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

maintained separate handwritten notes and computer files on these patterns and trends for later reference.

Validity and Reliability, Objectivity and Bias in This Study

As I first began to contemplate my own research into the workings of the Commission, I wondered about the questions I would initially ask—and the questions which would emerge from the inquiry itself. Brainstorming these as I wrote in my personal journal, a rapid-fire series of questions immediately came to mind . . . questions that emerged from my academic and professional experiences. Related to Briggs' advice regarding "pondering the theoretical baggage," I wondered how Commission members pondered their own theoretical understandings of teacher education reform and of group dynamics leading to consensual decisions; how they inquired about their own understandings and philosophies of teacher education within a historical and political frame; how they defined their reality during this process; how they made meaning from Commission proceedings and their own educational backgrounds and experiences. I wondered how they were aware of relationships between their actions as Commission members and their beliefs; how this awareness had emerged from their backgrounds and experiences. I wondered how individual's autobiographies informed the way they served on the Commission, the ways they made meaning and responded. I wondered similarly about other participants in the process. And, I wondered about changing the pronoun *they* to *I*. How would I consider, how would I answer these "how's" from my own perspective? And, what would my study *say*?

The second part of my task as a researcher, to be mindful of validity and reliability issues and relationships, guided the beginning, ongoing, and final framework of my study.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Once again a series of questions, these related to methodological decisions, emerged from my readings and beginning research experiences: who would I study; how would I choose the participants; how would I attempt to establish rapport; how would I structure observations, interviews, and questions; how would I triangulate data; how would I handle my biases; how would I determine theoretical underpinnings of my initial questions; how would I recognize emerging, and quite possibly different, theories. How would I be able to see teacher education reform through the eyes of others? How would I tell the story of the Commission and that of others? How would I interpret these stories in a meaningful way, avoiding the criticism of a "perspectiveless perspective" (Pinar, 1988, p. 138)? And, I wondered about changing the pronoun here, too—this time from *I* to *they*. How would *they*, as my collaborators, affect methodological decisions? How would this be *their* study? What would *their* study say?

Whirling about in my mind, these—and many other—questions soon began to guide my thinking. The possibility, and responsibility, of telling the stories of the Commission—of sharing the "vivid, streaming, kaleidoscopic experiences of life as it is lived" (Langness & Frank, 1991, pp. 98-99)—was exciting, challenging . . . and, frankly, terrifying. Fishman (1988) defines in her "ethnography of . . . (her) ethnographic experience" (p. 212) the formidable task of the researcher, particularly one employing ethnographic methodology: "Ethnography is work. It is more than the collection of data or even the description and explanation of data. It is making the implicit explicit, articulating the ineffable/indescribable/unspeakable. It means seeing the invisible and then making it visible to others" (p. 212).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Integrating these purposes with this study's primary goal of creating a historical documentation of Commission proceedings into what was labeled earlier in this chapter as a modified topic-oriented micro-ethnography has been challenging. This challenge was heightened as I began to recognize that Commission proceedings focused more on presentation than debate, with members generally providing only brief cursory responses. Thus I was unable to pursue some of the ethnographic questions I had first generated. This challenge was amplified even more by my need as a researcher to be cognizant of reliability and validity issues. (Issues regarding objectivity and bias are discussed later in this chapter.)

I attended the last six Commission meetings[6], the May joint BoR-BESE meeting during which the Commission Director presented the Commission's Year One Report, six LACTE meetings, and six informal LACTE dinner meetings, in addition to other related meetings and compressed video conferences at my institution. I also conducted numerous formal and informal interviews throughout the span of this study. I documented Commission meetings, materials, and recommendations in detail to serve as a historical account as well as to show the development and evolution of these recommendations in Commission meetings. I described these meetings based on a close examination of such sources as Commission minutes, materials, pre- and post-meeting correspondences, presentation materials, and my fieldnotes. I also utilized my notes from formal and informal interviews and other related meetings. I attempted to craft formal and informal interview questions such that they would validate or reshapen my written observations and documentation.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Throughout the process, I asked other observers, as well as participants, questions intended to confirm and/or clarify my notes and observations. I regularly discussed what I was documenting with some of these, asking for their comments, suggestions, and corrections. At LACTE meetings, I was able to seek clarification and confirmation of my notes as to Commission proceedings, discussions, and documents when the Commission Director and State Department of Education staff members reviewed Commission discussions and invited questions, input, and suggestions from LACTE members. I did this both formally during the meetings and informally away from the meeting room. I was able to do the same after these representatives had left and LACTE members continued to discuss further Commission issues and implications, as well as during LACTE informal dinner meetings the evenings preceding LACTE meetings. I also asked one observer who had attended Commission and LACTE meetings to read and comment on drafts of this study.

Using interviews as well as the reviews of others in triangulation with my observations represented my efforts toward achieving reliability and validity in this research. While this study is neither quantitative, and therefore subject to assessment strategies associated with this methodology, nor purely ethnographic, and thus subject totally to assessment strategies commonly associated with that methodology, I did attempt to attend to qualitative evaluative criteria applicable to the study's form and goals.

Limitations of the Study

This study focuses on a historical case study of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality and the positioning of its recommendations in current teacher education reform movements. While it draws from an ethnographic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

research perspective to enrichen the documentation, it is not intended to be an ethnographic study in the purest sense. This is not the purpose of the study. Ethnographic studies of the Commission would offer valuable companion pieces to the historical account provided by this study.

My initial involvement in Commission meetings was solely work-related. This involvement changed early on as I identified my research focus. I continued to participate because of work responsibilities, but I also began conducting the research for this study. While this situation was helpful in that I had immediate and early access to the research settings and individuals involved, I was aware that the mix of roles could be somewhat problematic by blurring the focus on the aims of the study. I questioned issues of objectivity. I tried to be diligent in my constant search for patterns and themes as I documented Commission proceedings, while attending to specifics important to my work responsibilities. At times the work responsibilities seemed to further inform and provide direction to the research.

I was concerned that my direct connection to an IHE college of education might interfere with the openness of some of the Commission members and other participants. Anyone with preconceived ideas about SCDE faculty might have viewed my questions and engagement in discussions as reflective of my ties to the "education monopoly." I tried to remain aware of this possibility as I asked questions and reviewed my notes. Ironically, on two occasions one Commission member evidently decided early on that I was not part of such a "monopoly," though she clearly believed that one existed. During breaks at two different fall Commission meetings, she confided to me in asides what could be considered negative, almost threatening comments aimed towards LACTE Commission

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

representatives and observers. Her comments reflected a "*they*" versus "*we*" situation (i.e., SCDE deans and faculty, whom she viewed as stumbling blocks to reform, versus her group, whom she viewed as advocates for needed reform as being proposed at the time). She was clearly including me in the "*we*" group, though she was aware of my connection with an SCDE.

I found these dual roles to be uncomfortable at times and worried that my being so close to Commission proceedings because of my two "hats" would cloud research findings. I neither wanted my work responsibilities to narrow my research focus nor my position in either role to affect my relationships with others. I attempted to convert this discomfort into a sharpened sense of the need for great care in observing closely and in developing questions. Through journaling, I tried to avoid tacit assumptions that I understood events and actions based on my familiarity with the topics and individuals involved. In this way I attempted to keep my assumptions in the forefront of my attention.

Another limitation relates to my personal biases. During my twenty-seven years of experience as a secondary teacher and teacher educator, I have developed a philosophy about education in general and teacher education in particular. My understanding of teacher education and the need for reform is colored by my own experiences, studies, and extensive familiarity with one IHE's teacher education programs.

I also have a bias related to confrontations. I have a rather passionate, aggressive way of confronting issues with others on matters I consider important. I feel that such confrontation can be not only positive by providing a means of understanding each other's views and opinions in an attempt to come to some sort of compromise, but also constructive by offering the opportunity for both sides to understand the other better and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to move to a higher plane of overall understanding of the issues being discussed. I sometimes question why others do not respond in this way and attribute my own reasons to their not doing so.

In an attempt to address the limitation created by my biases, I wrote personal notes separately from my fieldnotes. Sometimes I did this quickly in shortened form during meetings and interviews, expanding when by myself later (often in the car). Other times I recorded my reactions to presentations, discussions, conversations, and materials soon after meetings. I reviewed these regularly as a reminder of my beliefs regarding teacher education reform, my opinions and prejudices about individuals and their allegiances, and my preconceived ideas about the development of Commission recommendations. I also attempted through these to discover beliefs of which I was unaware.

As a result, at times I was surprised. Individual responses often differed from what I had expected. I also found that my own views and responses sometimes changed. Many times my assumptions were incorrect. Throughout the research I tried to reveal known biases and discover "new" ones in an attempt to increase my awareness of their effects on my interpretations and conclusions.

Summary

This study draws from qualitative research methodology characterized as case study. Further defined by its historical and ethnographic perspectives, this case study describes and explains the work of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality within a context of current national teacher education reform movements. Research goals, including providing a historical account of the proceedings of the Commission and the resulting policy recommendations, were supported by research

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

strategies associated with ethnographic research. The study could be described as the interweaving of a historical study with a modified topic-oriented micro-ethnography (see Spradley, 1980).

While this is not an ethnography, it is a case study reflecting an ethnographic perspective. A passion for understanding the human experience effectively supports the researcher who accepts the tasks of ethnographic research: to pursue the inter-relatedness of life, the social construction of meaning, and the interpretations of life stories. This research, in its quest for an understanding of the Commission's work leading to the development of its policy recommendations for teacher education reform in Louisiana, looked for instances of inter-relatedness, social constructions of meaning, and interpretations of life stories. But the study's research goals, and findings, called for using these instances to support the case study rather than to serve as the dominating purpose for inquiry.

Eisner (1992) observes that "what we believe, in the end, is what we ourselves create" (p.15). Weber describes these creations as "webs of significance that we ourselves have spun."[7] What are the implications for this research?

Just as the ethnographer who studies far distant cultures or even cultures next door, I attempted to integrate ethnographic methodology—a type of topic-oriented micro-ethnography—into this historical case study in my search for meanings in the creations, in the spinnings of the Commission. This search is my effort to tell truths . . . truths as they existed in the lived experience of the Commission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

End Notes

1. Dr. Miles Richardson. Spring, 1994. Anthropology 4090 (Ethnographic Methodology) class notes. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Unless stated otherwise, information regarding the three prevailing views of social research—positivism, naturalism, reflexivity—was obtained from class notes.

2. Dr. Miles Richardson. Spring, 1994. Anthropology 4090 (Ethnographic Methodology) class notes. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

3. Dr. Petra Munro. Fall, 1995. EDCI 5880 (Qualitative Research) class notes. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

4. Dr. Miles Richardson. Spring, 1994. Anthropology 4090 (Ethnographic Methodology) class notes. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

5. Dr. Miles Richardson. Spring, 1994. Anthropology 4090 (Ethnographic Methodology) class notes. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

6. To describe the September and October meetings, I drew from complete meeting materials provided by the Commission Director, meeting packets collected by my dean, and formal and informal interviews of the Director, other planning committee members, Commission members, and observers.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 4

LOUISIANA'S 1999-2000 BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON TEACHER QUALITY

Chapter Four describes the proceedings of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality. Each meeting is treated separately in an attempt to highlight the evolution of Commission actions and recommendations. This discussion focuses on the detailed description of various components of each meeting, including the following: any correspondence mailed to Commission members prior to the next meeting, including materials distributed to members prior to the meeting; the order of activities; materials provided to members during the meeting; presentations by external speakers; Commission discussions; and recommendations emerging from that meeting. Explanatory subheadings are used to guide the reader through the various components of each meeting. Formal policy recommendations are explicated in detail. The last sections describe the final actions of the 1999-2000 Commission and summarize research results.

Background of the Commission

> To recommend policies that lead to a *cohesive PK-16+ system* that holds *universities and school districts accountable for the aggressive recruitment, preparation, support, and retention of quality teachers who produce higher achieving K-12 students.*[1]

This charge, issued by Frances Henry, Chairperson, on September 9, 1999, established the task ahead for the Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality. The outcome of a partnership formed by Louisiana's Governor, Board of Regents (BoR), Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE), and Department of Education (LDOE) and motivated by Congressional mandates in Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for teacher education program accountability systems at the state level, the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Commission was created in April, 1999, by a joint motion from the BoR and BESE.[2] Its task would be to improve teacher "quality" and thus K-12 student achievement in Louisiana through its policy recommendations for teacher education.

The Commission held monthly meetings in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The meetings were open to the public, with time allotted at the end of each meeting for public input. Its focus during year one (1999-2000) was on areas related to teacher education, including state teacher certification structure; teacher preparation program accountability, including higher expectations for new teachers, a process to assess program effectiveness, and the Congressionally mandated annual report card; recruitment and retention of "quality" teachers; and alignment of teacher "quality" initiatives and policy funding. Meetings during year two (2000-2001) would address "Professional Support for All Teachers" and "Effective Principals" (see Appendix H for further detail on Commission focus areas for each year). This study focuses solely on proceedings and recommendations during year one.[3]

Composition of the Commission

Formed because of "an awareness of the need for universities and districts to work together to address teacher quality issues" (Burns, 2000), the Commission consisted of 31 members representing state, university, district, school, and community leaders in the following categories (Louisiana Department of Education, 2001).

(1) Designated members included three BoR members, three BESE members, Senate Education Committee chairperson or designee, House Education Committee chairperson or designee, Commissioner of Higher Education or designee, Governor's designee, State Superintendent of Education or designee, and Governor's Educational Advisor or designee.

(2) BoR-selected members included a university/college president/chancellor, a university provost, three public college of education deans, a private

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

college of education dean, an arts and sciences dean, and a faculty member.

(3) BESE-selected members included an urban district superintendent, a rural district superintendent, a district director of personnel, an elementary/ middle school principal, a high school principal, an elementary school teacher, a middle school teacher, and a high school teacher. (The three teachers and two principals were to be current or previous Teacher/ Principal of the Year Award winners still practicing in schools.)

(4) Members jointly selected by BoR and BESE included two community representatives and one preservice teacher. (The two community representatives chosen represented Teach for America and the Council for a Better Louisiana.)

Originally the Commission was intended to consist of thirty members: the category of preservice teacher was not included in the initial appointments. However, following his passionate call during the November meeting for student involvement, a male preservice teacher from a public Louisiana university was also named to the Commission and began serving in January, 2001.

Changes in Commission Membership

The above categories of membership as listed in Commission materials dated 10-18-99 differed somewhat, however, from the categories currently listed on the Commission's website (Burns, 2000). For example, the positions dedicated to the "chairs of the Senate and House education committees" were replaced by "designees of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House." Also, the designee for the State Superintendent of Education was listed as a member as well as the Superintendent. (In similar situations, solely the designee was listed.) Of seeming significance was the listing of the three practicing teachers not only by their different grade levels, but also by their membership in one of the three teacher organizations in Louisiana—Louisiana Association of Educators (LAE), the Louisiana Federation of Teachers (LFT), and Associated

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Professional Educators of Louisiana (APEL). Each organization was represented by one of the teachers.

Also of significance to group discussions, dynamics, and decisions was the replacement during the year of three deans who had represented public colleges of education. These deans had accepted other employment and were thus no longer available to serve. Rather than being replaced by LACTE nominees representing similar institutions as offered by LACTE, two of these seats were assumed by provosts rather than deans. This occurred despite a statement in the Commission's "Rules and Operational Procedures" that "if an appointee resigns, the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education will appoint a new individual who meets the same criteria used to select the original appointee" (September 9, 1999).

Planning Committee

In addition to Commission members, a planning committee was directly involved in proceedings. This committee assumed responsibilities for coordinating and planning meetings based on monthly Commission member input. Though not members of the Commission, these committee members played a critical role in Commission proceedings. Called the "coordinating committee" in some of the earlier Commission materials, the Commission's "Guiding Rules for Meetings" directed Commission members to "delegate details" to this committee (September 9, 1999). The "Status Report" submitted on December 8, 1999, to a joint meeting of the BoR and BESE described the role of this group in a section labeled "Structure of the Commission": "A Coordination Team is responsible for planning meetings based upon input from Commission members and input from others who are concerned about teacher quality."[4]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The planning committee represented the BoR; BESE; the LDOE; the Governor's Office; and the Council for a Better Louisiana (CABL). BoR representatives included both the Deputy and the Associate Commissioners for Academic Affairs, the Deputy Commissioner for Sponsored Programs, and the Coordinator for the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning. Representing BESE was its Executive Director. The LDOE was represented by the Deputy Superintendent of Education and the Director of the Division of Teacher Standards, Assessment, and Certification. The Governor's Office was represented by the Governor's Education Policy Advisor and the Special Projects Director. CABL's representative was its Senior Vice President, who also serves as Director of its Forum for Education Excellence.

CABL was the only non-governmental agency represented on the Commission's planning committee. This organization describes its mission as one of serving as "a visionary, non-partisan statewide organization which acts as a catalyst for improving the quality of life for all citizens of Louisiana" (Council for a Better Louisiana, 2001). CABL's Forum for Education Excellence is described as "an independent group of business and community leaders committed to improving the quality of education in Louisiana" (Council for a Better Louisiana, 2001).

Commission Leadership

A BoR member served the first year in the role of Commission chairperson; a BESE member is now serving in that role during the second year (2000-01). Chair responsibilities will continue to alternate between the two agencies. The Governor's Special Projects Director, a member of the Commission planning committee, served as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Director for the Commission in 1999-2000, responsible for facilitating all Commission meetings.[5]

Meetings

The Commission met monthly from September through May, 1999-2000, except for the month of December.[6] The setting for these meetings was the Louisiana State University Pennington Biomedical Center in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Meetings began at 10:00 a.m. and ended at approximately 4:30 p.m. Meetings were facilitated and directed by the Commission Director. Commission members were seated around long conference tables arranged in a U-shape, with the Director and external speakers located in the open part of the U. Observers were seated in rows behind the base of the U.

September 9, 1999

The first meeting of the Commission, held September 9, 1999, focused on its charge in relation to the status of teacher education in Louisiana and nationally. The purpose of this meeting was primarily that of orienting Commission members to plans, procedures, and processes. They were provided with various materials related to background information and data deemed by the Commission planning committee to be relevant to the Commission's charge. The Commission Director guided the group through this information in detail, as well as through Commission procedures, processes, and plans.

Speakers: Validation

Comments from the Governor's Chief of Staff, the State Superintendent of Education, and the Commissioner of Higher Education validated the group's existence as these individuals described the need for state policy regarding recruitment, certification,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

preparation, and support of "quality" teachers that would create strong PK-16+ partnerships needed to improve education in the state. This need resulted in the Commission's charge to make recommendations regarding policy—recommendations that each speaker said would be supported by the Governor, the BoR, BESE, and the LDOE.

Commission Director: Information Sharing

The Commission Director shared information concerning teacher demographics, supply and demand, National Teacher Examination (NTE)/Praxis pass rates, teacher perceptions of their teacher preparation programs, and the HEA Amendments of 1998. HEA requirements would be important to the work of the Commission as members considered Congressionally mandated requirements for annual state and college/ university report cards and how these would be interpreted in Louisiana, additional components to be required by the state in these report cards, and procedures for identifying and assisting low-performing teacher preparation programs.

Materials Distributed: Background Information

Materials provided to Commission members included the "Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality Charge to the Commission"; a listing of Commission members and contact information, as well as the agency represented; a listing of planning (coordinating) committee members and contact information, as well as the agency each represented; Commission "Guiding Rules for Meetings"; Commission "Rules and Operational Procedures"; "Common Acronyms in Education," including meanings; Commission "Work Plan & Timelines," listing dates of meetings, with "potential topics" shown as "to be determined" from November on; "Snapshot of the Status of Teacher

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Education in Louisiana," prepared and presented by Dr. Jeanne Burns, Commission Director; a report on Texas education; and various articles and other handouts.

"Snapshot of the Status of Teacher Education in Louisiana"

Dr. Burns' "Snapshot of the Status of Teacher Education in Louisiana" provided Commission members with general findings in the form of narratives and charts on various aspects related to the Commission's charge, using numbers as recent as 1998-99 and as far back as 1974-75. These aspects included Louisiana student achievement; HEA (1998) requirements; Louisiana teacher demographics related to numbers, experience, graduate studies, and salary; Louisiana teacher supply and demand data, including numbers of certified and uncertified teachers and numbers of teacher education graduates not employed in Louisiana public schools; NTE pass rates by public and private colleges and universities (prior to required Praxis assessments); and practicing teacher and university faculty "perceptions pertaining to teacher preparation."

Information related to student achievement focused on Louisiana students' low performance on National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading, as well as enrollments of public and private school students in university developmental courses. Mandates from the HEA Amendments of 1998 (to the HEA of 1965) were provided: state procedures for identifying and assisting "at-risk" and "low performing" teacher preparation programs, report cards from IHEs on program "quality," and state report cards on teacher preparation in Louisiana. Basic Louisiana teacher demographic information included comparisons in the numbers of teachers from 1990-91 to 1997-98 (reflecting an approximate increase of 3700), a breakdown of these by years of experience and the number currently eligible for retirement (15,000+), identification of the largest and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

smallest producers (IHEs) of Louisiana teachers holding bachelor degrees, the pattern of teachers pursuing master's degrees from 1991-92 to 1997-98 (reflecting an approximate decrease of 4.5%), and changes in teacher salary averages from 1993-94 to 1997-98 (reflecting an approximate increase of $5000).

Information on teacher supply and demand in Louisiana included NTE/Praxis passing scores, the number of types of teaching certificates issued (three standard and six nonstandard or temporary); the pattern of standard certificates issued in 1997-98 as compared to 1974-75 (reflecting a decrease of 60%); the pattern of teachers retiring during the same period (reflecting an increase of 51%); the pattern of nonstandard certificates issued during the same period (reflecting an increase of 58%); the number of school districts employing in 1998-99 teachers without standard or nonstandard certificates (21); and the number of Louisiana teacher education graduates who did not teach in public schools from 1996-98 (approximately 700-800+ per year). Data on NTE passage rates from 1995-98 reflected a rate of 90% or higher at 69% of Louisiana's public IHEs (nine of 13) and at 83% of the private IHEs (five of six).

General findings concerning "perceptions pertaining to teacher preparation" that were shared with Commission members drew from two sources, the U.S. Department of Education (undated) and the Public Agenda (1997). [No information was provided in Commission member materials regarding dates of study, numbers involved, descriptions of participants, and definitions of terms.] Data from the U.S. Department of Education focused on "percent of full time teachers (by different years of experience) who feel they are 'very well prepared' to address various areas in their classrooms." The breakdown of years of experience was three or less [sic], four to nine, and 10-19. General findings

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

stated that teachers from all groups felt inadequate in the areas of students with disabilities (approximately 75%+), educational technology (approximately 75%), limited English proficiency or diverse cultural backgrounds (approximately 80%), performance assessment techniques (approximately 70%), and state/district curriculum/performance standards (approximately 45%). The "general findings" narrative also pointed out that, although teachers felt more prepared in the area of classroom discipline than in some of the other areas, less experienced teachers felt less prepared (approximately 70%+ compared to approximately 90%).

The second source of data came from Public Agenda, a "nonpartisan, nonprofit public opinion research and citizen education organization based in New York City... founded in 1975" (Public Agenda, 2001). Funded by such diverse groups as the Fordham Foundation, AFT, and the NEA, this organization strives to "help leaders better understand the public's point of view on major policy issues...and [to] help citizens better understand critical policy issues so they can make their own more informed and thoughtful decisions" (Public Agenda, 2001). Data shared with the Commission from the Public Agenda report entitled "Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Public Education" showed "percent of university respondents that indicated that it was 'absolutely essential' that their university teacher education program impart certain qualities to their students." The narrative summary which accompanied the data table focused on the study's identification of "absolutely essential" teacher qualities, such as teachers as lifelong learners (84%), as proponents of active learning strategies (82%), as holders of high expectations for all students (72%), as knowledgeable of child development and learning theories (46%), as prepared to teach with limited resources and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

unprepared children (45%), and as trained in time management and lesson preparation (41%). The table included other qualities, including the teacher as knowledgeable of content (57%).

Articles and other handouts included with members' materials included "Teaching for High Standards: What Policymakers Need to Know and Be Able to Do" by Linda Darling-Hammond and Deborah Loewenberg Ball (1998); "Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Public Education" (Farkas & Johnson, 1997), a report published by the Public Agenda and funded by the Fordham Foundation; "To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers Are Taught, An Action Agenda for College and University Presidents," American Council on Education (1999); and information on Teach for America. Representing diverse perspectives about schooling, teacher education, and reform initiatives, these materials provided a common base of information for Commission members.

"Teaching for High Standards: What Policymakers Need to Know and Be Able to Do"

"Teaching for High Standards: What Policymakers Need to Know and Be Able to Do," co-published by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) and the NCTAF, provided Commission members with citations pertaining to bodies of research on several topics: the significant impact of increased teacher knowledge on student performance; comparisons between teaching and teacher education in the United States with that in other countries, reflecting much less financial investment in preservice and in-service education in the U.S.; and vast differences in the expectations and standards of teacher education programs among states. The authors then included NCTAF's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"interlocking recommendations to ensure a systemic approach to developing high-quality teaching" (Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1998, p. 13), as well as related state strategies that have proven to be effective.

"Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Education"

"Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Public Education," based on telephone surveys of 900 education professors and pre-survey focus groups, provided members with a conclusion that the perspectives of education professors on education, schools, and teaching frequently differ in substantive ways from those of the general public, teachers, parents, and high school students. Similar Public Agency surveys of the latter groups reflect minimal expectations of "safe, orderly [public] schools that graduate students who master basic skills, develop good work habits, and learn such values as honesty and respect" (Farkas & Johnson, 1997, p. 15), whereas results of this survey showed that these expectations are least important to teacher educators and reflective to many of them of an archaic factory model of education lacking a research base. The education professors surveyed overwhelmingly viewed teachers and students alike as life-long learners; learning as an active process (with discipline problems resulting from the opposite approach); learning as a result of struggles with process rather than mastery; teachers as facilitators of learning rather than as transmitters of information; and teaching and learning as collaborative activities. Viewing teaching as an "elaborate, highly evolved craft practiced by specialists trained in the latest techniques and supported by the latest research" (Farkas & Johnson, 1997, p. 13), teacher educators discounted teaching strategies relying on competition in the form of awards for behavior and motivation, on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

memorization, on standardized testing and multiple choice questions. Instead they advocated approaches related to group projects and authentic assessment particularly in the form of performance-based portfolios. While they supported the concept of higher standards, they questioned the reliability, usefulness, and impact on teaching of standardized testing.

"To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers Are Taught"

"To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers Are Taught" (1999) is the report of the Presidents' Task Force on Teacher Education established by ACE to address educational and societal issues. ACE, self-described as "the nation's coordinating higher education association," has a membership of approximately 1800 colleges, universities, and other higher education organizations which are generally represented by their chief executives (American Council on Education, 2001). The section of the report made available to Commission members, "Action Agenda for Presidents," focused on ways identified by the Task Force that college and university presidents can and must decisively strengthen their institutions' teacher preparation programs to address problems of K-12 schools that were identified in a previous section of the report—strategies supported by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and by the American Association of Universities (AAU), as evidenced by their supporting resolutions appended to the report. Actions deemed necessary included accepting whole institutional responsibility for teacher education; establishing teacher education's role in the overall institutional mission; conducting internal and external program reviews; fostering collaboration between faculties; providing necessary resources; encouraging research and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

development in teacher education; articulating with other institutions, especially community colleges, in order to increase numbers; supporting graduates as their early careers; and leading reform discussions and movements.

"Teach for America"

The "Teach for America" information provided an undated profile of members from 1990-1996; results from a 1997 survey of school and system administrators, parents, and students demonstrating high degrees of satisfaction with members; 1994 and 1995 members' positive self-reports on effectiveness and activity; a program summary and history; and testimonials from various educational leaders from across the country, as well as from former President Clinton. Proposed in 1989 by Wendy Kopp as her undergraduate senior thesis at Princeton University, Teach for America trained its first 504 corps members in 1990, supported by an initial seed grant from Mobil Corporation, followed by a 1990 $500,000 three to one (3:1) challenge grant from Ross Perot which was matched within five months. This information explained that Teach-for-America training includes completion of assignments related to observations required the spring following selection, used as bases for discussion during the summer; five weeks of preservice training during the summer (originally eight weeks in 1990) in which corps members share morning teaching responsibilities in an enrichment program and study the "practice" of teaching in the afternoon. Members are then placed in school districts facing teacher shortages. Partnership agreements with school districts and SCDEs insure placement of at least two members per site; mentoring, supervision, and evaluation; and opportunities for professional development and reflection, including observations of master teachers.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Group Activity: Burning Issues

During the meeting Commission members were asked to identify individually in writing "burning issues" they felt important to addressing the Commission charge, using the following prompt to guide their writings: "What are the 'burning issues' that will need to be examined by the Commission as it develops a PK-16+ system that produces quality teachers who help students achieve at higher levels?" Member responses were later summarized and grouped by the coordinating (planning) committee into the following categories: additional data needed, both existing and new; additional information needed, both state and outside; written reports requested; issues to be examined; Commission logistics; and additional comments. The summary was later provided to the Commission for discussion during the next meeting.

An examination of these "burning issues" as seen by Commission members and as grouped by the planning committee is important to an understanding of later Commission policy recommendations, as the issues identified reflected member backgrounds in, understandings of, and predispositions toward teacher education programs in Louisiana. Members' responses also seemingly reflected influence from the various readings that had been provided to them. In cases of overlapping and/or repetition of issues among categories, issues will be included within each group.

Categorization: Burning Issues

The planning committee grouped under the first category ("additional data needed") member requests for existing and new data. Existing data requests focused on teacher candidate quality; numbers of preservice teachers by certification content area; number of certificates issued annually to baccalaureate teacher candidates in comparison

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to the number to post-baccalaureate (alternate certification) teacher candidates; district needs; percentage of uncertified teachers as compared to other states; initial success in the field; salary comparisons by degree, district, and other Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states; and projections for impending retirements. New data requested included information regarding retention: status of certified teachers who never teach in Louisiana public schools; numbers of teacher education graduates teaching in nonpublic Louisiana schools or in other states; retention rate by years of experience; teachers' reasons for leaving Louisiana public schools; College of Education enrollments; and potential impact of lowering Praxis passage rates for program entry and initial licensure.

The second category related to the need for additional information obtainable at the state level and outside the state. Requests for state-level information focused on core curriculum coursework in teacher education programs; state certification requirements, including those for alternate certification; the role and success of the new teacher assistance and assessment program; and the impact of state subsidized tuition opportunities for preservice teachers and the decrease in such opportunities for in-service teachers. Some members had questions concerning the meanings of various education-related acronyms used throughout the day and in materials provided. Information requested from outside the state related to HEA requirements; certification requirements in other states; comparisons of Louisiana's Praxis passage rate scores with those of other states; comparisons of Louisiana's teacher pay structure with those of other states; and comparisons of Louisiana's student teaching/internship requirements with those of other states.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Requests grouped under the third category, "Written Reports," reflected particularly the impact of readings provided earlier: "full Public Agenda Report"; the "report that looks at differences between the public [sic] and the educators [sic] perspectives as to what is important in teachers - the executive summary" (presumably a request for the full Public Agenda report, as well as those reporting the general public's, parents', and students' perspectives); "recent Fordham Foundations Report," with the accompanying note, "most will not agree - but all should read"; and "Teach for America's chart comparing how other states do alternative certification with respect to Teach for America Teachers." One member requested a "middle school report on needs of teacher certification"; one, simply "some other 'thinking' reading materials."

The fourth category of "burning issues" was labeled "issues." This category was further sub-grouped into the following areas: certification of "quality" teachers, preparation of "quality" teachers within/outside universities, teacher education program assessment/approval/reporting, recruitment, retention, realignment of resources/funding, professional development, principals (not a focus area of this study), data collection, and other. The first five of these groups included the most questions as sorted by the Commission planning committee.

Grouped under "certification of quality teachers" were questions related to traditional (baccalaureate) and non-traditional (alternate) certification programs: the availability of data for discrimination of effectiveness of the two programs; ways to insure consistency of standards for practice in both programs; and the advisability of streamlining alternate certification to attract more non-traditional students. One member asked an even more basic question: "What are some issues that should be considered regarding

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

certification versus non-certification?" Some certification issues raised focused on the complexity of certification processes, the high number of specific certification areas in Louisiana (110+), the possible need for upper elementary and middle school certifications reflecting more in-depth content knowledge, severe shortages in certain content areas, the possibility of state funding of Praxis fees for preservice teachers with high grade point averages; and the need for reciprocity with other states to facilitate Louisiana certification of teachers with out-of-state certification. Other issues concerned performance assessment in SCDEs and performance-based certification, with one member referring to INTASC as a possibility for licensure and certification. An issue related to in-service teachers focused on the need for professional development and possibly for the revocation of lifetime licenses, as well as additional incentives for attainment of National Board Certification.

Just as with "certification of quality teachers," Commission members suggested that issues related to "preparation of quality teachers within/outside universities" included performance-based assessment—from "how can we help teacher education become performance-based" to "what data is available about performance-based systems" to "exit competency rather than GPA and/or coursework." Two related issues raised included increasing state university program admissions requirements and preparation for required Praxis assessments. Several members questioned the need for standards in teacher education leading to, for some at least, standardization of teacher education programs: "to allow all teachers to be educated in the same way" and to "build consensus among higher education institutions about what skills are essential as core elements of a teacher preparation program." Members either directly or indirectly alluded to teacher education

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

standards, which they defined in terms of content- or skills-based knowledge, in the following areas: greater depth of content knowledge, through such means as collaborations between SCDE faculties and College of Arts and Sciences faculties and "address(ing) content mastery versus pedagogy"; "teach(ing) to new content standards"; more extensive preparation for teaching at the middle school level in both content and field experiences; increased training in technology; and "align(ing) [teacher preparation] with the profiles of the learners." Several members referenced preparation in the areas of discipline and classroom control, with one member calling for "more psychology, anger management, and discipline/classroom control techniques."

Many also raised issues related to field-based experiences and student teaching, with several specifying experiences at the middle school level: "how can we revamp field-based experiences and student teaching experiences," "how can we revise student teaching strategies and assignments," "how can we provide actual practice teaching at the middle school level," "how can we expose students to middle schools that are considered at-risk before the teachers are actually assigned to such schools," and "how are university laboratory schools used." One member called attention to "lengthened student teaching assignments, mentoring relationships, real world/real school student teaching placements, [and] follow-up seminars after student teaching." Other issues grouped in this category included the possible need for middle school certification, the consideration of "alternative teacher preparation delivery systems (other than traditional higher education institutions)," assuring the offering of "senior level content and content-methods courses...even if enrollment in those courses is low," and providing to local school systems "incentives for partnering in teacher preparations and sanctions for not partnering."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Assessment and approval of teacher preparation programs and the development of meaningful report cards" was the third sub-group of "issues" as determined by the Commission's planning committee. One member proposed the need for "a research system instead [of] anecdotal records" for program assessment and approval. Members also raised questions regarding "address(ing) the need for universities to provide updating and performance development," with one member questioning the possibility for instituting incentives and sanctions to encourage universities to partner with school systems in teacher preparation. Other issues listed under this sub-grouping related to the assessment of K-12 teachers and university faculty, as well as to matters of governance.

In the K-12 area, questions focused on the need for "information about what knowledge and skills (measurable ones) are necessary for effective teaching," "adequate means of evaluating teaching effectiveness," and identification of "what makes a good teacher - qualification versus certification." One member addressed what s/he saw as a potential problem with performance-based approaches: "If we are going to performance-based certification structures, how do we reconcile that some preservice students who excel turn out to be lousy teachers and some poor preservice teachers are our best classroom performers in terms of getting the highest achievement levels from their students?"

Governance issues raised included "(moving) new teacher assessment out of the local public schools" and issues regarding university-level promotion and tenure at all levels, not just that of SCDEs. One member asked, "Can we change higher education promotion and tenure criteria for all university faculty (College of Education and Liberal Arts and Humanities, Sciences)?" Another questioned the possibility of including "K-12

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teaching improvement involvement" in promotion and tenure decisions, "perhaps in lieu of traditional research."

The fourth sub-group under "issues" focused on "recruitment of quality teachers." Members addressed several areas of need: "underserved districts"; minority recruitment; shortage areas ("special education, vocational education, music"); and teacher shortages created by increasing retirements and decreasing teacher education enrollments. A few questions raised various concerns, some related to attracting young people and "rekindl(ing) the commitment to teach," while others related to concerns about young people and the "lack of enthusiasm, passion, commitment, etc. from our younger generation of teachers." This member's concerns extended to the larger society and to more experienced teachers: "This may be a 'societal' problem, but it truly needs to be addressed. Teaching has become just a 'job' and not a career. All of this leads to a lack of desire to seek higher degrees and certification; a greater percentage of teachers leaving education - a greater percentage of teachers who retire at 20 years." Members asked about possible recruitment innovations and incentives, with one referring to "partnership(s) with business." Several members also addressed the need to "raise the profile and respect for teaching as a career": "How do we elevate the teaching profession in the eyes of Louisiana citizens - a profession worthy of pay, respect, and support?"

"Retention of Quality Teachers" formed the fifth sub-group. This grouping focused on issues related to various means of support for new and experienced teachers. Questions related to K-12 school and district support reflected problems experienced by rural districts with pay scales lower than those of their neighbors, the impact of "seniority issues" on the placement of new teachers, and the need to "get the best teachers in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

most 'at-risk' schools since...a teacher can have the most impact on student learning." Several questions took the form of suggestions that focus on the work environment and working conditions: making the work environment attractive by offering childcare; encouraging networking with peers "so they can share professionally and be connected to support one another and feel empowered within the system to affect [sic] change"; and creating a career ladder by which experienced teachers can "advance without leaving the classroom." One member suggesting the career ladder stated that "for no other profession do folks in 25 years of experience have the same job as folks with 2 years of experience." One saw performance standards as the basis for a career ladder, while another saw the possibility of tying pay to performance. Pay was a possible issue to another member, who questioned, "How can we overcome the loss of some of our best new teachers to other states (Texas, for example)? How can we stop (or slow) this drain of talent - money or what?" Somewhat surprisingly, particularly in terms of later Commission policy recommendations, only one member addressed directly how universities can "provide on-going support to graduates in areas of need." Another seemingly alluded to university collaboration when addressing "issues that create early burn-out (e.g., new teachers being given the least attractive assignments; lack of professional mentoring, etc.)."

Only two of the members' questions fell into the sub-group labeled "realigning resources and funding" by the planning committee. Both of these questioned possible sources of funding, with one member parenthetically asking if these would include "property, sales, local, state, federal, etc."

Questions related to "professional development" were sorted into this sub-group under "issues." These can be further categorized into concern for what members seemed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to view as a lack of interest in and the subsequent need for requiring professional development, possible incentives, and areas of need. One member commented that "virtually no other profession grants life-time certification"; another questioned why few teachers seek higher degrees; and still another questioned how to convey the importance of professional development. Incentives mentioned included "significant money differential for the masters" [sic] degree and providing time for professional development outside of instructional time. Areas of need included focus on "strategies...needed to teach a diverse student population - inclusion" and "retrain(ing) teacher graduates (e.g., classroom management, etc.)."

Issues raised by the Commission also referred to "data collection." These focused on systematic follow-up of graduates to determine why they leave the system and on requiring private and parochial schools to report new teacher employment. Also mentioned was the need to insure the use of "common" or "identical criteria when making state/regional/national comparisons or rankings" related to teacher salary, certification, and similar areas.

The final sub-group under "issues" was a catch-all labeled "other." This sub-group included questions related to "open(ing) dialogue among education partners, respond to market needs" and "governance issues (e.g., State Board of Education; local, etc.)."

The last two categories of "burning issues" included those related to Commission "logistics," as well as "additional comments"—comments which the planning committee evidently felt did not fit into other categories. Logistics related to the organization and distribution of information. Additional comments focused on requiring private and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

parochial participation in the same testing required of public schools and the observation that "elementary teacher graduates are not reading specialists."

An examination of these "burning issues" as identified in writing by Commission members during this first meeting provides insight into member reasoning behind later Commission policy recommendations. These were the issues viewed early on by members as important to the Commission charge. These issues established directions for later meetings.

October 14, 1999

The October meeting of the Commission focused on "effective" practices for the recruitment, preparation, and retention of "quality" teachers with presentations by external speakers providing national and state perspectives. The meeting's emphasis was on ways other states were directing teacher preparation reform initiatives, as well as on "burning issues" as identified by Commission members in writing during the previous meeting.

Before external speakers made their presentations, the Commission vice-chair summarized three key points that Michael Fullan, recognized for his work on educational change, had stressed during a presentation the prior month to some Commission members: the importance of "recreat(ing) the [teaching] profession" to influence public opinion; the necessity for incentives for universities should this re-creation extend to teacher education, requiring teacher educators to redesign programs; and a caution concerning encouraging too many innovations at one time, rather than being selective. This presentation set a context and tone for the remainder of the meeting.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Commission Director: Burning Issues, Group Activity

The Commission Director then reviewed data by referring the Commission to a summary of the "burning issues" which they had identified during the September meeting, explaining that these had been grouped into short-term and long-term needs. The next stage would be the gathering of facts, identification of priorities, and verbalization of questions to address. Commission members were provided with a worksheet listing six areas: certification of "quality" teachers; preparation of "quality" teachers by IHEs and private providers; teacher education program assessment and approval and development of "meaningful" report cards; recruitment of "quality" teachers; retention of "quality" teachers; and resource/ funding realignment. For each area, based on the day's presentations and discussions, members were to respond to the following prompts at the end of the meeting: "What effective practices & policies should Louisiana integrate into its new system?" "What ineffective practices and policies should Louisiana avoid?" "What are the barriers that Louisiana would need to overcome to implement effective practices & policies?" and "Additional information to be gathered for the Commission."

Speakers: Reform Initiatives in Other States

Providing a national perspective for the Commission, Michael Allen, Policy Analyst with the Education Commission of the States, focused on various strategies employed by other states in the areas of teacher recruitment, preparation, program accountability, certification, and retention. Commission members received a related handout labeled "Secondary Data Sources - National Perspective: Policies, Practices, & Recommendations Pertaining to Teacher Quality," which provided locations of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

implementation of reform policies and practices or sources of recommendation for reforms.

He discussed recruitment goals regarding overall numbers as well as shortage areas and the reduction of teacher attrition. Suggested strategies for meeting these goals included establishing multi-purpose state recruitment centers and targeting select populations, such as pre-college, minorities, local community, out of state, paraprofessionals, early retirees, and mid-career changers. Financially based incentives aiding recruitment included overall increases in teacher salaries, scholarships and loan forgiveness programs, signing and moving/relocating bonuses, differential pay, and summer employment opportunities. Other effective incentives included the elimination of employment hurdles through implementation of interstate reciprocity, more efficient hiring procedures, and alternate certification programs.

Allen then focused on trends in teacher preparation, program accountability, certification, and retention. He described two major trends in teacher preparation: various collaborative efforts—colleges of education (COEs) and colleges of arts and sciences, IHE and K-12, COEs and community colleges—and alternate certification programs, both at the IHE and the district level. Program accountability trends related to accreditation; increased program admission requirements; the development of IHE, state, and national report cards; and what he termed "quality guarantee." Certification trends focused on levels of certification, from initial to second stage to re-certification to advanced.

Trends in teacher retention of both beginning and experienced teachers reflected a combination of professional and financial support. Allen discussed support for beginning

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teachers in the form of induction and mentoring programs, reduced workloads, and "appropriate" assignments. He also pointed to needs related to "solid" teacher education programs; adequate working conditions; administrative support; and opportunities for effective professional development and salary and career advancement.

The perspective of one state was presented by Dr. Robert E. Tyndall, Vice Chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, who shared information related to teacher "quality" initiatives in North Carolina, particularly in relation to new IHE/K-12 partnerships, a new teacher preparation accountability program, a new IHE report card system, a new alternate certification program, and recruitment of teacher candidates at the high school level. Tyndall also shared select sections of North Carolina's 1997 "Excellent Schools Act," the stated purpose of which was the improvement of K-12 achievement and reduction in teacher attrition through mandates for teacher education and school administration programs.

The "Excellent Schools Act" included standards for teacher preparation, including required annual performance reports to be submitted to the state department of education. Data for these reports included grade point averages and scores on pre-professional skills tests as indicative of "quality" of program entrants; graduation rates; "time-to-graduation" rates; passage rates on professional and content area examinations required for certification; percentages of graduates receiving initial certification; percentages of graduates employed as teachers; percentages of graduates teaching for at least four years; graduate satisfaction; and employer satisfaction.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The act also mandated that admission and initial certification standards be reviewed by the state board of education. Certification in North Carolina is a leveled program, with initial certification followed by continuing certification granted after three years of experience and certificate renewal every five years requiring earned ten semester hours or fifteen units of renewal credit. Additionally, all teacher education students are required to demonstrate competencies related to the identification and instruction of children with learning disabilities. The act mandated that continuing certification also come under evaluation and development to reflect state emphasis on student achievement.

A particularly innovative reform initiative that became part of this law involved expectations for beginning teachers prior to the awarding of career status. The state board of education was directed to develop a mentor program for beginning teachers following a survey to determine needs to be addressed, as well as guidelines related to working conditions for beginning teachers, including workload, extracurricular responsibilities, and student assignment. Also addressed in this section were evaluations prior to the awarding of career status, with focus on the revision and development by 1998 of performance standards intended to result in measurable K-12 student achievement, on nonrenewal of contracts, and on dismissal for "inadequate" performance. Required annual observations of these beginning Teachers included three by an administrator and one by a teacher, in addition to one required evaluation by an administrator. Other Teachers were to be evaluated annually, though local boards retained discretionary power over the frequency of such evaluations for certain identified groups, as well as over evaluation approaches as long as what was used was validated. The act directed the development of training

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

programs by 1998 for administrators regarding improved evaluations. Additionally, guidelines for evaluation of superintendents were to be developed and adopted by 1998. By this act, career status could be earned after four consecutive years of teaching. Another area of focus included the alignment of professional development with state goals in regard to the improvement of student achievement.

The final section of the act related to advanced teaching status, expectations, and recognition. The state board was instructed to develop a new certification category, "Masters/Advanced Competencies," requiring a more rigorous program of graduate-level study with academic content area concentrates. As an incentive for Teachers to pursue this advanced certification and/or National Board (NBPTS) certification, salary differentials were enacted. National Board Certified Teachers were to receive an additional 12% salary increase beginning in the 1997-98 academic year; a salary increase of 10% beginning in 2000 would be sought for "Masters/Advanced Competencies" certificated Teachers. The act stated that these two increases combined would result in a minimum salary of $53,000 for a "Masters/Advanced Competencies," National Board Certified teacher. Additionally, the state would fund the required National Board participation fee for candidates, as well as up to three days of approved paid leave during their year of participation.

Also part of this section were "school-based incentive awards." Teachers in schools in which students met expected levels of knowledge and skills received incentive awards of $750; teachers in schools in which students surpassed expected levels of knowledge received awards of $1500. The state also provided funds for support of low-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

performing schools in the form of assistance teams and remediation for Teachers in those schools, with steps such as these part of the public notification required of the low-performing school.

The act also included sections related to "extra pay for mentor Teachers . . . new teacher development . . . professional development . . . and extra days." Programs for support of new teachers were funded in the form of three additional paid days for orientation and classroom preparation, as well as paid mentor teachers. Teachers were compensated for participation in professional development activities related to the improvement of student achievement; principals were compensated for training related to teacher observation and evaluation. Additional funds for additional assignments related to improved student achievement were provided to districts to be distributed at the discretion of the superintendent and the school improvement team.

Tyndall also shared information regarding the creation and implementation of North Carolina Teachers of Excellence for All Children (NC TEACH), a Title II- funded alternate certification program resulting from the collaborative efforts of the state board of education and the University of North Carolina. This fast-track graduate-level teacher education program focused on recruiting, training, supporting, and retaining mid-career professionals to teach in areas of critical shortage (math, science, middle school, foreign language, and special education).

NC TEACH required a six-week summer problems-based curriculum/training session at one of six sites, with the sixth week one of support during the first days of the academic year at the employing school site. Instructional teams at each site consisted of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

master teachers (National Board Certified Teachers when possible), K-12 administrators, teacher education faculty and content specialists. Areas of emphasis during the summer session included orientation to the profession, children as learners, planning, management, assessment, utilization of test data, strategies to assist all students, state and local contexts for public education, parental involvement, and North Carolina's curriculum. Modeling of various teaching strategies throughout the session informed beginners' practice.

Weekly seminars were held throughout the year for continued study of teaching, content, and professional development, as well as for support. Distance learning was a vehicle for developing further candidates' knowledge and skills in areas such as instructional use of technology, individualizing for diverse needs, classroom management, communication with different populations, identifying and accommodating special needs, and reflective practice. Candidates observed other teachers, and other teachers observed candidates. Videotaped class segments were used for candidate assessment. During the first year of teaching, participants were mentored by a paid teacher mentor, as well as by an online mentor working with a cohort of candidates. During the second year, they continued to receive online mentoring, as well as direct assistance from NC TEACH master teachers and SCDE staff. In turn, second year "NC TEACHers" supported and assisted the next cohort of first year candidates.

Students who completed the six week summer session received a $1000 stipend and earned six semester hours of graduate credit. Completion of the academic year resulted in another twelve semester hours of earned graduate credit. Noncredit Praxis

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

workshops were available during the second summer to assist those candidates unsuccessful in meeting Praxis requirements.

Tyndall also included information on University-School Teacher Education Partnerships. Commission members received several related documents with meeting materials: "Overview of University-School Teacher Education Partnerships," including "Findings of First Year of Partnership Activity"; specific information on the program at University of North Carolina at Wilmington; and "A Vision for Excellent Schools of Education," information from the University of North Carolina Deans' Council on Teacher Education describing program purpose, guiding principles, and components.

The University-School Teacher Education Partnerships program which began in 1997 connected the fifteen University of North Carolina institutions with public schools to effect school improvement and teacher education reform through change at both the university and K-12 levels. "Guiding principles" for these partnerships included earlier and extended preservice experiences in the schools; collaborative professional development programs; greater communication between groups; research into teaching and learning; and collaboration in curriculum and program planning and development. University of North Carolina program information pointed to what it described as the program's uniqueness in addressing all phases of teacher education—recruitment, selection, preparation, induction, professional development—and in involving all affected populations, including parents, K-12 teachers and administrators, IHE faculty and staff, citizens, and business and industry.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Descriptions of communication difficulties among K-12 and university faculties were noted in the "Overview" and attributed to differences in "cultures, priorities and reward systems, and agendas." However, positive changes thusfar included more extensive clinical experiences for preservice teachers; improved preparation of mentor K-12 teachers; increased use of technology related to computer literacy and Internet skills, as well as e-mail communication among participants; curriculum change as a result of action research; professional development for practicing teachers; the involvement of National Board Certified Teachers; and recruitment of teacher candidates, particularly from minority populations.

Group Activity: Recreating the Teaching Profession

Following the presentations and a brief question-and-answer period focused primarily on reactions to the presentations, Commission members shared thoughts about the readings and presentations and completed the worksheet "Recreating the Teaching Profession in Louisiana." They were asked to focus on what they viewed individually as "effective" and "ineffective"practices in relation to the creation of an accountability system for Louisiana. Worksheets were submitted to the Commission Director.

November 18, 1999

The November meeting focused on accountability systems for teacher preparation programs, with external speakers once again providing national and state perspectives. The meeting began with a review of past Commission proceedings and an update on what was forthcoming. Volunteers were solicited for Commission subcommittees focusing on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

certification restructuring, alternate certification, and a "State Data and Recruitment Center."

The full Commission would set as its top priority the creation of a teacher education program accountability system in Louisiana that would identify "at-risk" and "low-performing" teacher education programs as mandated by the HEA. Accountability system components to be addressed would include assessment model, performance indicators and criteria, commitments to implement, rewards and consequences, and the IHE report card—with focus in this meeting on the assessment model, performance indicators, and commitments. Providing national and state perspectives on accountability systems were invited presenters Dr. Lynn Cornett of SREB and Dr. William Reaves, Assistant Vice Chancellor of the Texas Education Agency and The Texas A&M University System.

Materials Distributed: Accountability

Various materials were provided in members' packets. These included "Next Steps" for the Commission, which summarized past meetings' outcomes and "stages of problem solving"; the SREB "Teacher Education Accountability System" PowerPoint presentation; "The Texas A&M University System/The Regents' Initiative for Excellence in Education"; "Secondary Data Sources - Components of Teacher Preparation Program Accountability Systems"; "Creating an Accountability System for Teacher Preparation Programs in Louisiana" and related worksheet; data on teacher certification shortage areas in Louisiana in 1997-98; and "Public Input Form Responses."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Commission Director: Next Steps, Problem-Solving Model

At this stage of the Commission's work, members were informed of the method used to coordinate and direct Commission activities. According to the Commission's October minutes, the Commission Director "used Parnes [sic] Problem Solving Model[6] to identify the steps that the members would take to address the charge of the Blue Ribbon Commission." The document "Next Steps" reflected this model, showing problem-solving stages for each meeting, meeting outcomes, and actions required. "Next Steps" also served as a review for Commission members of September and October presentations and discussions and as a springboard for next steps required.

Members saw that the September meeting had focused on the problem-solving stage labeled "Mess-Finding," a stage in which participants "generate what is known about a mess and identify important questions"; in this case, Commission members had identified "burning issues." Following the meeting, the planning committee had categorized September's "burning issues" into three questions requiring "immediate action" and six questions requiring "long term actions." Questions of urgent importance had related to teacher supply, HEA-mandated teacher education program evaluation, and collection and dissemination of data on teachers: "What must we do to attract quality individuals to become teachers through our alternative certification process and other incentives? How are we going to evaluate our teacher preparation programs to address the HEA? How can we more effectively gather and disseminate state data pertaining to teachers?" Questions necessitating "long term actions" had focused on streamlining the certification process; developing performance-based standards for teacher education programs and certification;

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

re-designing teacher education programs to "better prepare teachers"; supporting teachers (through advancement opportunities, professional development, improved working conditions, etc.); improving public perceptions of teaching as a profession; and obtaining necessary resources and funding for changes proposed.

Members learned that the October meeting had represented the "Data-Finding" and "Problem-Finding" stages. Commission members had been asked to "generate data that addresses the question(s)" and "prioritize options and identify real problem(s) that need to be addressed." Members were reminded in "Next Steps" that they had identified "effective" and "ineffective" practices following presentations on teacher recruitment, preparation, certification, and retention efforts in various states in general and in North Carolina in particular. Then, "based upon information generated, a decision was made to prioritize the questions that needed to be addressed by Commission members and use subcommittees to gather additional information about three areas." One of the priorities identified here had involved the HEA-mandated teacher education program accountability: "How will the state hold universities (and school districts) accountable for the recruitment, preparation, and retention of *new* teachers entering the teaching profession?"

The second priority listed had focused on recruitment, certification, and data collection—with a note that these had "lower priority due to the fact that Commission decisions pertaining to accountability could impact decisions in the following areas." Recruitment priorities were framed in the question "What must the state do to create a statewide data center that will: (1) assist districts in the recruitment of teachers; (2) assist the State in the collection of data pertaining to teachers who leave the field; and (3) assist

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the State in the collection of other relevant data pertaining to teachers and teachers' needs?" Certification priorities had focused on "improvement" of the existing certification structure, with particular attention to requiring content majors and minors, using performance-based certification, and decreasing the number of certification areas. Also a priority would be the "improvement" of the existing alternate certification structure to allow the state to "provide flexibility to teacher preparation programs who are using alternate pathways to prepare teachers for certification but hold universities accountable for the effectiveness of the teachers once they begin teaching." Subcommittees on "State Data Center for Teacher Quality," "New Certification Structure," and "Alternate Certification Policy" had been formed to address these priorities and report to the full Commission at the February or March meeting.

Also of priority to Commission members, according to "Next Steps," were the "induction and mentoring" of new teachers. However, member questions concerning the efficacy of the existing New Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program in Louisiana had resulted in a postponement of this issue until additional program information could be provided.

Information was provided regarding additional actions necessary to support Commission work, including requests for state funding to support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of "quality" teachers. Another such action had involved the creation of K-16+ consortia in English/language arts and in mathematics, consisting of SCDE and college of arts and sciences faculty, as well as district personnel. Members were informed that these consortia would be charged with determining by April, 2000,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

what teachers should know and be able to do as teacher education program completers and first year teachers. Consortia members would then identify performance indicators and possible performance-based assessments. Consortia work would be informed by state and national K-12 content standards, Praxis requirements, NCATE standards, and Louisiana's "Components of Effective Teaching" used in the New Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program. Consortia goals listed for the Commission included developing a common understanding among K-12 and higher education faculty of the knowledge and skills needed by beginning teachers as they address state and national K-12 standards; improving Praxis passage rates; increasing number of IHEs eligible for national accreditation; and improvement in K-12 achievement.

Members were informed that the November meeting (as well as the upcoming January and February meetings) would address the problem-solving stage labeled "Idea-Finding." Commission members would "produce feasible ideas/solutions to address the problem(s) by answering 'How will the State hold universities (and school districts) accountable for the recruitment, preparation, and retention of *new* teachers entering the teaching profession?'" To assist Commission members in answering this question, presenters would provide information on efforts of several states in general, and of the Texas A&M system in particular.

Speakers: Accountability, National and State Perspectives

One of these presenters, Dr. Lynn Cornett, Senior Vice President of SREB, discussed the national perspective regarding teacher education accountability. SREB, created in 1948 as the "first interstate compact for education," represents sixteen Southern

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

states, including Louisiana. Each state is represented on the SREB governing board by the state's governor and four governor-appointed members, including a state legislator and an educator. SREB conducts and publishes studies and maintains regional K-12 and higher education databases intended to assist and inform governmental and education collaboratives focused on improvement in education and thus improvement in "the social and economic life of the region" (SREB, 2000).

Suggesting certain areas to be considered in developing such an accountability system, Dr. Cornett provided examples of what other states are doing. She discussed emerging goals of states, including K-12/higher education partnerships, increasingly diverse teacher workforce, decreasing needs in critical shortage areas, and increased K-12 student achievement. Among the areas she suggested for consideration when developing a system of standards and assessment were the following: ultimate sources of accountability—the IHE, SCDEs and colleges of arts and sciences, or individual teacher education programs; selection of indicators and criteria as related to "quality" of students—upon entering and exiting, as well as success and satisfaction of graduates; incentives, rewards, consequences, and assistance necessary to create change; and state leadership for reporting, implementing, and overseeing the required data-driven information system developed through collaborative K-12/higher education efforts.

Dr. William Reaves, Assistant Vice Chancellor of the Texas Education Agency and The Texas A&M University System, provided a single state's perspective in his discussion of The Regents' Initiative for Excellence in Education, as well as that of one IHE, the Texas A&M system—which he said had surpassed state accountability expectations with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

its initiatives. The Texas accountability system, requiring specific commitments from IHE presidents and provosts for teacher education improvement, had created a "Center for Excellence in Education" designation requiring IHE achievement of Educator Performance Targets; Productivity Targets, related to increases in areas such as numbers of teachers and minority candidates; and Resource Targets, related to increases in areas such as scholarships and teacher education program operating budgets.

Group Activity: Creating an Accountability System

Following these presentations, Commission members reflected upon information shared by presenters. They brainstormed possible purposes of a teacher education accountability system in Louisiana. Using a worksheet titled "Creating an Accountability System for Teacher Preparation Programs in Louisiana," members suggested purposes which focused primarily on program goals and "effectiveness," teacher supply, and collaborative efforts: to improve teacher "quality," K-12 achievement, and public perceptions of teaching as a profession; to "redistribute the burden of student achievement"; to assess and improve teacher education program "effectiveness"; to collect assessment data for publication; to "change behavior within the college system"; to increase teacher education enrollments and teacher retention rates; to create a "seamless" K-12/higher education system; to "identify leadership roles"; to "build trust in order to obtain funding"; to "solidify the Governor, BoR, BESE, and Legislature commitment to accountability."

Using "Secondary Data Sources - Components of Teacher Preparation Program Accountability Systems," Commission members examined five different accountability

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

assessment models as well as North Carolina's indicators before addressing accountability system components and indicators most appropriate to meet Louisiana needs. These assessment models focused on one or a combination of the following categories to classify programs as "low-performing," "at-risk," and in some cases earning "special recognition": educator performance (state teacher examination, employer satisfaction); academic program (state approval, national accreditation); recruitment and retention (shortage areas); K-12 school and student performance (K-12 school growth targets, K-12 student performance); and school/university partnerships. Model programs varied greatly in designating standards for labels: (1) minimum expectations, educator performance, only in the form of state teacher examination pass rates; (2) minimum expectations, the same as model one, but with high standards in all four additional categories for "special recognition"; (3) "set criteria (standards) for a combination of variables" in all five categories; (4) "external review teams and matrices" for all categories except "school/ university partnerships"; and (5) an "adaptation of Louisiana's School Accountability Model," utilizing baseline data, a formula assigning weights to all five categories, University Performance Scores, growth targets, and six- and twelve-year goals.

Information provided to Commission members on performance indicators, defined as "variables that are used as part of an assessment model to examine performance," stated that these vary greatly among states. Examples of indicators used by other states were grouped in categories labeled "educator performance" (Praxis passage rates, graduation and "time to graduate" rates, graduate and employer satisfaction, etc.); "student productivity" (supply in general, minorities and shortage areas in specific); "resource"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(salaries, operating budgets, scholarships, authentic K-12 partnerships, etc.); "academic program" (accreditation, student-faculty ratio); "faculty productivity" (course and supervisory loads, time in K-12 settings); "K-12 student performance"; and "partnership." Commission members were also given a list of indicators used in North Carolina's accountability system, most of which fell in the "educator performance" category: program admission data, including grade point average and average scores on pre-professional skills tests; graduation rates; "time to graduation" rates; average scores on professional and content area certification examinations; percentages of graduates certified and hired; retention rates four years following graduation; and graduate and employer satisfaction.

Using the "Creating an Accountability System" worksheet, Commission members responded to the following prompts: "What model would best address the needs of Louisiana? What indicators should be included in Louisiana's assessment model? Should there be commitments from institutions, school districts, BoR, BESE, Governor, and Legislature to successfully implement the accountability system? If yes, what would you include as commitments?"

Responses concerning the model or combination of models best suited to the needs of Louisiana varied from a mandatory minimum expectations model, with pass rate only or set criteria for a combination of variables; a mandatory minimum expectations model, with optional very high expectations, with pass rate and additional criteria for special recognition; a model incorporating varying expectations (such as criterion not met, met, exceeded), with an external review team and matrices; and a growth model, adapted from

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Louisiana School Accountability Model. Desired model components included focus on performance at the institutional level, not just that of the SCDE; levels of performance with fixed standards and criteria; expectation and encouragement for performance improvement with sufficient time allowed for such improvement; labeling by categories rather than by scores derived from a formula; and incentives. Suggested indicators included Praxis passage rates; graduate and employer satisfaction; graduates' performance in the state's assessment of new teachers; percentages of graduates with content minors; number of graduate-level and continuing education programs; K-12 achievement; numbers of certifiable teacher candidates from "traditional" and alternate certification programs—overall and in shortage areas; candidate and graduate retention rates; number of scholarships for teacher education candidates; authentic K-12 partnerships; university faculty involvement in K-12 schools; extent of preservice experiences in K-12 schools; university supervisor qualifications; collaborative efforts between SCDEs and colleges of arts and sciences; university commitment to teacher education; increased teacher education program funding, including increased salaries for faculty in teacher education; and K-12 administrative preparation.

Commission members were also provided with examples of commitments from others to insure success of an accountability system. But the discussion of commitments needed was tabled until further development of the assessment model, which would impact commitments necessary.

The final section of the document "Secondary Data Sources" provided information on HEA requirements, including a brief summary of what was required and what was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

allowed as additional assessment. A chart defining U.S. Department of Education descriptive information required for state report cards and availability of data showed that Louisiana authorities could address all required categories except that related to accountability, i.e., the process for identifying "low performing" and "at-risk" teacher education programs. This information included certification requirements for Level I (initial), Level II (in Louisiana, three years of teaching experience and successful completion of Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program), Level III (in Louisiana, five years of teaching experience and a master's degree), and names of required assessments and passing scores; alignment of state teacher certification requirements and assessments with state student standards and assessments; passage rates on state teacher examinations; state assessment (accreditation) and accountability (classification as "low-performing" or "at-risk"); state certification waivers (types and numbers of teachers with waivers by categories); alternate certification (types); and a description of state efforts to improve teacher "quality." Commission members were reminded that "Louisiana MUST identify an assessment model to assess the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and establish criteria to identify low performing and at-risk teacher preparation programs."

- A similar chart defining U.S. Department of Education indicators required for institutional report cards and availability of data at the state level showed the need for institutional reporting to the state and the state's need to create a data-collection process. These indicators required for institutional report cards included state teacher examination passage rates, including comparisons to state's average passage rate; number of program completers by content/grade level; data on "practice teaching," including number of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

students enrolled, average number of hours per week, total number of weeks, number and rank of supervising faculty, faculty-student ratio; accreditation and approval (state) status; and designation as "low-performing." Universities would be required to report this information to the public.

The document labeled "Public Input Form Responses" included anonymous responses submitted to the Commission. Four people offered comments and suggestions regarding the Commission's task. One respondent made suggestions regarding teacher recruitment and retention, suggesting recruitment efforts at the high school level and increased preservice attention to classroom management issues to forestall beginning teacher frustrations over "lack of ability" and subsequent resignations. Two respondents suggested changes in the certification in Louisiana of those with foreign course work/ certificates. One, with credentials from France in special education, decried the difficulties s/he had experienced in attempts to obtain certification in Louisiana. The other spoke to this problem as well as to a need for language immersion programs in teacher education. A fourth respondent offered three suggestions: streamlining LDOE certification processes; state focus on birth-five years; and the development of specific state and district policies on remediating fourth and eighth graders unsuccessful in standardized testing.

January Correspondence Prior to January Meeting

In rather detailed correspondence prior to the January meeting (dated January 5, 2000), the Commission Director informed members that this would be an "interactive meeting and input from all Commission members [would] be expected." In preparation for the January meeting, members were asked to consider the following questions and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tasks regarding selection and prioritizing of indicators to be used in Louisiana's accountability system: "If we must prioritize indicators, which 5 indicators [from those generated during the November meeting] would most effectively assess the quality of Louisiana's teacher preparation programs if included in an accountability system?...Are some of these of greater weight than others? Also identify 3-5 important indicators that should be included in a report card to the public but not included in the assessment model."

Sample Assessment Model: Levels and Labels

Members were also provided in this correspondence with a sample assessment model inclusive of elements identified during the November meeting (national accreditation; teacher examinations in certification level and specialty area; retention; and recruitment, which actually focused on employer satisfaction rate). Included were notes acknowledging that the Commission could increase the number of levels and would determine the labels to be assigned, as well as define the indicators (standards) and the percentages required for each. Members were asked to examine this sample model and consider the following questions: "Should all universities be expected to reach the highest level? Should the labels be consistent with the K-12 labels for schools (e.g., Program of Academic Distinction) or different? Must a university meet ALL criteria for every indicator at a performance level...to be assigned the label...? How much time should universities be provided to move to a higher performance level (e.g., one year, two years, three years, etc.)?" Provided in these materials were examples of labels and time periods used by other states.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Task: Labels and Corrective Actions

Members were reminded in this correspondence that their task included the identification of "low performing" and "at-risk" programs with subsequent "consequences/ corrective actions." Provided with examples of corrective actions (oversight teams, withholding of approval for new university programs, program discontinuation) and rewards (commendations, funding priority and flexibility, additional scholarships) used in other states, members were asked to review these in light of how labels could be applied to Louisiana IHEs; what types of corrective actions would be appropriate, including criteria for "discontinu(ing) a teacher education program"; whether or not rewards would be given and, if so, what types and to whom; and general and specific commitments necessary for the teacher education reforms proposed.

Summary: Prior Responses on Accountability

Members also received a summary of accountability system purposes and indicators included in their responses in November on individual worksheets titled "Creating an Accountability System for Teacher Preparation Programs in Louisiana." The planning committee had grouped indicators according to purposes.

For example, paralleled with the improvement of teacher "quality" were the following indicators: Praxis passage rate (e.g., first attempt; repeated attempts); employer and graduate satisfaction; first-year teacher performance on the state assessment program; program accreditation; percentage of candidates with content minors; and graduate level and continuing education programs. Indicative of meeting the goal of improving K-12 student achievement would be documentation of such achievement and that of providing

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

an "adequate" supply of teacher candidates would be documentation of the number of teachers exiting (total and shortage areas), number of candidates certified through alternate certification, and percentage of students starting and completing programs. Numbers/percentages related to teacher retention and numbers of scholarships awarded would validate the goal of increasing teacher retention. Authentic K-12 partnerships, preservice teachers' time in K-12 schools, university faculty time in K-12 schools, and "quality" of university supervisors would be required indicators addressing the goal of connecting K-12 and higher education into a "seamless education system." Indicators supportive of the goal to "create a system to change behavior within the college system" included the degree of collaboration between SCDEs and colleges of arts and sciences, as well as the university's commitment to teacher education. Grouped with "building trust in order to obtain funding" were indicators regarding increased funding for expenditures and salaries for teacher preparation faculty. Identification of leadership roles was tied to preparation of school leaders. Other purposes suggested in November had no parallel indicators.

January 13, 2000

The January meeting continued the discussion of a teacher preparation accountability system, with focus on the identification of indicators; an assessment model; consequences and rewards; and commitments necessary for success. The meeting opened with the introduction of the new preservice teacher representative and general announcements. The Commission Chair reported on the December BoR and BESE joint meeting during which BoR and BESE members were updated on Commission activities.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

She also reported on a recent meeting with the four Louisiana university system presidents to emphasize their role in teacher education.

Materials Distributed: State Accountability

Among the materials provided to Commission members for the meeting were "Outcomes & Next Steps" (revised 1-6-00); the section on Louisiana in "State of the States - Improving Teacher Quality," *Education Week*; a status report submitted to the BoR and BESE, December, 1999; and the section on Louisiana in Fordham Foundation publication, "The Quest For Better Teachers: Grading The States." These all focused on accountability.

"State of the State Report"

The Commission Director reported on the "State of the State Report" issued by *Education Week*, in which the Commission work was mentioned and Louisiana was assigned a grade of *C+* for "Improving Teaching Quality," which represented a tie for sixth place among all states. This grade was based on teacher assessment (Praxis, New Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program, NBPTS licensure and financial incentives, and number of National Board Certified Teachers); teaching in field (percentage of secondary teachers with degree in subject taught, minimum degree/coursework required for licensure, state discouragement of out-of-field teaching); professional support and training (state-required and funded beginning teacher induction, state encouragement and support of ongoing professional development); and teacher education (percentage of education graduates from NCATE-accredited institutions, state-mandated clinical experiences).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Commission Director: Updates

The Commission Director informed members that they had already addressed many of the actions recommended for university presidents in "An Action Agenda for College and University Presidents," part of the report "To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers Are Taught" published by ACE that members had received in their September packet of materials. She also provided updates on progress of the English/language arts and mathematics consortia and the three subcommittees—alternate certification, new certification structure, and what was now being called the "data collection technical subcommittee" (rather than the "state data center for teacher quality" subcommittee).

Group Activity: Prioritizing and Refining

The Commission, still engaged in the Idea-Finding stage of problem-solving, then focused attention on the identification of specific elements of Louisiana's accountability system for teacher education, looking at members' responses in November. Their tasks included prioritizing indicators; refining assessment models; and identifying consequences/ corrective actions, rewards, and general and specific commitments necessary for program success.

Indicators

Using the indicators generated during the November meeting, Commission members prioritized these as to which "would most effectively assess the quality of Louisiana's teacher preparation programs if included in an accountability system." Approximately half of the Commission members included Praxis passage rate, first attempt

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(17) and K-12 student achievement (14) in their top five. Approximately one-third included program accreditation (11); retention numbers/percentages after three years (10); employer satisfaction (10); and first year teacher performance on the Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program (10). The next group of indicators, labeled as "preference," reflected approximately one-fourth and included authentic K-12 partnerships (9); university faculty time in K-12 schools (8); and university commitment (8). Numbers dropped considerably for the next group of indicators: preservice teacher time in K-12 classrooms (4); teacher candidate productivity—total and shortage areas (3); administrator preparation (3); SCDE/arts and sciences collaboration (3); program retention (2); alternate certification productivity (2); Praxis passage rate, repeated attempts (2); graduate satisfaction (1); graduate level and continuing education programs (1); and productivity of content area minors (1). Not selected at all were indicators related to teacher education scholarships; university supervisor "quality"; and increased funding/salaries.

Upon examining the top indicators, the Commission Director encouraged member response to any, particularly to those prompting concern. Much discussion centered on indicators related to the number of attempts involved in Praxis passage. Members representing SCDE deans in particular expressed concerns about focusing solely on first attempts, stating that such focus would be potentially misleading and inaccurate as to student ability and program "quality" and productivity. Commission members discussed other possible results of such an indicator: the subsequent raising of entrance requirements and thus a decrease in numbers certified, as well as the potential impact on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

other indicators. A suggested alternative was the reporting of all attempts, perhaps as percentages.

Another concern revolved around the indicator pertaining to the Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program. Using data from the Assistance and Assessment Program would be meaningless in differentiating among IHEs, some members felt, as the passage rate was approximately 97% (including noncertified teachers). There was also concern that this rate and employer satisfaction would be too closely connected since employers (i.e., school administrators) generally served on new teacher assessment teams; thus these two indicators would be basically equivalent.

K-12 achievement as an indicator was also one which prompted considerable discussion. Some Commission members expressed concern over the lack of IHE control over many variables influencing student achievement. Others questioned whether or not the state had "the ability to determine student achievement of teachers who graduated from universities in Louisiana." Of major concern to several members was the necessity for insuring "fairness" to teachers in the "process to link K-12 student achievement to teachers to universities."

The Commission then discussed whether or not all 22 indicators should be considered for inclusion in the institutional report card separate from the accountability system. Consensus focused on the need for additional information as to data collection processes prior to decisions regarding inclusion for the assessment model and the accompanying report card for public information. Committee members also requested information regarding HEA requirements for state and institutional report to the U.S.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Department of Education. Members suggested that the Data Collection Technical Subcommittee provide at the February meeting the following information concerning all 22 indicators: existing data; data collection methods; and reasons for and against inclusion in accountability system/report cards.

Scoring

The discussion shifted to "refinement of the assessment model" as members discussed the use of "absolute scores" for "meet(ing) all criteria for a specific level to be given a performance label" versus "variable scores" for "obtain(ing) points at different performance levels and receiv(ing) a label based upon total points." Members generally opposed the use of "absolute scores," favoring instead a "variable scores" system comparable to that used in Louisiana for K-12 school accountability. K-12 accountability components suggested for consideration included input/output indicators; individual baseline scores based on IHE performance upon collection of initial data; a target score for all IHEs; related individual growth targets, along with predetermined time for reaching these; rewards for growth and/or surpassing state expectations; corrective actions resulting from scores deemed unacceptable and/or failure to meet growth targets; and two labels reflecting performance level and growth.

The Commission decided to table discussions of weighting as to importance until specific indicators were identified and the planning team was able to create a teacher education accountability system comparable to that for K-12 schools. They did, however, offer suggestions regarding the development of the accountability system: that weighting

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

be determined by the number of indicators; that "discomfort would be felt by some regarding the use of 'failing' labels"; and that "the K-12 model might be too complicated."

Consequences, Corrective Actions, Rewards

"Consequences/corrective actions" for IHEs labeled as "at risk/low performing" or unable to meet growth targets was the next topic for discussion, with focus on possible actions required of the affected IHE and any school districts involved, as well as of the BoR. Suggestions were also offered as to provisions for students enrolled in these programs.

IHEs with these labels might be required to develop five-year plans for improvement, as well as inform their students and the general public of the label, corrective actions/consequences, and status. For deficiencies "directly tied to schools" with whom the IHE is involved, school districts could be expected to collaborate in the elimination of the deficiencies. Members suggested that the BoR assume a leading role by taking actions necessary to assign negative labels; "attach budget implications"; provide assistance, including improvement funds and additional resources; require an external team visit for the purposes of developing recommendations for improvement and creating appropriate timelines soon after the label is assigned; "use dollars to impact the entire university - [to] get individuals at the leadership level involved"; halt program expansion or creation until improvement is evident; and "reconstitute or eliminate" programs not showing improvement. Students enrolled in the IHE's program would be provided opportunities to cross-register or transfer to other IHEs, even when within their final 30 hours and without loss of scholarships.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In contrast, IHEs that surpassed growth targets and state expectations might be provided rewards. Rewards suggested included positive labels; commendations; formal public recognition, faculty/program/college recognition, and preservice teacher recognition for improvement efforts; additional funding, endowments, increased state funding opportunities, incentive funds supporting teacher "effectiveness" research, university faculty merit salary increases, and additional Tuition Opportunity Program for Students (TOPS)/scholarship funding; and National Board Certified teacher program involvement.

Commitments

Members then focused their discussions on commitments necessary to support these reform initiatives. Suggestions were varied according to source of commitment: the state legislature, BoR, BESE, universities, school districts, community, and a combination of all of these. Commitments expected from the legislature would include funding of teacher education program changes; providing resources such as distance learning to universities and K-12 schools; and supporting K-12 partnerships. The BoR would be expected to commit to targeting funds for shortage areas and special needs and to aligning higher education policies with BESE K-12 policies. BESE would also be expected to commit to the alignment of policies as well, in addition to eliminating emergency credentialing of uncertified teachers.

There were many commitments to be expected at the university, district, and community levels. University commitments would include the "production" of higher performing graduates; increased funding for teacher education; opportunities for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

preservice students to work with at-risk public school students and in "real-life" field-based experiences; collaborative efforts between SCDEs and colleges of arts and sciences; "meaningful" and authentic dialogues with K-12 schools; support of graduates in the field; faculty instruction that modeled "real life" classrooms and "appropriate" techniques; provision of "guarantee" to program completers; increased faculty involvement in school settings; preparation programs that addressed individual differences, as well as special needs "that extend(ed) beyond special education"; alignment of college curricula with K-12 curricula; and "document(ation) [of] the relationships between faculty efforts to improve teacher quality and the state's education reform initiative."

School districts would be expected to commit to "meaningful" and authentic dialogues with universities; provision of "high quality" supervisors of preservice teachers; and placement of new teachers in "positive" settings with "strong" administrators. They would also be expected to commit to ongoing support for the first three years—where they would have the resources needed to demonstrate their effectiveness (e.g., technology, books, etc.).

Community commitments included providing exemplary programs funded by endowed chairs and private scholarships for teachers, as well as incentives for teachers to teach (e.g., home/car loans, child care). All groups—the BoR, BESE, universities, and school districts—would be expected to commit to working together.

Public Input: Task Force on Child Sexual Abuse

During the time allotted for public input, an individual spoke on behalf of the Task Force on Child Sexual Abuse and provided printed information. She spoke to the need for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teacher preparation in the areas of recognition of and addressing child abuse and asked the Commission to consider such topics as they revised teacher preparation.

February Correspondence Prior to February Meeting

Prior to the February 10 meeting, members received correspondence from the Commission Director regarding the upcoming meeting. She informed them that the Technical Data Subcommittee had met and their recommendations would be shared at the next meeting. She also included materials labeled "Draft Recommendations for a Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System," with instructions to review this document prior to the meeting.

February 10, 2000

The February meeting focused on refinement of the proposed Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System Assessment Model and on identification of an alternate certification model. The Commission Chair opened the meeting with a report on a recent meeting with IHE chief academic officers to update them on Commission work. The Chair also reported on a presentation on Commission work to a joint meeting of the Louisiana House and Senate Education Committees.

Commission Director: Draft Accountability System

Still in the Idea-Finding Stage of Problem-Solving focused on accountability system refinement, the Commission Director formally presented draft accountability system recommendations that had been mailed previously to Commission members. Recommendations were based on January Commission discussions and responses and patterned after the K-12 School Accountability System.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The draft accountability system focused on 11 areas: indicators; method of measuring program "effectiveness"; indicator criteria and points; method of determining improvement; method of communicating program growth to the public; reward system; corrective actions for "unacceptable" status; corrective actions related to growth targets; timeline; the state's role in reporting to the public; and the appeals process. Specific examples were included in this draft, but members were reminded that this was an initial draft intended to initiate discussion and therefore subject to change.

Indicators

Indicators in the draft were phrased in more specific, measurable terms than before. These included percentage of first attempt Praxis passage rate; mean score on teacher satisfaction survey following first teaching year; mean score on employer satisfaction survey following second teaching year; retention rate (percentage) after three years of graduates who had begun teaching in Louisiana schools; mean score (4-point scale) for Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program; and national accreditation/state approval.

Scoring

The draft also provided suggested measurement of program "effectiveness" in terms of a single composite score called the "Teacher Preparation Performance Score" (TPPS), intended to provide an accurate description of program "quality" across the state as measured by the indicators. Calculation for this score would be based on a formula related to IHE performance on each indicator, with a total score ranging from 0-100 and 100 representing "quality" program. IHEs would be assigned labels based on these

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

scores, to be determined by the BoR and BESE. (Scores provided here with labels are examples only.) Labels would include "unacceptable" (TPPS = below 60); "satisfactory" (TPPS = 60-99); "quality" (TPPS = 100-125); and "distinguished" (TPPS = 125 and above). All IHEs would be expected to achieve a TPPS of 100 and "quality" status.

Criteria for Points

The next area included in the draft involved criteria for each indicator allowing IHEs to obtain points at each level. The example provided for the Commission was accompanied by a note explaining that, following the collection of data by the state, actual criteria would be determined. Criteria included in the example were as follows: Praxis passage rate, first attempt—below 80%, unacceptable; 80-96%, satisfactory; 97-98%, quality; and 99-100%, distinguished. Similar sample criteria were shown for each indicator.

Growth Targets

State determination of improvement would be based on baseline data gathered for all IHEs, with the first TPPSs assigned in spring 2001. IHEs would then be given four years to reach the expected score of 100 ("quality" program), with a growth target for "quality" assigned for two-year intervals (representing one-half of the differential between the TPPS and 100). Once the TPPS of 100 was reached, growth targets would be set for "Distinguished" program status.

Publication of Results

Communication to the public of program growth would be in the form of growth labels, such as "exemplary growth" (exceeding growth target by a pre- determined number

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of points); "recognized growth" (meeting or exceeding growth target by less than a pre-determined number of points); "minimal growth" (some improvement, but insufficient to meet Growth Target); and "university in decline" (flat or declining TPPSs). Lack of growth on the part of IHEs labeled "quality" or "distinguished" status would not result in "minimal" growth labels; however, a drop in status label ("Distinguished" to "Quality") would result in a "university in decline" growth label.

Rewards

Specific rewards suggested for the "Distinguished" and "Quality" labels, as well as for "Exemplary" and "Recognized" Growth labels, were varied. For the "Distinguished" program, rewards might include a positive label; public recognition through ceremonies and institutional/state report cards; an extra five points assigned to IHEs for education grant proposals submitted for state funds; and IHE preference for grant proposals submitted for private Louisiana foundation funding. "Quality" programs would be rewarded with a positive label and public recognition similar to that for "Distinguished" programs. "Exemplary" and "Recognized" Growth would be rewarded by a positive label, public recognition in institutional/state report cards, and additional teacher education funding through Performance Funding.

Corrective Actions

Corrective actions for "Unacceptable" status would be leveled. Level I Corrective Actions would include immediate classification as "At-Risk" for the U.S. Department of Education and the assignment of an external team charged with assisting the IHE in reaching "Satisfactory" status. Level II Corrective Actions would result from failure to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

demonstrate improvement through the re-calculated TPPS at the end of the first year. The IHE would then be labeled as "Low Performing" for the U.S. Department of Education, and the state's external team would continue working with the IHE during the second year. Following the second year, lack of improvement would result in withdrawal of state program approval. If the IHE wanted to reinstitute a program, it would then be required to plan and develop a "reconstituted" program over the next year at a minimum. During this period, the IHE would not be allowed to accept new students into its programs. Currently enrolled students would be allowed to complete their program at the IHE to become state-certified, or they could transfer at any point to an approved IHE if they met admissions requirements. (Students in their final 30 hours would not be included in the approved IHE's TPPS.) The nonapproved IHE would be expected to assist the student in the transfer process.

Consequences

Consequences for failure to achieve Growth Targets would vary according to IHE status. Status of "Satisfactory," "Quality," or "Distinguished" would preclude corrective actions. There would be no consequences if "Quality" programs did not reach Growth Targets. However, "Satisfactory" programs would be expected to reach Growth Targets; failure to do so would result in consequences. In the first two-year cycle, a Program Review conducted by the BoR would result in recommendations for the IHE, to which the university would be expected to respond in writing. Failure to reach the Growth Target in the second two-year cycle would result in BoR rejection of approval for any new programs in any discipline until "Quality" status is achieved.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Timeline

The timeline suggested would result in announcement of the first TPPSs during spring, 2001. The first two-year cycle to meet the Growth Target would be from July 1, 2001, to June 30, 2003; the second, from July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2005.

Reporting

The state and IHEs would share responsibility for informing the public. A joint BESE/BoR annual report on teacher education program status would reflect institutional progress, and State and Institutional Report Cards would be issued. Indicators in addition to those required for the U.S. Department of Education would be included.

Appeals Process

Procedures would be established for an appeals process regarding scores and resulting labels. IHEs would be allowed to appeal their scores to BESE/BoR.

Group Activity: Refining of Indicators

Following discussion of the accountability system overall, Commission members once again addressed the six indicators identified in January as possibilities for inclusion in the accountability model. Members made recommendations as to additional indicators to be included, existing indicators to be adapted, and further information needed to inform decisions.

A topic of continued concern to some members was inclusion of Praxis passage rates related to first and successive attempts, with the final recommendation to include the percentage of cohort program completers who passed Praxis even with repeated attempts. Also recommended for inclusion were indicators related to the mean scores of graduates'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

program satisfaction surveys at the end of the first year of teaching and those of principals' satisfaction surveys at the end of the second year, with the latter possibly including a question examining K-12 student performance in the new teachers' classrooms. Involvement of teacher education students and faculty in authentic partnership K-12 schools would be another potential indicator (with classification criteria to be developed by the Commission), as would the level of IHE performance for national accreditation/ state approval.

Indicators related to supply and retention included a percentage increase in regular and alternate certification program completers, total and shortage areas, and a retention percentage based on Louisiana teachers still teaching three years past program completion. Members requested additional information on retention.

Group Activity: Labeling

Members also discussed the suggested labels: "distinguished," "quality," "satisfactory," and "unacceptable." Following discussion over perceived differences in and connotations of terms, members decided to replace "distinguished" with a different term for greater distinction between the highest level and the "quality" level, and "satisfactory level" with "approaching quality" to indicate efforts aimed at the "quality" level. [The term "exemplary" was later selected to replace "distinguished."]

Committee Report: New Certification Subcommittee

The remainder of the meeting focused on a report from the New Certification Subcommittee, with recommendations presented by the Commission Chair and the Director. These focused on changes in certification structure regarding recommendations

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

for initial licensure; more in-depth course content; greater flexibility in obtaining additional certifications; more extensive mentoring of beginning teachers; and required professional development.

Recommendation for Licensure

Subcommittee recommendations related to initial licensure shifted responsibility for recommendation for certification from the LDOE to the IHEs. IHEs would also assume responsibility for their graduates' success. This change would allow the LDOE to end its practice of counting credit hours on transcripts and begin programs providing greater LDOE support of teacher education programs.

In-depth Course Content

Another recommendation focused on changes in the certification structure to allow for greater content knowledge in the grade levels of certification, as well as more flexibility for add-on grade level certifications (12-15 hours, special education). Common elements in the new structure included coursework related to general education requirements, knowledge of the learner and the learning environment, teaching methodology, and student teaching; differing elements included focus areas (PK-2, 1-5, 5-8, 9-12) and "flexible" hours to be used by universities "to create quality teacher preparation programs."

Beginning Teacher Support

Beginning teacher support in the licensure process was recommended to extend for a second year. This would provide mentoring throughout the first year prior to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

assessment during the second year. This assessment would use a 4-point scale and portfolios as performance assessments.

Professional Development

A fourth recommendation from the subcommittee required new teachers to engage in professional development activities for certificate renewal. Details concerning professional development and the reissuing of licenses would be developed by the Commission during 2000-2001.

Correspondence Prior to March Meeting

The Commission Director's correspondence to members prior to the March meeting included several documents for member review prior to the meeting: Summary of February Meeting Responses; revised recommendations for the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System (TPPAS); a related work document; new recommendations from the Alternate Certification Subcommittee; revised recommendations for the New Certification Structure; and examples of state, university, and district commitments in support of teacher "quality." The Director reported on a meeting with a Louisiana university faculty member with expertise in NCATE accreditation to discuss possible inclusion of NCATE accreditation in the accountability system formula. Such inclusion in the accountability formula would be inappropriate, it was decided, for two reasons: differences in accreditation and approval requirements for public and private IHEs would result in different standards among institutions, and changes in state approval standards would not be in effect for some private institutions until 2003, thus making it difficult to gauge growth during the 2001-2003 two-year cycle.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

It was recommended, however, that the BoR require reporting of NCATE status in the institutional report cards. The Commission Director also reported on availability at the March meeting of information requested in February: retention data by IHE over a five-year period, which would allow examination of numbers of program completers who entered teaching in Louisiana and numbers who remained in teaching over this period; retention data from other states; and recommended criteria for authentic K-12 partnership schools.

The work document included in the correspondence prompted members to reconsider recommendations from prior meetings, thus beginning the process for final decisions. Areas for consideration included determining which indicators should be used for the accountability system and their respective weightings; the appropriateness of recommended rewards, corrective actions, labels, and timelines; recommended changes for the proposed Practitioner Teaching Program (PTP) and the New Certification Structure, including certification grade levels; and commitments to be expected from the state, universities, and districts.

March 9, 2000 Meeting

The March meeting continued discussions regarding the refinement of the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System Assessment Model and identification of an alternate certification model. The meeting began with reports on various recent meetings related to education reform initiatives.

The Commission Chair reported on a "Forum on the Development of An Accountability System for Teacher Education Programs" held at the end of February for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

all system presidents, campus heads of public and private institutions, chief academic officers, and deans of colleges of education and arts and sciences to inform them of Commission work and to provide an opportunity for interaction with presenters from Louisiana and Texas.[7] The Commission Co-Chair reported on a recent presentation with another Commission member and planning committee members to the Louisiana School Board Annual Conference in New Orleans. A Commission member also reported on a K-16 Regional Mini-Conference held in Eunice, Louisiana, at the end of February, during which participants received information on proposed Commission recommendations and identified the following ways "to raise student achievement to meet the state standards": preservice training, staff development, increased salary, local flexibility on regulations, and shared commitment.

Commission Director: Updates on Indicators

This meeting, addressing the Solution Finding stage of problem-solving, centered on updates on previously identified indicators and ramifications for inclusion in the accountability system. The Commission Director also reported on the recommended addition of another indicator.

Praxis Passage Rates

Praxis passage rates to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education would be based on a cohort of students who had completed their programs between July 1, 1999, and June 30, 2000, with scores from examinations taken through August 31, 2000, (including retakes) accepted for calculations by ETS. Classification as a "Praxis pass" would be limited to program completers in the 1999-2000 cohort who had attained

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

passing scores on all required assessments no later than August 31, 2000: Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) - Reading, Writing, and Mathematics; Area Specialty Test(s); and Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) - K-6 or 7-12. There was some discussion on the possible consideration of measuring increased Praxis scores by individuals rather than the overall passage rate. Also discussed was the advisability of reviewing existing Praxis cutoff scores for possible change.

Graduate and Employer Surveys

New teacher and principal satisfaction surveys would be developed during the summer of 2000. New teacher surveys, examining from the perspective of the new teacher the extent of teacher education program preparation and support for the first year of teaching, would be administered during the fall of 2000 to those who had begun teaching during 1999-2000 (following one year of teaching). Principal surveys would also be administered during the fall of 2000 to administrators who had supervised teachers classified as new teachers during 1998-99 (following two years of teaching). The principal surveys would examine the extent of teacher education program preparation for the first two years of teaching, as well as the extent of K-12 student academic growth during each of the two years. She reported that the Southeast Center on Teacher Quality was assisting Louisiana's efforts to identify common survey questions for use in southeastern states for comparison purposes, with plans to consolidate regional and state survey questions.

NCATE Status

The Commission Director reported further on the meeting mentioned in March correspondence concerning inclusion of NCATE accreditation in the accountability system

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and the subsequent recommendation that such accreditation be reported only, rather than used as an indicator. She explained that, in addition to reasons noted in the correspondence, some private IHEs could experience lower TPPSs in 2003 as a result of implementation of new, more rigorous state approval standards at that time. She emphasized the importance of consistency of criteria throughout both two-year cycles (2001-2005). The recommendation was made to consider use of the state supplement only as the indicator pertaining to program accreditation/approval.

Retention Rates

Members examined data on retention of teachers in Louisiana's public schools during the first five years of employment. They determined that, on average, more teachers exit public schools following the first and second years of teaching and that a "smaller but fairly consistent" number exit following the next three years. Members requested additional information regarding reasons for exiting. Some suggested that data-gathering efforts be coordinated with districts; others expressed concerns about teacher openness in reporting to districts their "real" reasons for leaving.

Two options for this indicator were offered by the planning committee. One option centered on setting state goals for retention rate reduction at 2% annually. Should this goal not be met, state exit data related to the first three years of teaching would be used to evaluate state, university, and district commitment to improve teacher retention and effectiveness of actions by each.

The second option included retention rate in the accountability formula. State exit data related to the first three years of teaching would be used to eliminate those exiting for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

reasons beyond district/IHE control (e.g., moving out of state, medical reasons). Retention criteria extending beyond the latest three year average would then be set. The example provided was that, given a 25% state average for loss of teachers during a three year period, criteria for "Quality" status might be 20% loss and criteria for "Exemplary" status might be 15% loss. Following discussion of these options and possible problems inherent in reporting, the Commission elected to eliminate retention as an indicator to be used in 2001 accountability formula calculations, but to require its inclusion in institutional report cards and to consider its inclusion in authentic K-12 partnership school criteria.

K-12 Partnership Schools

Members also determined that insufficient information regarding authentic K-12 partnership schools was available. They requested additional information necessary for determining appropriateness of inclusion in the accountability system.

Program Quantity Indicator

Recommendations related to the program quantity indicator focused on percentage increases of regular and alternate certification program graduates in teacher shortage areas. To obtain points at the "Quality" and "Exemplary" levels, IHEs would be required to meet pre-determined percentage growth targets in designated teacher shortage areas. Members were provided with numbers related to 1998-99 teacher shortage areas by content area/grade level and parish.

Weightings of Indicators

The Director then reported on suggested weightings of indicators, as well as on the proposed addition of another indicator. There were two suggestions regarding

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

indicator weights: that indicators be categorized as to reflection of program "quality" or program "quantity," with equal weight given to each category (50% each), or that weighting be differentiated, with program "quality" equaling 60% and program "quantity" equaling 40% of the TPPS. Discussion centered on the appropriateness of including both "quality" and "quantity," with "quality" having greater weight.

K-12 Student Achievement Indicator

Also recommended was the inclusion of an additional indicator related to K-12 student achievement. Commission consensus seemed to be in agreement with this indicator, though concerns were expressed regarding the state's ability to determine K-12 achievement in this way.

New Alternate Certification Program

The final topic for discussion centered on the Alternate Certification Subcommittee's recommendation for the development and implementation of a new alternate certification system. This system would provide a fast-track certification path for people with baccalaureate degrees outside of SCDEs who had obtained employment in Louisiana schools for the upcoming academic year (thus potentially increasing the number of certified teachers and decreasing the number of uncertified teachers). Required to demonstrate necessary content knowledge through required state examination (Praxis) prior to employment, these potential teachers would enroll in classes the summer prior to teaching and throughout the academic year while teaching "to develop the necessary skills to deliver instruction in an effective manner."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Members discussed possible changes to these recommendations, including waiving the PPST and specialty Praxis requirements for candidates with graduate degrees in area of certification. Also discussed were suggestions that temporary certificates be validated for three years only, that a licensure appeals process be developed, and that universities collaborate in creating summer courses. Members questioned whether or not alternate certification students must be admitted to graduate schools if they wish to apply hours required for certification toward a degree. Concerns were expressed about demands placed on practicing teachers for improvement in K-12 student achievement as well as for their involvement in the state's mentoring and assessment program for new teachers.

Correspondence Prior to April Meeting

Correspondence received by Commission members prior to the April meeting included the following documents: Summary of March Meeting Responses, general information on Commission tasks for the 2000-01 year, Commission Four Year Action Plan, Proposed Collapsing of Certification Areas, Revised Practitioner Teaching Program, Revised New Certification Structure, and Revised Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System. The primary purpose of the April meeting as stated was to "discuss the elements of a four year action plan to address the recruitment, preparation, and retention of quality . . . teachers." The Commission Director requested that members examine the proposed four year action plan and prepare to suggest additions, deletions, or revisions at the next meeting. They were also asked to review areas of Commission focus for the 2000-01 year and the proposal for collapsing existing certifications into fewer areas. Members were informed that the afternoon of the March meeting would be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

devoted to discussion of the New Certification Structure and the Practitioner Teaching Program. They were also asked to be prepared to discuss possible roles for the Commission in support of teacher salary increases.

The Commission Director also reported on the Planning Committee's meeting with Dr. Richard Hill, an external consultant who had assisted with the development of the Louisiana K-12 School Accountability System. Feedback from this meeting regarding ways to strengthen the proposed accountability system would be shared at the April meeting. Because Hill would be unavailable to join the Commission until the May meeting, the Planning Committee had decided to "continue in-depth discussion" about the model at that meeting to provide Hill with sufficient information for formula development during the summer. He would then present the formula to the Commission for feedback during the September, 2000, meeting.

April 13, 2000

The April meeting focused on the development of final Commission recommendations: the Alternate Certification Model and the New Certification Model. Additionally, a proposed four year implementation plan was presented. The Commission Chair and Co-Chair opened the meeting with a report on updating BESE on Commission work.

Speaker: Higher Teacher Salaries

A representative of the Governor's Office then addressed the Commission on the Governor's support for higher teacher salaries and the important role the Commission could play in supporting the Governor's efforts. Member suggestions for ways to do so

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

were varied, including passing a resolution of Commission support; sponsoring a forum for teachers and legislators; and providing information to the public through various means, including publication of real life stories about "effective" teachers. Consensus of the group was "to publicly support state efforts to raise teacher salaries to the SREB average."

Commission Director: Updates

The Commission Director updated the Commission on the external consultant hired to assist with the development of the accountability formula. She also discussed plans for the 2000-2001 Commission.

Consultant

The Commission Director discussed the involvement of Dr. Richard Hill, National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, who would serve as external consultant in the development of the accountability formula. Dr. Hill was scheduled to meet with the Commission during the upcoming May meeting to discuss issues related to measurement, reliability, and validity. She also informed members that a small subcommittee of Commission members would meet with Dr. Hill throughout the summer to develop this formula, with subcommittee recommendations scheduled for presentation to the full Commission during the September, 2000, meeting. During the upcoming May meeting, Commission members would have an opportunity to share their thoughts with Dr. Hill on issues for subcommittee consideration during the summer.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2000-2001 Commission: Composition, Charge

The organizational structure of the 2000-01 Commission was discussed. The chair and co-chair positions would alternate, with a BESE chair and a BoR co-chair. Serving as co-directors would be a BESE/LDOE staff member and a BoR staff member, both of whom would also assume responsibility for assisting IHEs and districts with implementation of Commission recommendations. All 1999-2000 Commission members would be invited to serve, provided that they still met the qualifications of the position that they originally represented. Vacancies would be filled by the BoR and BESE.

The 2000-01 Commission would be charged with recommending policies in the areas of professional development and professional development funding, educational leadership, and teacher "quality." Professional development goals would include the creation of a professional development system for new teachers characterized by five-year renewal cycles for licensure which would be tied to ongoing professional development aligned with school improvement goals. Similarly, a comprehensive professional development system at university and district levels would be created for all teachers. The area of professional development funds would be closely related, as this area would address the creation of a system to use effectively any existing and new resources for professional development. Another professional development goal would involve developing strategies to improve the "quality" of all graduate programs for educators.

2000-01 Commission activities related to educational leadership would include the creation of a comprehensive system to recruit, prepare, and retain highly qualified administrators, as well as to provide leadership opportunities for highly "effective" teacher

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

leaders wishing to remain in school settings. Teacher "quality" would continue to be addressed through completion of recommendations for the TPPAS and through alignment of university curriculum with K-12 content standards, Praxis, NCATE, and state approval standards in the areas of English/language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, the learner/learning environment, early childhood education, and leadership.

Group Activity: Implementation Plan

Following discussion of plans for 2000-01, the Commission returned to its immediate tasks. Continuing in the problem-solving stage of Solution Finding, Commission members discussed a four-year action, or implementation, plan in light of the goal of improved K-12 academic achievement. Success in reaching this goal would be measured by achievement at the fourth and eighth grade levels on the LEAP for the 21st Century Test and the percentage of freshman high school students graduating within a four year time period in the form of specified percentage increases. The goal would be supported by three objectives: "Teacher Quality Objective," "Teacher Shortage Objective," and "Teacher Retention Objective" with strategies for achieving these objectives assigned to the BoR, BESE, or both. Commission members discussed the wording for these objectives, as well as specific strategies for addressing each.

Teacher Quality Objective

The "Teacher Quality Objective" focused on program completers from Louisiana's public and private universities. Measurements for this objective would be interpreted as increases to 100% in the number of teacher education programs which by spring 2005 had attained "Quality" or "Exemplary" status on the TPPAS; had Praxis passage rates of 90%

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

or higher; and had developed a partnership relationship with one or more professional development schools. Another measure would be a specified increase in the percentage of National Board Certified Teachers.

One strategy addressing this objective would be jointly shared by the BoR and BESE: issuance of a spring 2001 State Report Card on Teacher "Quality." Related strategies for which the BoR would be responsible included implementation of a new Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System (fall, 2000)[8]; establishing the requirement that all IHEs redesign their teacher education programs in alignment with the state K-12 content standards, Praxis, and NCATE (spring, 2001); and requiring all IHEs to issue Institutional Report Cards on the "quality" of teacher education programs.

Similarly, BESE would assume responsibility for certain related strategies. Among these would be informing the public about numbers of uncertified teachers by requiring districts to notify parents in writing that their children's teachers were uncertified (fall, 2000) and reporting data on uncertified and out-of-field teachers on the School and District Report Cards (fall, 2001). BESE would also be responsible for decreasing the allowed length of service for uncertified teachers who have not successfully passed all parts of Praxis (winter, 2000). Other strategies related to implementation of professional development systems included a system requiring professional development programs for licensure renewal every five years for all new teachers (fall, 2001) and a comprehensive professional development system for all PK-16+ teachers in Louisiana (fall, 2001).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Teacher Shortage Objective

The "Teacher Shortage Objective" related to uncertified teachers in public schools. By spring 2005, measures for this objective would include the following: a decrease in the number of uncertified and out-of-field public school teachers from 13% to a specified lesser percentage; pre-determined increases in the percentage overall of regular and alternate certification program completers and in that of program completers in mathematics, science, and special education; and a specified percentage increase in the number of teachers who leave the profession and then return.

The BoR and BESE would be jointly responsible for several proposed strategies, all of which could begin in spring, 2001. One involved the creation and implementation of regional Teacher Cadet Programs to recruit prospective teachers from regional high schools. Another related to collaborating with legislators on bills providing financial incentives for teaching in shortage areas. Such bills might include revising TOPS legislation to include alternate certification and nontraditional students; to require teachers receiving the scholarships to teach in state teacher shortage areas a number of years equal to that of the scholarship; and to provide $3000 supplements during the first three years of teaching in teacher shortage areas. Another bill might provide forgivable education loans for teachers agreeing to teach in shortage areas for a specified amount of time.

Singular responsibilities for the BoR related to teacher shortages could include using performance funding to reward IHEs which had increased the number of certified teachers produced, particularly those in shortage areas (spring, 2003). BESE would be responsible for addressing teacher shortages by changing existing certification

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

requirements: collapsing many unnecessary areas to a few (fall, 2000); simplifying the certification process for experienced out-of-state teachers (fall, 2000); implementing the new Alternate Certification System (spring, 2001); and implementing the new (regular) Certification System (summer, 2001). BESE would also be expected to address recruitment needs by providing districts with high numbers of uncertified teachers the technical support needed for recruiting certified teachers (fall, 2000) and by creating and implementing an electronic recruitment center to link prospective candidates with position openings (summer, 2001).

Teacher Retention Objective

By spring 2005, the "Teacher Retention Objective" would be measured by an increase in the retention rate of first year teachers in Louisiana public schools: for those from Louisiana, an increase from 85% to 90%, and for those from other states, an increase from 76% to a specified percentage. This objective would also be measured by an increase in the retention rate of third year teachers in Louisiana public schools: for those from Louisiana, an increase from 75% to 85%, and for those from other states, an increase of a pre-determined amount.

Joint responsibilities of the BoR and BESE regarding teacher retention centered on pushing through legislation related to teacher salary. Goals for legislation would include increasing teacher salaries to the SREB average, providing significant increases for advanced degrees, and exempting new teachers from state income taxes during their first five years of teaching.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Additional Strategies

Additional strategies not directly related to the above three objectives were recommended. Two of these, to be jointly shared by the BoR and BESE, related to data collection and demonstrated commitment. The two agencies would be responsible for the creation and implementation of a system for collecting consistent data from districts and IHEs. They also would assume responsibility for requiring IHEs to demonstrate commitment to teacher education through passing scores on the State Supplement of the School Improvement Process.

A third strategy centered on authentic partnerships. BESE would be responsible for the creation and implementation of comprehensive induction programs for new teachers during their first three years of teaching which would require collaboration among districts, IHEs, and the LDOE. Another BESE responsibility would be the creation of a supportive school environment for new teachers.

BoR responsibilities related to authentic partnerships would include requiring all university presidents to designate a PK-16+ Facilitator responsible for creating an authentic partnership among university presidents, university deans, university faculty, district superintendents, and K-12 faculty—one that would cross all lines. The BoR would also require universities to create and implement PK-16+ Councils at all universities, with every district represented on a council. In addition, every university would be required to create and implement a minimum of one Professional Development School.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Group Activity: New Certification Model

The Commission then reviewed the proposed New Certification Model, including a proposal for streamlining certification areas in Louisiana from 110+ to 36 primary areas of certification through consolidation and elimination. An example provided of such streamlining was the consolidation of current certifications in nursery school, kindergarten, nursery school and kindergarten, Montessori, non-public Montessori teacher into one certification: Pre-Kindergarten - Grade 2 (PK-2)[9] alternate and regular certification. The proposal also recommended that committees examining the alignment of state, Praxis, and NCATE standards with IHE teacher preparation (various consortia) should examine consolidation of related certification structures.

Much discussion of the new certification structure focused on changes in elementary (grades 1-8) certification. Recommendations for new certification levels—PK-2, 1-5, 5-8—were met with concern from some members over the potential impact on availability of certified teachers at the upper elementary levels. Several members, including personnel directors and SCDE deans, expressed concern that these changes would exacerbate existing shortages of certified teachers. Commission members were informed that a resolution to the Commission from the South Central Louisiana Association of School Superintendents was forthcoming, in opposition to the division of certification into smaller grade levels because of similar concerns regarding availability of certified teachers. Some members referred to similar action taken by the state in the early 1990s (converting to a grades 1-4 and 5-8 certification system), action that was reversed within two to three years because of small numbers of teacher candidates choosing the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

grades 5-8 route. Other members supported the changes based on what they viewed as a need for greater in-depth content knowledge at the upper grade levels, particularly the middle school. An alternative was proposed by SCDE deans: retaining the current certification but overlaying a particular grade focus. For example, certification might be grades 1-8 with a grades 1-5 or a grades 5-8 focus, thus allowing personnel to fill needs according to focus when possible and also according to shortage area when needed. Further consideration of these proposed changes was tabled to allow staff to gather additional data for sharing at the May meeting.

In addition to proposed consolidation of certification areas, under discussion was the New Certification Structure which would change significantly the course requirements for certification. Among the recommendations was that universities would assume primary responsibility not only for recommending candidates for initial licensure, but also for the success of their program completers. In effect this would remove from the LDOE responsibility for checking off course work,. Other recommendations involved changes which would foster more in-depth content knowledge in the grade levels in which candidates intend to teach, as well as provide "flexible hours" which would allow for add-on certifications such as special education or additional grade levels. Some recommendations focused on different stages of licensure: the second, ending after two years of teaching (rather than one) and the completion of one full year of mentoring prior to assessment during the second year; the third, following successful completion of the new teacher assessment program and three years of successful experience; and successive

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

stages, based on ongoing professional development required for five-year license renewals.

Coursework required in the New Certification Structure was divided into three main categories. These categories were labeled common elements of basic certification for all grade levels, differing elements of basic certification, and additional certifications. Some of these elements were the same as or comparable to current coursework requirements; others were quite different.

The common elements of basic certification for all grade levels included general education courses, knowledge of the learner and the learning environment, teaching methodology, and student teaching. Differing elements included focus areas (grade level certifications) and "flexible" hours to be used by individual universities in creating "quality" teacher education programs. Additional grade level certifications would require approximately 12 semester hours, which could be drawn from the "flexible" hours category. One recommendation focused on requiring IHEs to create programs that would allow at least two areas of certification.

Correspondence Prior to May Meeting

Materials received by members prior to the May meeting included the following: Commission Recommendations; Blue Ribbon Professional Development Schools; Practitioner Teaching Program; New Certification Structure; Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System; Indicators for State and Institutional Report Cards; State, University, and District Commitments; and a worksheet for the May 11th meeting. They were informed that the May meeting would focus on finalizing discussion

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pertaining to Commission recommendations to be presented during a joint meeting of the BoR and BESE at the end of the month. Members were reminded that their responsibility was to make recommendations to the two boards, not to develop detailed plans for each recommendation; BoR and BESE staff would develop detailed implementation plans reflecting Commission intentions.

In preparation for the May meeting, members were asked to examine carefully a list of key issues to be discussed, each tied to a particular document: the New Certification Structure; the Practitioner Teaching Program; Commission recommendations; the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System; and state, university, and district commitments. They were also asked to declare their intentions regarding future participation on the Commission.

May 11, 2000

The May meeting focused on finalizing all Commission recommendations to be made to the BoR and BESE at a joint meeting the end of the month. During this meeting, the Commission discussed issues related to the New Certification Structure; the Practitioner Teaching Program; Commission recommendations; the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System; and state, university, and district commitments. A worksheet on these issues that had been distributed to members in correspondence prior to this meeting served as a guide for the meeting's discussions.

Group Activity: New Certification Structure

Under "New Certification Structure" on the worksheet was a summary of what were described as "two strong opinions currently exist(ing) among Commission members"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

about new certification proposals. Also included on the worksheet was information about the addition of a minimum number of pre-student teaching field-based experiences beyond observations, with an example given of 180 hours.

Members were reminded of the April discussion on certification levels. Some members had supported the new certification grade levels to allow for more in-depth content knowledge; others had supported the existing structure because of teacher supply needs and preservice teacher interests. Based on these differing opinions, two options for certification levels were proposed as a compromise.

Certification Level Options

One option recommended a set of certification levels slightly different from that recommended in April: PK-2, 1-5, 4-8, and 7-12 (rather than PK-2, 1-5, 5-8, 9-12). A note on the worksheet pointed out that this option expanded the recommended new middle school certification from 5-8 to 4-8 and the new secondary certification from 9-12 to 7-12.

The second option reflected an alternative proposal that had been suggested at the prior meeting by SCDE deans. Under this option, current certification levels of 1-8 and 7-12 would be retained through 2004-2005, but with a focus in one of the newly proposed grade levels (PK-2, 1-5, 4-8, 9-12). Principals would be encouraged to place teachers according to their focus area, which would represent a teacher's more in-depth understanding of that content area. If during that time (between the implementation of the new certification structure and 2004-2005), the LDOE determined that a sufficient number of candidates were selecting middle school focus, this new certification proposal would be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

implemented in 2005. If there were an insufficient number of candidates selecting grades 4-8 as their focus, BESE would determine what to do about certification levels.

Following discussion of the two options, the Commission selected the first as the one to be included in the New Certification Structure: PK-2, 1-5, 4-8, 7-12.[10] This option represented a slight modification to the originally proposed structure. The New Certification Structure would be included as a recommendation in the Commission Report to be presented at the joint BoR-BESE meeting (see Appendix I for the detailed certification structure).

Group Activity: Practitioner Teaching Program

The second issue listed on the worksheet, the alternate certification structure labeled the Practitioner Teaching Program, was also discussed. The Commission Director pointed out that some changes to this program had been recommended. These changes included one that required nine credit hours (or equivalent contact hours), rather than the original six, for the intensive field- and course-based summer program. This change was intended to increase the amount of time spent in field-based experiences.[11]

The number of credit hours required during the school year in the Practitioner Teaching Program also reflected a change. All Practitioner Teachers would be required to complete six credit hours (or equivalent contact hours) in seminars while teaching and an additional three credit hours (or equivalent contact hours) in a supervised spring internship. This change was intended to support one-on-one mentoring in the school setting by the program provider.[12]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Another change involved Prescriptive Plans to be developed at the end of the academic year for all Practitioner Teachers who demonstrated problems. These plans would require from 1-12 additional credit hours (or 15-180 contact hours). [A note on the worksheet stated that "all teachers will be able to complete the Practitioner Teaching Program in 18 hours within a one year time period if they demonstrate proficiency during teaching. Such teachers will undergo the assessment for all new teachers during the fall of the next year."]

Concerns over this program focused on restricting alternate certificate routes exclusively to the Practitioner Teaching Program and on the absence of monitoring standards for private providers allowed to offer the program. Some members suggested the need for additional routes for those students not interested in the practitioner program for reasons such as an unwillingness to assume full teaching responsibilities prior to completion of preparatory coursework and field experiences or to add coursework requirements to first year teaching demands. Also raised as a concern was whether or not private provider programs would be required to meet the same accountability requirements required of IHEs. Following this discussion, the Commission agreed that the Practitioner Teaching Program would be included as a recommendation in the Commission Report to be presented at the joint BoR-BESE meeting (see Appendix J for the detailed program).

Group Activity: Four Recommendations

Members then turned their attention to the Commission's overarching four recommendations, having been instructed in earlier correspondence to be prepared to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

delete or revise these at the meeting. Final recommendations included in the Year One Report presented to the BoR and BESE varied somewhat from those in the worksheet distributed through earlier correspondence.

Using this worksheet, Commission members reviewed recommendations which highlighted "improved student achievement" as the overall goal, supported by "improved teacher quality." This improvement of teacher "quality" would be achieved by addressing the four major areas comprising the Commission's recommendations. Each recommendation on the worksheet included an outcome stated in terms of benchmarks, a means of measuring success in meeting the outcome, and actions supportive of achieving the outcome.[13]

Creation of University-District Partnerships

The first recommendation focused on the "creation of coordinated partnerships": "to have state agencies, universities, and districts work collaboratively to *coordinate existing partnerships and create meaningful new partnerships that result in improved student achievement.*" According to the worksheet, this recommendation would have an expected outcome by 2005 of 100% of the universities and professional development schools and 80% of the partner schools meeting growth targets for the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System and the K-12 School Accountability System.[14] Important to the accomplishment of this outcome would be actions taken at the state, university, and district levels involving the Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality/PK-16+ Commission[15]; PK-16+ Councils, Coordinators, and Consortia; Teacher

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Preparation Redesign Committees; Blue Ribbon Professional Development Schools; and Partner Schools.

The Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality/PK-16+ Commission would "recommend policies to the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary & Secondary Education that result in systemic change in the preparation of teachers and principals." PK-16+ Councils composed of university, district, and community leaders and chaired by university presidents/chancellors would "develop strategies for universities, professional development schools, and partner schools to meet state growth targets" for the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System and the K-12 School Accountability System. The PK-16+ Coordinator within each IHE, a position to be funded by grants, would "(answer) directly to the president/ chancellor and (would coordinate) efforts across colleges and districts for the university, professional development school(s), and partner schools to meet state growth targets."

Representatives from SCDEs, colleges of arts and sciences, other colleges, and districts would serve on PK-16+ Consortia to collaborate in the identification of "core knowledge that teachers must possess to teach the K-12 content standards, pass the Praxis examinations, meet NCATE accreditation requirements, and effectively teach higher achieving students." Then Teacher Preparation Redesign Committees with composition similar to that of PK-16+ Consortia would align the university curriculum with this identified core knowledge for teachers.

Blue Ribbon Professional Development Schools based on state criteria would provide the learning environments necessary for preservice teachers, experienced teachers,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and university faculty to collaborate in improving K-12 achievement.[16] Innovative partnerships with K-12 schools would provide opportunities for increased pre-student teaching experiences in field-based settings.[17]

Increased Teacher Recruitment

The second recommendation spoke to "recruitment of teacher candidates and certified teachers": "to have state agencies, universities, and districts work collaboratively to *actively recruit individuals into the teaching profession with a focus upon certification in teacher shortage areas.*" This recommendation would focus on increasing the percentage of certified teachers in Louisiana from 87% to 94% by 2005, an outcome to be measured by certification data collected by the LDOE. Actions supportive of this outcome would include a "streamlined" alternate certification structure—awarding certification following "one year of combined course work and full-time teaching...and (demonstration of) required content knowledge, instructional expertise, and classroom management skills. Additionally, TOPS scholarships would be made available to alternate certification students who agreed to teach in teacher shortage areas in Louisiana (mathematics, science, special education, middle school, or identified geographic areas).[18] The creation of an electronic recruitment center would also support recruitment efforts by providing information on Louisiana vacancies to prospective candidates and on prospective candidates to Louisiana administrators.

Active recruitment of teacher candidates would be encouraged through various actions: requirements that IHEs actively recruit more candidates, particularly in teacher shortage areas, with success rewarded through the Teacher Preparation Program

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Accountability System; requirements that IHEs collaborate with technical/community colleges to insure that the latter's students develop the core content knowledge identified by PK-16+ consortia; support of legislation which would fund TOPS scholarships for nontraditional community college students agreeing to teach in Louisiana teacher shortage areas; and the creation of high school level Teacher Cadet Programs which would be jointly supported by IHEs and districts. Support for the Cadet Programs, which would allow high school juniors and seniors to enroll for high school/university credit in courses introducing them to teaching as a profession, would be sought from the legislature in the form of $3000 bonuses for Cadet Program graduates during the first three years of teaching in Louisiana teacher shortage areas. A related action in the form of counseling high school students regarding advantages and disadvantages of entering and remaining in the teaching profession would provide young people with accurate information about the profession. Similar counseling would take place at the university level as well. Paraprofessionals would also be encouraged to seek certification through proposed legislative action which would double the number eligible for teacher certification coursework funding.

Similarly, active recruitment of certified teachers would be supported through changes in Louisiana certification requirements for out-of-state teachers and experienced teachers reentering the profession and through changes in recruitment strategies in districts with critical shortages. To recruit out-of-state teachers with three or more years of successful PK-12 teaching experience, Commission members suggested recommendations that focused on streamlining certification requirements they would have

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to meet. To encourage the return of experienced teachers out of the profession for five or more years, a free Internet course on the integration of technology into the curriculum would be created and offered in partial completion of the required six credit hours for re-entering the teaching profession. Also, districts suffering the most critical teacher shortages would receive assistance in the "implementing [of] effective strategies to locate and hire certified teachers and ... to better utilize existing certified teachers" in meeting shortage needs. Teacher education program graduates with temporary certificates because of Praxis deficiencies would receive targeted assistance in areas needed.

District placement of teachers was another proposed action critical to this outcome. Districts would be encouraged to place first and second year teachers in positions related to their certification. Annual District Report Cards would reflect the percentage of certified teachers, as well as the percentage of schools with fully certified teachers. The district teacher certification rate would be included in the formula developed for the state District Accountability System.

Related to the active recruitment of potential teachers, particularly in areas of critical shortage, was the reorganization of the existing certification system. By collapsing the large number of existing certification areas (110+) into fewer areas (36 proposed), the state would ostensibly provide districts with greater flexibility in hiring. Also included here was the collection of data from districts to determine reasons for teacher exit. Streamlining the certification process by requiring universities to recommend names of successful program completers for certification rather than LDOE transcript review (except with out-of-state teachers) would expedite the certification process. To

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

encourage further the hiring of certified teachers rather than those uncertified, waivers would no longer be provided to teachers failing to meet certification requirements.

Preparation of "Quality" Teachers

The third Commission recommendation centered on "preparation of quality teachers": "to have state agencies, universities, and districts work collaboratively to *prepare teachers who possess the in-depth core knowledge and teaching skills to effectively educate higher achieving K-12 students.*" The outcome of this recommendation would be that 100% of the state's universities would achieve "Quality" status on the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System as measured by data collected for the accountability system.

Several initiatives would be supportive of this recommendation and outcome. These included the new content-focused certification structure, the Louisiana Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System, state and institutional report cards for teacher education programs, technology infrastructure and preparation, redesign of university curricula, and faculty involvement in K-12 schools.[19]

The new content-focused certification structure provided for greater in-depth knowledge to teach students at all levels.[20] The results-driven Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System would hold universities accountable for graduate success in PK-12 settings (see Appendix J for the detailed accountability system). Related state and institutional report cards on "quality" of teacher preparation programs would provide this information to the public. Technology infrastructure and preparation would be supported at the university, professional development school, and partner school levels to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

prepare new teachers to integrate effectively technology into the curriculum. University curricula would be redesigned "to address university and district expectations for what effective teachers should know and be able to do to teach higher achieving students."[21] All SCDE faculty responsible for the instruction of preservice teachers would be required to work directly in K-12 school settings for a minimum of one semester every five years. This work could assume various forms, including conducting action research, teaching field-based courses, supervising student teachers, and/or mentoring new teachers.

Increased Retention Rate

The Commission's fourth and final recommendation involved the "creation of essential conditions and environments": "to have state agencies, universities, and districts work collaboratively to *create environments and conditions that support and retain highly effective preservice teachers, new teachers, experienced teachers, principals, and university faculty.*"[22] The intended outcome of this recommendation was to increase the retention rate of beginning Louisiana public school teachers after three years of teaching from 73% to 85%, to be measured by data collected by the LDOE.[23]

Actions necessary to achieve this outcome were varied. These included providing monetary incentives for teachers; funding implementation of reforms; changing university tenure and promotion policies; supporting stronger new teacher induction programs; creating awareness of district teacher retention rates; developing a comprehensive database; recommending a system for recruitment, preparation, and retention of "quality" principals; and providing professional and leadership development.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Funding Needed

Some of these actions were tied to funding. Those related to monetary incentives for teaching included creating and supporting legislation to raise teacher salaries to the SREB average, to provide substantive pay increases for advanced degrees, and to exempt new teachers from state income tax during their first five years of teaching. Additionally, support would continue for existing legislation providing for reimbursement of NBPTS application expenses and $5000 pay increases per year for five years to teachers attaining national certification.[24] Actions related to program funding as needed for implementation of Commission recommendations included the redistribution of existing funds/resources among the BoR, BESE, the LDOE, universities, and districts; the active pursuit of grant funds; and the securing of new state funds for recommendation components requiring dedicated funding, such as the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System and hiring additional faculty to meet needs created by increased teacher education program enrollments.

Policy and Program Changes Needed

Other actions were tied to policy and program changes. University tenure and promotion policies would need to be revised to reward faculty actively engaged in district and K-12 school partnerships. The Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program would reflect the following changes: expansion of the program's new teacher mentoring component from one semester to one full year; enhancement of the "quality" of interaction between mentors and new teachers; extension of the assessment component to the beginning of the second year of teaching rather than the end of the first year; and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

expansion of the current performance-based assessment resulting in interview and observation data to include a portfolio of teacher work samples. Induction programs for new teachers would be enhanced by providing assistance to principals in developing three year comprehensive induction programs for new teachers and by requiring universities to provide ongoing support to graduates during their initial three years of teaching through online support, Internet resources, seminars, and other means.

Reporting

Actions related to district teacher retention applied to the district, university, and state levels. Districts would be required to report one, two, and three year retention rates in the annual District Report Cards. These rates would also be included in the state District Accountability System formula. The state would develop a comprehensive database system to be shared by universities and districts as a source of information on teacher recruitment, "quality," and retention.

Recommendations for 2000-2001 Commission

Some of the actions listed applied to Commission recommendations that would be required during the 2000-01 academic year. Among these was a recommendation to the BoR and BESE for a comprehensive system for recruitment, preparation, and retention of highly "qualified" principals and district leaders. The Commission would also be required to recommend for all new teachers an ongoing professional development system aligned with K-12 school improvement goals and structured for five-year licensure renewals. Similarly, the Commission would be required to recommend comprehensive professional development systems for experienced teachers and for principals that would provide

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"opportunities to participate in meaningful professional development that results in improved student achievement." University faculty would also be provided with professional development necessary for successful delivery of the redesigned curriculum.

Additional Recommendations

Another required recommendation from the Commission focused on strategies to improve the "quality" of existing university graduate programs. The Commission would also be required to recommend "ways to create leadership opportunities for highly effective teachers (e.g., Teachers of the Year, National Board Certified Teachers) who wish to remain within school settings."

Speaker: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System

The remainder of the meeting centered on two areas: explanation of the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System formula and discussion of state, university, and district commitments necessary to support Commission recommendations. The Commission Director and Dr. Richard Hill led the discussions, with Dr. Hill explaining the Teacher Preparation Performance Score formula (see Appendix K for the detailed accountability system).

The final recommendations for the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System represented the application of information, presentations, and discussions from previous meetings. These recommendations identified and defined indicators to be used in determining teacher preparation program growth, as well as the phase-in schedule showing when each indicator would be integrated into the TPPS formula. Also recommended were methods for calculating various scores: the overall TPPS; the Teacher

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Quantity Index; and the Institutional Performance Index. Methodology to be used in establishing program completer targets and in assigning teacher preparation program labels was also a component of these recommendations, as were rewards for IHEs demonstrating high performance and/or growth and corrective actions for IHEs labeled "low performing" or "at risk."

Indicators to be used in determining teacher preparation program growth were categorized into three groups: teacher quantity, institutional performance, and authentic university-school partnerships. These were further defined in measurable terms. Each of the three areas would be weighted equally in the rating system.

Teacher Quantity

Teacher quantity focused on three indicators related to numbers of program completers and minorities represented in these program completers. Included in this category as an indicator was the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers "relative to a predetermined *program completer target*." Also included were numbers of traditional and alternate certification program completers in two teacher shortage areas: "critical certification shortage areas" and "critical rural district shortage areas."

Certification shortage areas were defined as mathematics; science (biology, general science, chemistry, physics); mild/moderate special education; and middle school certification. The rural districts identified as shortage areas were five parishes with the largest percentages of uncertified teachers: Red River Parish, East Feliciana Parish, St. Helena Parish, Madison Parish, and Assumption Parish.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The third indicator called for the number of racial minority and teaching minority traditional and alternate certification program completers, sums that would be "duplicated" counts (i.e., a program completer would be counted more than once if s/he fell in more than one category). Racial minorities included in the count were African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic, Native American, and Pacific Islander as reported by ETS from Praxis examination information volunteered by candidates. Teaching minorities, also identified through ETS reporting, were defined as males taking the "Early Childhood Education" or the "Elementary Education" Praxis assessment. These counts would also be duplicated counts; i.e., one candidate meeting requirements of two categories would count as two.

Institutional Performance

Institutional Performance focused on four indicators related to Praxis assessment, new teacher and employer satisfaction, and retention rates of traditional and alternate certification program completers. The Praxis assessment indicator was defined as the percentage of program completers who attempted and the percentage who passed Praxis subtests.

Also included in the Institutional Performance category would be ratings by new teachers and "building level assessors" (e.g., principals) derived from surveys of their perceptions of the "effectiveness" of respective teacher preparation programs. Surveys would be developed and field-tested during the spring of 2001. The new teacher survey would be mailed to 1998-99 program completers teaching in Louisiana public and private schools. Upon the establishment of standards for survey scores, individual program raw

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

scores (based on the mean score across all questions for all returned questionnaires) would be converted to a Teacher Survey Index. The same procedures would be followed with building level assessor surveys to obtain an Assessor Survey Index.

Retention rates, another indicator of Institutional Performance, would be calculated beginning in 2003-2004. These calculations would first require the determination of two numbers: the number of 1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completers who had begun teaching in Louisiana schools the fall after program completion minus the number who had moved out of state during the three year period, and the number of program completers still teaching in Louisiana schools after three years. The first number would be divided into the second number to determine the retention rate.

Authentic University-School Partnerships

Authentic University-School Partnerships would focus on improvement in K-12 School Accountability System growth targets in Professional Development Schools. Other indicators for this category were still to be determined.

Timeline

Because some indicators would not be available for reporting until as late as 2003-2004, an indicator phase-in schedule was established. The first year of reporting, 2000-2001, would include a smaller number of variables than successive years. The recommendation stated that this phase-in would not be problematic, for "all indicators will be appropriately indexed [so that] a program's score in one year will be comparable to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that of previous years even though the previous years' scores contained only a subset of the indicators."

Indicators to be phased in during the 2000-2001 year included all three related to Teacher Quantity, as well as the Institutional Performance indicator connected to the Praxis assessment. These indicators would be based on the 1999-2000 cohort of traditional and alternate certification program completers with the exception of the Institutional Performance Praxis indicator, which would be based on traditional program completers only. (The state would factor into its own report alternate certification program completers in this category.)

The 2001-2002 year would see the phase-in of two more Institutional Performance indicators: those reflecting satisfaction ratings by graduates and employers. These would be based on the 1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort. Also phased in at this time would be the addition of 1999-2000 alternate certification program completers to universities' percentages of Praxis attempts and pass rates.

In 2002-2003 all indicators related to Authentic University-School Partnerships would be phased in. These would include improvement in K-12 School Accountability System growth targets in Professional Development Schools and any other indicators developed for this category.

The final currently defined indicator would be phased in during 2003-2004. This indicator, grouped under Institutional Performance, would reflect retention rates of 1999-2000 traditional and alternate certification program completers at the end of their third

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

year of teaching. Commission recommendations also stated that K-12 student achievement data would be reflected in "future cycles."

Calculation of Single Composite Score

Calculation of a single composite score would be based on a formula examining university performance on each indicator. This score would be called the Teacher Preparation Performance Score. Calculations would vary somewhat until all indicators were phased in.

For the first two years, 2000-01 and 2001-02, the single composite score, labeled the Teacher Preparation Performance Score, would be derived from calculations involving the Teacher Quantity Index and the Institutional Performance Index. After that time, the overall score would be derived from calculations involving the Teacher Quantity Index, the Institutional Performance Index, and the University-District Partnership Index.

Also important to these calculations would be the establishment of program completer targets. To obtain this target for individual IHEs, the BoR would first establish a program completer goal for the state. Dividing this goal by the number of 1997-98 program completers would establish a target state percentage increase. The initial individual IHE program completer target would then be determined by multiplying the IHE's 1997-98 number of program completers by the target state percentage increase.

IHEs could request adjustment to the program completer target. The BoR would establish a review panel of external consultants to hear such requests and make adjustments as deemed appropriate. However, the total of IHE targets would have to match the original program completer goal set by the BoR for the state. Thus, the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

lowering of one IHE's program completer target would result in the raising of other IHEs' targets. Should significant organizational changes occur in an IHE following establishment of program completer targets, the IHE would be allowed to appeal to the BoR for adjustment. Such approval would not affect other IHEs' targets.

The next step in determining the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability Score would be to calculate the different indices. These would eventually include the Teacher Quality Index, the Institutional Performance Index, and the University-District Partnership Index.

Teacher Quality Index

The Teacher Quality Index (TQI) would be calculated by adding the total number of program completers (PC) to the product of the sum of program completers certified in certification shortage areas (CSA), employed in rural shortage areas (RSA), identified as racial minority (RM), and identified as teaching minority (TM) multiplied by .5, with this sum divided by the program completer target (PCT) assigned to the IHE. The formula would be $TQI = [PC + .5\ (CSA + RSA + RM + TM)] \div PCT$.

Institutional Performance Index

The Institutional Performance Index (IPI) would be calculated by adding the Certification Index (CI), which is the Praxis passage rate, the Graduate Satisfaction Index (GSI), the Assessor Survey Index (ASI), and the Retention Index (RI), with this sum divided by four. The formula for the Institutional Performance Index would be $IPI = (CI + GSI + ASI + RI) \div 4$.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Teacher Preparation Performance Score

With these calculations producing an average index for Teacher Quantity and for Institutional Performance, the Teacher Preparation Performance Score would be calculated for 2000-01 and 2001-02 according to the following formula: TPPS = (TQI + IPI) ÷ 2. Similarly, the TPPS for 2002-03 and after would be calculated with the University-District Partnership Index (PI) factored in (details still to be determined). The TPPS would then be calculated according to the following formula based on the Teacher Quality Index, the Institutional Performance Index, and the University-District Partnership Index: TPPS = (TQI + IPI + PI) ÷ 3.

Raw data from these calculations would then be converted on a scale which would determine the appropriate label designating each IHE's level of "effectiveness." Teacher Preparation Performance Scores would range from 0 to greater than 0, with "Quality" status awarded to IHEs with scores of 100-124.9. The four-year plan recommended by the Commission stated that all IHEs would be expected to achieve a score of 100 and thus "Quality" status by April 1, 2005.

Labeling Process

The labeling process would begin in 2001 (April 1), which would serve as a baseline year for IHEs. At that time one of two labels would be assigned to an IHE: "Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program" for a TPPS of 80 or above and "Below Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program" for a TPPS of 79.9 or below. From April 1, 2002, through April 1, 2005, IHEs would be assigned annual labels for their teacher preparation programs based on the following TPPS categories: "Exemplary" for 125.0

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and above; "Quality" for 100.0-124.9; "Satisfactory" for 80.0-99.9; "At Risk" for 50.0-79.9; and "Low Performing" for 0-49.9. Following this four year period (2001-2005), scores required for each label would increase over time with a revised schedule of scores beginning in 2005-2006, in order to encourage continued IHE growth to maintain labels.

Reward System

Recommendations for rewards for IHEs attaining labels of "Exemplary" or "Quality" were varied, as were those for IHEs labeled "Satisfactory" the previous year and meeting predetermined growth targets over the year. A teacher preparation program designated as "Exemplary" would receive a positive label; recognition in public ceremonies, institutional report cards, and state reports; professional development grants for its faculties; and fellowship funds for its graduate students. "Quality" programs would also receive positive labels; recognition in public ceremonies, institutional report cards, and state reports; and professional development grants for their faculties. Programs labeled "Satisfactory" the previous year and which had met predetermined growth targets over the year would receive a positive label, public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports, and institutional grants to support improvement efforts.

Corrective Actions

Universities labeled "Satisfactory" which did not reach the expected "Quality" status by 2005 would face the imposition of corrective actions. Among these would be retaining the services of an external consultant at university expense to work with the PK-16+ Council in conducting a "rigorous" program review to identify actions necessary for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

program improvement. The university would report to the public recommended actions and annual progress in improving the program.

Universities with Teacher Preparation Performance Scores resulting in labels of "at risk" or "low performing" would also be assigned corrective actions. These actions would be leveled according to the number of cumulative years at the lower level. The following are types of corrective actions discussed.

An "at risk" teacher preparation program label at Level 1 would result in the university's receiving an "at risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education as mandated by Title II of the HEA. The university would be allowed two years to reach "Satisfactory" level. At its own expense, the university would retain the services of an external consultant to work with the PK-16+ Council in conducting a "rigorous" program review for the purpose of identifying actions necessary for teacher preparation program improvement. The university would report to the public recommended actions and annual progress in improving the program.

Labeled as an "at risk" program for any two years during the four-year cycle would result in Level 2 corrective actions. Universities would have one year to move to the "Satisfactory" level; otherwise, they would move to Level 3 corrective actions. Types of Level 2 actions recommended included the university's receiving an "at risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education, as well as the BoR's rejection of any new university programs requested for colleges offering general education and major courses to teacher education majors. Private universities at Level 2 would be assigned "probationary status" by BESE as part of the state approval process.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Low performing" teacher preparation programs or "at risk" programs failing to demonstrate required growth during Level 2 corrective actions would face Level 3 corrective actions. A Level 3 university would receive a "Low Performing" label for the U.S. Department of Education. At its expense, the university would be assigned an external team to assist the program, and the university would be required to inform students of the "low performing" status and plans for program improvement.

Institutions would be allowed two years to move to a "Satisfactory" level. (IHEs with "at risk" labels for three years would be allowed only one year to move to a "Satisfactory" level; otherwise, they would move to Level 4.) A Level 4 university would lose state approval of its teacher preparation program. A university wishing to "reconstitute" its teacher preparation program would be required to engage in program planning for a minimum of one year prior to submitting a new program request. During this time it would not be allowed to accept new students into the teacher preparation program, and it would be expected to provide assistance to all currently enrolled students wishing to transfer to approved institutions. Students who transferred during the final 30 hours of their program would not be calculated into the Teacher Preparation Performance Score of the approved institution.

State, University, District Commitments

The Commission then discussed state, university, and district commitments they should recommend as necessary for establishing "teacher quality [as] a state priority in Louisiana." Types of commitments related to areas such as funding, policy making, and processes. These were listed in categories labeled Governor and Legislature, Board of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Regents, Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, University Presidents/Chancellors, and District Superintendents.

Needed commitments from the governor and the legislature included actions necessary to increase teacher salaries to the SREB average; to support teacher recruitment efforts through provision of scholarships and financial incentives; and to fund teacher preparation redesign efforts at the IHE and district levels. They would also be expected to commit to supporting legislative changes that would "result in better prepared teachers."

The BoR and BESE would share some of the same responsibilities for commitments needed. Both would monitor their respective areas for meeting commitments (i.e., the BoR would monitor IHE presidents/chancellors; BESE, districts); align their policies with the other; maintain new policies during the first four-year cycle; and collaboratively create a common database accessible to IHEs and districts. Additionally, the BoR would fully implement the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System; target funds for teacher preparation program redesign; and hire additional IHE faculty in teacher shortage areas. BESE would eliminate waivers for uncertified teachers, as well as allow IHEs greater flexibility in course and certification program design.

University presidents/chancellors would be expected to commit to attaining "Quality" status within four years and to providing resources necessary to do so. Other recommended commitments included creating and chairing a PK-16+ Council, an advisory committee charged with identifying collaborative efforts needed to meet university and K-12 professional development/partner school growth targets as required by the Teacher

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Preparation Program Accountability System and the K-12 School Accountability System. Members would represent the following categories in the region: parish school superintendents, regional service center directors; corporate partners; deans of SCDEs, arts, sciences, humanities, and other colleges; professional development school and partner school principals; and other K-12 school leaders.

University presidents/chancellors would also "designate and empower" PK-16+ Coordinators to oversee teacher preparation program redesign and to ensure coordinated partnerships among the IHE, districts, and communities. Other commitments included the establishment of an internal review and evaluation system for routine data collection, analysis, and reporting necessary for the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System; the alignment of IHE curriculum with K-12 content standards, Praxis expectations, and NCATE standards; the support of at least one Professional Development School as defined by the state; and modification of tenure and promotion policies that would encourage and support active involvement in the improvement of teacher "quality" in K-12 school settings.

Comparable to those of university presidents/chancellors, recommended commitments for district superintendents would include responsibility for supporting collaborative efforts toward improvement of teacher "quality" and K-12 achievement. Superintendents would be charged with collaborating with IHEs in several ways: through creating authentic partnerships with K-12 schools that would foster "meaningful field-based experiences for preservice teachers and K-12 students"; defining "high expectations" for program completers and first year teachers; gathering data about the first

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

three years of teaching of IHE program completers employed in the district for assessment of teacher preparation program "effectiveness" and identification of professional development needs; supporting beginning teachers during their first three years of teaching; and addressing regional recruitment, preparation, and retention needs in teacher shortage areas. Other commitments included providing "high quality" supervisors for preservice teachers and placing new teachers in areas of their certification and in positive school environments with resources necessary to meet "high expectations."

Dissension Among the Commission

By the end of the May meeting, Commission members had for the most part approved all policy recommendations to be presented to the BoR/BESE joint meeting. However, this is not to say that all Commission members were in full agreement with all recommendations and with all proposal details.

Some superintendents were still quite concerned with the New Certification Structure, as was evident by the resolution voicing their opposition from the South Central Louisiana Association of School Superintendents, signed by all twelve members. Similar concerns continued to be expressed by representatives of district personnel offices, as well as by some SCDE deans. Similarly, several members continued to express concern for the seeming lack of attention to funding issues and the value of substantive raises for teachers.

Often these concerns were expressed in terms of policy implications behind the recommendations. Concerns of this type surfaced in correspondence from the 1999-2000 LACTE president to BESE's president (also the 1999-2000 Commission Co-Chair designated to become the 2000-01 Chair). BESE's Quality Educators Committee had

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

voted at its March meeting to request responses from LACTE members to Commission recommendations; this correspondence was in response to that request. A review of these concerns helps explain the barely visible and rather quiet undercurrent of dissension that characterized some meetings.

LACTE, composed of SCDE deans from all Louisiana IHEs with teacher education programs, had been intensely involved in Commission proceedings throughout the year. Initially having four members sitting on the Commission (though, as has already been noted, this number was cut to two in the latter part of the year when two who had moved were replaced by provosts rather than other deans), LACTE also was represented consistently at every Commission meeting by several SCDE deans sitting in the audience. In addition, as explained earlier, they scheduled their monthly meetings to be held in Baton Rouge on the day following each Commission meeting, allowing for immediate discussion following Commission meetings and for BESE staff and Commission Planning Committee members to participate in LACTE meetings. In this way staff and committee members could provide additional information on and clarification of Commission proceedings, as well as gather input from the deans helpful in further considerations of Commission proceedings.

Though signed by 1999-2000 LACTE President S. Ragan (personal communication, May 22, 2000), this correspondence was the result of a collaborative effort sent on behalf of the entire membership, representing member consensus from the May LACTE meeting when a quorum had reviewed the most recent drafts of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Commission report.[25] The correspondence followed the final Commission meeting on May 11 and preceded the joint BoR/BESE meeting to be held on May 25.

LACTE members first expressed gratitude for the opportunity to provide responses regarding Commission recommendations to BESE, as well as admiration for the Commission's "comprehensive approach" in addressing teacher certification issues, alternatives to the existing alternate certification program, teacher preparation program accountability, and commitments needed to teacher education reform in Louisiana. They expressed eagerness to continue work with the Commission in 2000-01 in examining school leadership and continuing professional development issues and reforms. They also reaffirmed their request not only for continued representation on the Commission as a whole, but also for representation on "any smaller grouping or formal subcommittee of the Commission."

They then categorized their responses to various components of the Commission's upcoming proposal: the new teacher certification structure; the new alternate certification program (Practitioner Teacher Program); PK-16+ partnerships; commitments; and the teacher preparation program accountability system. They expressed support of components of each, as well as concerns about each.

Supportive of the concepts underlying the new teacher certification structure, LACTE acknowledged the need for simplification of the current structure in Louisiana. Stating that members were not unanimously in support of the new PK-2, 1-6, 4-8, 7-12 structure, as a group they accepted this structure as a reasonable compromise to that originally presented.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

However, LACTE presented several concerns about program approval and accreditation issues involving the new certification structure. One such concern related to the requirement of two certifications within a 124 semester hour, four-year undergraduate program, given professional organization requirements for program approval. Noting that most single and joint certification programs in Louisiana IHEs currently exceeded 124 hours and that Blue Ribbon Commission consortia work could result in additional content requirements in some areas, LACTE expressed concern that the new structure would negatively impact IHEs' ability to continue to meet the "rigorous professional standards" required for NCATE accreditation and national program approval, both of which were expected by the BoR.

Another concern related to the need for resources to support program redesign at the planning and implementation stages. While LACTE expressed support of redesign "directions," they cautioned that substantial new and redirected resources would be necessary for the development of "quality outcomes."

In regard to the alternate certification program, LACTE conveyed its support of experimentation on a voluntary basis under certain conditions related to elementary education, special education, Praxis screening, first year teacher assessment, and resources. This support, though, was tentative, as evidenced by LACTE's reference to recent studies in Texas, California, and Maryland on similar alternate certification programs which compared negatively on variables related to retention, K-12 student achievement, and state certification test results.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The conditions suggested included one based on current experiences with baccalaureate backgrounds of alternate certification candidates. LACTE urged further consideration of the inclusion of elementary and special education in the new program because of pedagogy and content background not addressed in most bachelor's degree programs. They also raised the issue concerning whether or not the content background reflected in minimum Praxis specialty area test scores is equivalent to that of a specialty area major for secondary education. Another concern focused on insuring that the first year teacher assessment program provided a "strong, objective, and discriminating examination of good and promising teachers." Concerns were also raised as to the availability of resources needed for "rigorous clinical diagnosis" of a new teacher's performance and for "substantial assistance" for those in need.

The deans praised the PK-16+ Partnerships as "perhaps the most inspiring outcome of the Commission's work," particularly the component calling upon extensive collaboration between universities and K-12 schools. Seeing national trends as strong and worthy of support by all IHEs and supportive of partnerships among colleges as well, LACTE cautioned against defining the structure of these collaborations too specifically so as to hinder collaboration built on strengths and uniqueness.

The deans expressed appreciation for the Commission's inclusion of necessary commitments in the report, suggesting that supporting salary increases of all types should be a responsibility of all groups involved. They emphasized that these increases are the "single most important step" toward the improvement of retention and recruitment rates of "qualified" teachers.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The concept behind the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System also received the support of the deans. However, they strongly suggested that variables and their weights be closely examined for fairness to all institutions and types of programs, "to avoid 'favoring' one kind of institution over another." Seeing the potential for development of an "equitable formula" during summer and early fall subcommittee meetings, they reiterated their request that deans be represented on the subcommittee which would meet that summer.

These and other concerns were not only expressed by some Commission members, but also by members of the general public who had completed forms provided for public feedback. Many shared concerns about teacher pay, resource needs, and the seeming arbitrariness of label identification and growth targets. Some addressed the need to survey graduates teaching out of state. Others addressed concern for holding IHEs responsible for recruitment and retention without "significant incentive," stating that IHEs often have no control over critical shortage areas. Still others shared concerns over the notion that preservice teachers should engage in field experiences solely in low-performing schools.

Relatedly, one person suggested that, because Professional Development School standards in existence for several years differed significantly with guidelines established by the Commission, perhaps school relationships encouraged by the Commission should be labeled Partnership Schools. This person also questioned requirements related to blanket percentages of K-12 and university faculty participation, explaining that SCDEs should not be held responsible for K-12 faculty actions, nor should one presume that SCDEs are engaged in teacher education only.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

While these concerns were raised at various times throughout meetings, and particularly as invited during the May meeting when recommendations were presented in full, the resulting discussions were neither lengthy nor heated. In fact, the concerns often seemed to be mentioned, and accepted, as statements for the record.

While discussions during each meeting did result in some modifications to various Commission recommendations and accompanying documents, the original intent and overall thrust of each as presented at the May meeting had generally remained intact by the end of the meeting. The Commission Director was in effect authorized to present to the BoR and BESE at their joint meeting later in the month all policy recommendations with related actions, which she did in the form of a document entitled "Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality Recommendations: Year One Report." BoR and BESE members would receive for their review and action copies of all proposals regarding Blue Ribbon Professional Development Schools, the New Certification Structure, the Practitioner Teacher Program, the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System, and the State and Institutional Report Cards for Teacher Preparation Programs. Both boards would have to approve all components and publish these for public review before the recommendations could be implemented.

Summary

This chapter describes the proceedings of the 1999-2000 Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality. Focusing on each meeting as to materials, presentations, and discussions, this section of the study details Commission proceedings that led to policy recommendations for teacher education reform in Louisiana.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Commission meetings were structured to provide members with materials and presentations selected by the planning committee to provide background and suggestions for their consideration as they developed recommendations for teacher education reform. Members were provided some opportunity to express opinions concerning these materials and presentations as well as draft proposals offered. Their responses, solicited primarily in written form, were interpreted, summarized, and reported by the Commission Director and other members of the planning committee.[26]

Following these procedures, the Commission Director and the planning committee drafted Commission recommendations for teacher education reform. During the final meeting, the Commission Director reported to the Commission on the final drafts of recommendations. With few changes, she then presented these recommendations with related actions on behalf of the Commission to the BoR and BESE for informational purposes at a joint meeting in May, 2000, and full proposals for agency action at individual meetings of each in the fall of 2000.

End Notes

1. Information on proceedings and supplementary materials of the Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality comes from Commission member packets, official correspondence to Commission members, Louisiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (LACTE) meeting packets, and personal notes on Commission and LACTE meetings unless noted otherwise. Dates provided refer to specific monthly meetings.

2. Dr. Jeanne Burns, Commission Director, stated that representatives from other states have expressed much interest in this partnership of governmental agencies, a partnership somewhat unusual given the often conflicting interests of such agencies because of their differing responsibilities and constituencies. She explained that, while deadlines imposed by Congress had provided impetus for collaboration of some type, this partnership actually had earlier beginnings. Burns tied these beginnings to a Goals 2000 program in the state (and perhaps even earlier to a LaSIP initiative). Guided by a Goals

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2000 Commission, various proposals were offered individually by the governor's office, BESE, and the LDOE, but there was "no consistency, continuity, priority" to these goals. Though legislation and funds supported planning for education reform, none resulted. Goals 2000 was then supplanted by the current governor's support of the Louisiana LEARN Commission. The new process would involve combining key, though "very conservative," legislation with collaborations involving the governor, BESE, the LDOE, teacher unions, and business "to reach agreement on state priorities" for education. Higher education would become a focus of attention as the BoR offered Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (CITAL) grants, as would K-12 education as BESE sponsored educational summits. With a collaborative pattern loosely in place, the BoR, BESE, and Governor's Office wrote a grant for Title II funds in the spring of 1999. Though not funded, this collaboration represented the "first time the BoR and BESE developed an understanding" of each other. According to Dr. Burns, not getting the grant was "in a way, a blessing." The agencies involved decided they could "not let [the momentum] die," so the BoR and BESE provided funds for the establishment of a policy recommending body and the Governor provided an office for a director of that body. Thus the Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality was born. (J. Burns, Personal Interview, June 16, 2000)

3. For purposes of this study, past tense will be used for clarity when referring to the Commission. The reader should be aware, however, that the Commission's work continues, focusing in year two (2000-2001) on "Professional Support for All Teachers" and "Effective Principals."

4. In lieu of a December Commission meeting, the Commission Director presented an updated report on Commission progress during a joint meeting of the BoR and BESE.

5. Dr. Jeanne Burns, Commission Director, credited her appointment from the Governor's Office with providing her an independence she would not have had as an appointee or employee of either the BoR or BESE. This independence allowed her to "do what was in the best interest of the state . . . [without] worry(ing) about her job." (J. Burns, Personal Interview, June 16, 2000)

6. The model used is the "Osborne-Parnes Creative Problem Solving Process," a "structured, reliable method for generating innovative solutions on an as needed basis" (Daupert, 1996).

7. Correspondence dated February 10, 2000, from the Louisiana Commissioner of Education to System Presidents and Campus Heads of Public and Private Universities announced this forum for IHE system presidents and chief academic officers on the Commission's development of a teacher education accountability system for Louisiana. The invitation extended also to deans of education and arts/sciences/humanities and chief academic officers "since the strengthening of a teacher education program is the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

responsibility of the entire university...." During the forum, the Commission Director provided an overview of Commission work, followed by a presentation by Texas A&M University System representatives on their teacher education reform initiatives, one of whom had presented at the Commission's November meeting.

8. Parenthetical dates tied to these strategies represent the beginning of timelines.

9. The PreKindergarten - Grade 2 certification was subsequently changed to PreKindergarten - Grade 3 certification some time after the presentation of the Year One Report, drawing from discussion regarding professional organization guidelines.

10. These recommended new certification grade levels would change in the final revised certification structure to PreKindergarten - Grade 3 (as already noted), Grades 1-6, Grades 4-8, and Grades 7-12.

11. The worksheet provided to Commission members in correspondence prior to the May meeting stated that the additional six hours would "help to increase the amount of time spent in schools involved in practice teaching."

12. The term "program provider" is used in Practitioner Teaching Program documents rather than "IHE" or "university" because the recommendation for this program allowed for its being offered by private providers as well as by IHEs.

13. The Year One Report included a detailed Work Plan which also identified each outcome's current status, lead agencies, and new funding needs.

14. The Year One Report presented to the joint meeting of the BoR and BESE reflects changes in this recommendation's outcome: from 80% of the partner schools to 100%. The Report also reflects changes in timelines for all outcomes from 2005 to the academic year 2004-2005.

15. This is the first mention of the more comprehensive title "Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality/PK-16+ Commission," reflecting the expansion of Commission authority into higher education.

16. The phrase "state criteria" was deleted from the Year One Report. State criteria had not yet been developed, yet the timeline in the final recommendation shows that Blue Ribbon Professional Development Schools would be created by August, 2001.

17. The phrase "and allow university faculty to work directly with K-12 school faculty and students to assist them in reaching their schools' growth targets" was added following the May Commission meeting and prior to the May joint BoR/BESE meeting.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

18. The word "create" was added to the finalized recommendation; references to TOPS scholarships here and elsewhere in the Year One Report were deleted. Benchmarks for 2004-2005 included "at least 1000 teachers per year will obtain teacher certification through alternate certification programs" and "100% of alternate certification students will qualify for state scholarships." These changes in wording could have resulted from consideration of the state's difficulty in providing sufficient funding at the time for all eligible TOPS undergraduate recipients and thus thee recognition of a need to seek new funding sources.

19. An action added to the Year One Report following the May meeting was "Program Review: Have the Board of Regents review all redesigned teacher preparation programs to ensure that they address current needs of K-12 schools."
The timeline associated with this action was June, 2002.

20. The action in the Year One Report adds teacher development of "instructional expertise," plus "effectively" as a qualifying word for "teach."

21. The original timeline of June, 2001, for redesign of university curriculum aligned with university and district expectations was adjusted to allow time for collaboration among the various faculties involved and for procedures required for program approval at the SCDE, university, and BoR levels.

22. The wording "principals and university faculty" was deleted from this recommendation in the Year One Report.

23. The percentage of Louisiana current public school teachers who had remained in teaching longer than three years changed slightly in the Year One Report: from 73% to 75%.

24. The salary increase for NBPTS Teachers in Louisiana includes a $5000 supplement each year for 10 years, rather than for five years. This detail was corrected in the Year One Report.

25. Meetings were tightly scheduled and agendas filled with speakers, presentations, and detailed review of draft proposals, allowing little time for lengthy debates to work through issues and disagreements. While there were some group discussions at various times, especially in the initial meetings, these generally centered on brainstorming sessions or on brief individual, round-robin type sharing sessions on issues and/or concerns which the members had included in their written responses. Discussions in later meetings focused primarily on specific points in draft proposals, such as the inclusion of number of attempts of Praxis passage and the certification grade levels, as was documented in detail in this chapter. The Commission Director facilitated discussions in an attempt to maximize the efficiency of this group of 31 members and to minimize the monopolizing of discussion time by only a few members.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 5

STATE OF TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Chapter Five focuses on a summary of the study and its results. A review of the study's purpose, questions, and methodology begins the chapter, followed by a summary of the study's findings and their implications. The final section includes suggestions for additional research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore and describe Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality, focusing primarily on Commission proceedings and the evolution of its recommendations within a context of standards-based teacher education reform history. This research examined policy recommendations for Louisiana's teacher education programs that resulted from Commission meetings held at the Louisiana State University Pennington Biomedical Research Center in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, from September, 1999, through May, 2000. Aims of the study included describing the development of these recommendations and their relation to national teacher education reform movements.

Issues raised by professionalization and de-regulation movements within a historical and political standards-based context formed a backdrop to this case study of Commission proceedings and decisions. This study provides not only documentation of Commission proceedings of some historical value, but also insights into reform implications for teacher education in Louisiana, as well as for the work of similar commissions in other states.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Research Questions

The study explored the following questions.

- Where do current national teacher education reform movements fit in the historical and political development of teacher education standards?
- How do these national movements reflect professionalization and de-regulation debates?
- How did Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality develop its policy recommendations?
- Where do these recommendations situate the Commission in current national reform movements?
- How is standards-based reform reflected in Commission policy recommendations?

The first two questions provide a historical context for Commission recommendations by connecting current national teacher education reform movements to the historical and political development of teacher education standards and to current professionalization and de-regulation debates. These two questions are explored throughout Chapter Two in the historical account of standards movements and the professionalization and de-regulation debates.

The third question relates to the development of Commission policy recommendations. This question is explored in Chapter Four as it describes and explains in detail meeting proceedings and the development of the Committee's various recommendations.

The final two questions are the focus of this chapter. Set against the backdrop of the historical and political development of teacher education standards created in Chapter Two and the historical account of Commission proceedings detailed in Chapter Four,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

these questions guided a search for relationships between Commission recommendations and current national teacher education reform movements. Of particular interest here were the Commission's policy recommendations which became policy directives through later action by the BoR and BESE. These policy recommendations were presented as four major recommendations and three major proposals (described in detail in Chapter Four).

To initiate this search for relationships, I first explored the Commission's recommendations and proposals in relation to its initial charge. That exploration is summarized later in this chapter. Following the summary, I will share my discoveries concerning an exploration of where the Commission sits in relation to national reform movements. This exploration began with my attempt to find Commission actions that could be integrated smoothly into patterns, implications, and movements in teacher education reform history, with particular focus on standards-based reform and the professionalization and de-regulation movements. The intent was to determine where the Commission was situated—which "side" its recommendations more often reflected, whether or not there was evidence of standards-based reform, and what implications emerged for teacher education in Louisiana.

Review of Research Methodology

This qualitative inquiry employs case study methodology contextualized in historical and political ethnographic narrative, as explained in detail in Chapter Three. The research is a case study of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality, focusing on the Commission's proceedings, discussions, and materials. Goals of description and explanation from historical and ethnographic perspectives

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

characterize the basic thrust of this study: an in-depth historical accounting and description of Commission proceedings and the evolution of Commission recommendations intended to determine where the Commission is situated in national teacher education reform movements and how the recommendations reflect these national reform movements.

The nine month case study explored and described monthly meetings of the 31-member Commission from September, 1999, through May, 2000. These meetings were held at the Louisiana State University Pennington Biomedical Research Center in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Also important to this study were formal and informal monthly meetings of the Louisiana Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (LACTE), an organization of SCDE deans. These meetings were also held in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, at the Southeastern School of Nursing.

The case study relied primarily on participant observations and interviews. The researcher observed the last six (of eight) monthly Commission meetings, which began at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.; the joint BoR-BESE meeting held in May during which the Commission Director presented the Commission's Year One Report; six LACTE formal meetings, which began at 8:00 a.m. and adjourned as late as 5:00 p.m.; and six informal LACTE dinner meetings, which began at 6:00 p.m. and ended at approximately 8:30 p.m. Observations focused on meeting proceedings, presentations, discussions, and member responses. Numerous formal and informal interviews, conducted throughout the span of the study in various locations, varied from planned to spontaneous. Intended purposes for interviews included clarification of Commission proceedings and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

discussions, enhancement of documentation, soliciting and elucidating individual responses and interpretations of Commission actions, and validation of research observations and findings. Participants included Commission and planning committee members, including the Commission Director, BoR representatives, BESE representatives, teacher and administrative representatives, and human resources representatives. Also interviewed were various Commission observers, including LACTE members and BESE staff.

Summary of Findings

Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality received the following charge during its first meeting in September, 1999.

> To recommend policies that lead to a *cohesive PK-16+ system* that holds *universities and school districts accountable for the aggressive recruitment, preparation, support, and retention of quality teachers who produce higher achieving K-12 students.*[1]

(This charge is discussed in more detail in Chapter One.) Separating key words and phrases within the charge enables a closer look at the intent.

- cohesive PK-16+ system
- universities and school districts accountable
- aggressive recruitment
- preparation
- support
- retention of quality teachers
- produce higher achieving K-12 students

The Commission's work throughout the year was aimed at addressing each of these tasks, which it did. Each of these terms is embedded in at least one of the Commission's recommendations or proposals in its Year One Report that was presented to a joint meeting of BoR and BESE in May, 2000. Included in this report were the following recommendations:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

- Recommendation One: Creation of University-District Partnerships
- Increased Teacher Recruitment
- Preparation of Quality Teachers
- Increased Retention Rate

In addition, the Commission proposed the institution of the following programs.

- a new certification structure, which included required program revision guidelines
- a new alternate certification program
- an accountability system for teacher preparation programs

A brief summary of key components of Commission recommendations follows. (These recommendations and proposals are described and explained in detail in Chapter Four.)

One of the most inclusive recommendations involved the creation of university-district partnerships. These partnerships would assume a variety of forms, with each IHE required to create at least one professional development school, as well as a PK-16+ Council. In addition to the PK-16+ Council, the IHE would be required to name a PK-16+ Coordinator, who would report directly to the IHE president or provost rather than to the SCDE dean. This requirement was intended to pull university administration, as well as academic college faculty, into conversations and collaboratives with SCDE faculty and district personnel.

Creating an accountability system for universities, as well as identifying accountability responsibilities for school districts, were major tasks the Commission faced. The Commission approved a thorough, somewhat complex accountability system for teacher preparation programs that would involve three different formulas resulting in a single composite score. Various components would be phased in over a four year period. Beginning with Congressional mandates in Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Commission identified areas of accountability for universities that included the development of PK-16+ partnerships and direct involvement of faculty in the schools, teacher candidate recruitment, teacher preparation, new teacher support, graduate and employer satisfaction, graduate retention, and improvement in K-12 student and school achievement. Addressing and expanding Congressional mandates regarding licensure tests and labeling of at-risk and low-performing institutions, the Commission also addressed areas related to Praxis passage and systems of consequences and rewards in conjunction with labeling.

Recruitment activities also were included in recommendations. Universities would be held accountable for recruitment of teacher candidates through the various formulas in the accountability system. Districts would be encouraged and supported in recruitment attempts.

Preparation was addressed through extensive changes in the revised teacher preparation programs and alternate certification programs, in part as a result of changes in certification levels. Additional changes involved required professional development for new graduates throughout their careers, as well as NCATE-state accreditation requirements for IHEs.

Expectations for undergraduate programs were totally revised, resulting in the requirement that SCDEs revise their programs by 2002. These programs included changes such as requiring that secondary majors have primary and secondary areas of certification (much like majors-minors), modifying hours required in different categories of coursework, and adjusting certification levels to allow for greater specialization among

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

grades and to provide for emphasis in early childhood and the middle grades. Similarly, expectations for alternate certification programs were revised to create a fast track program primarily for midcareer individuals. These programs would provide the opportunity to attain certification after one summer of coursework, an internship plus coursework during the academic year immediately following, plus additional coursework the following summer as needed. Students in alternative secondary programs would not be required to seek certification in primary and secondary areas as required of undergraduates.

Support was also included in recommendations in the form of IHE provision of support to graduates during the first three years of teaching in Louisiana schools. Institutions would be held accountable for providing this support in various ways, including the surveying of principals and graduates as to satisfaction and competence in the field.

This support was related to the next recommendation, which addressed retention. IHEs would be held accountable for retention rates during the first three years graduates taught in Louisiana schools.

Responsibility for K-12 student achievement was also included in the university accountability system. To be developed and phased in later, indicators in this area would focus on the "value added" to K-12 achievement by graduates in the field.

The Commission succeeded in addressing each component of its initial charge through these various recommendations and program proposals. Having since gained

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

approval from the BoR and/or BESE on all of these, many have already been implemented.

National Reform Movements and the Commission

This study's search for relationships between Commission recommendations and national teacher education reform movements was contextualized in the historical and political development of teacher education standards. The exploration of this development led to a deeper understanding of teacher education reform movements and related professionalization and de-regulation debates both nationally and in Louisiana. This study provides evidence that national reform movements and conflicting national agendas involved in policy making were exemplified in the work of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission. This section focuses on how national reform patterns and debates were reflected in the Commission's work.

Edelfelt and Raths' (1999) exploration of the history of teacher education standards reveals four patterns. These include a similarity in recommendations spanning 130 years; various motivations behind standards creation; no reference in reports to previous reports, thus no visible evidence of lessons learned from report to report; and no empirical evidence supporting recommendations.

The recommendations they cite include "brighter students, more competent faculty, more realistic classes, rigorous general education, serious (performance) evaluation, collaborative planning" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 20), similar to those embedded in the Commission's policy recommendations for university teacher preparation programs. Yet, while the many attempts in the past to establish and apply standards met

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with some success, none have been outstanding in significance or impact . . . a less than optimistic prediction for the lasting future of Commission recommendations.

Surprisingly, these attempts to establish and apply standards have reflected little awareness of or lessons learned from prior attempts. Attempts have been "almost totally ahistorical, with no authors wondering why the profession had either ignored previous recommendations or adopted them without changing dramatically either the practice of teachers or the status of teaching" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 20). The same lack of success could be experienced by the current standards-based movement intent on aligning standards "if deliberators do not address other considerations" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 20).

These considerations include expanding teacher education attention and efforts to the world of practice—the individual schools and classrooms that are the next step for our graduates. In effect, aggressive attacks on the "washout effect" of socialization designed for "creating and monitoring standards on the conditions of work in schools" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 20) are necessary. Not a new suggestion, this charge is being addressed by some institutions in attempts to shift resources to provide alumni with intensive support and assistance in the first years of teaching. This charge is a key component of the Commission's recommended accountability system for IHEs in its requirements and expectations regarding IHE and district collaborations in supporting beginning teachers.

Similarly, the professionalization agenda advocates measurement of a program's effectiveness through assessment of the practices of its graduates three to four years in the field. Thus institutions would be expected to, and would assumedly want to, provide

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

support and assistance during this time. While this is an expense few units can currently afford, implicit and increasingly explicit state mandates such as those in Commission recommendations are beginning to require good faith efforts on the part of teacher educators to find creative ways to do so.

But individual institutions cannot effectively address these considerations alone. Because of this inability, and given the fragmentation and lack of voice of the teaching profession, some see a strong likelihood of failure of these standards-based efforts: "The power of the teaching profession is so fragmented, and its prestige so ailing, that the prospect of adequate emphasis on and sufficient financial support for teacher education, professional practice, and continuing professional development is dim" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 20). Some educators urge the profession to become politically active by combining forces through a coalition of all professional organizations and education agencies, the "practicing and preparing arms of the profession . . . working together and compromising vested interests. A coalition with such a base and such agreement would be difficult to hold back in the society" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 20). Perhaps the seeds of such a coalition are sprouting in the teaming of such associations and agencies as AACTE, NCATE and affiliated learned societies, CCSSO, NEA, AFT, and ETS (Griffin, 1999) at the national level, and in the teaming of the Governor's Office, BoR, BESE, universities, and districts at the state level.

"The [ultimate] irony is that the people of the United States have achieved great progress primarily because of the education level of the population, yet education is not well regarded and supported" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 21). Publicly promoting the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

image of the teacher and that of the teacher educator is yet another critical challenge for colleges and universities. Positive labels and rewards suggested by the Commission for "effective" university teacher preparation programs should help address this need, though there is some danger that these positives will be submerged under the more politically controversial and media attractive "low performing" and "at risk" labels. Here, too, perhaps the collaborative efforts of all groups involved in teacher education in Louisiana—the Governor's Office, the BoR, BESE, IHEs, and districts—can result in deeper understandings of each other, as well as in positive publicity.

As has been the recent history of much educational reform, including that in Louisiana, advocates of such policies tend to cross political lines.

> These policies were arrived at by both Democrats and Republicans after conservatives were successful in framing the reauthorization of (the) Higher Education Act in terms of teacher quality rather than the need for more teachers. Critics of teacher education successfully argued that any shortage could be overcome with the nearly four million people with teaching degrees who are not teaching - and have consistently argued that instead of investing any new money in Ed Schools or teacher education, that it should be used to increase teacher salaries, end existing hiring practices, and attract "smarter people" to teaching through alternative routes. Such policies are described as a means to "end-the-monopoly" of Ed Schools in the preparation of beginning teachers and to put them in competition with other providers. (Imig, 2000, p. 9)

Relatedly, Clinton Administration reforms, aimed at placing teacher education in the forefront of college and university programs, furthered the call for high standards in teacher education. The new Bush Administration is expected to do the same. While at first glance this seems to be a worthy call, a deeper look into possible consequences reveals potential problems. Most important, one must ask the question, What then is the future of teacher education?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Some see the future of teacher education programs as presently defined by colleges and universities bleak at best. Instead of encouraging greater support of teacher education at the president/provost level, Title II as translated and expanded by groups such as the Commission could produce far different results because of the perceived negative impact of accountability demands on other branches of the institution. While this is an issue of concern among institutions of all sizes, it is particularly so among smaller, private institutions, especially in "a competitive academic environment and [with] greater reliance on distance learning and entrepreneurial activity" (Imig, 2000, p. 16). The competition may be more than some institutions will want to, or even will be able to, face. The definite possibility in Louisiana is that some institutions will decide to, or even have to, eliminate their teacher education programs; others may attempt to eliminate various programs.

The literature reflects this business emphasis on competition, as seen in expectations for schools of education: "Increasingly, Ed Schools will be expected to 'capture' local markets for professional development as well as serve current and emerging 'clients' in more rewarding ways" (Imig, 2000, p. 16). In question is the potential for schools of education to make the changes necessary to compete successfully with private providers, given the expectations of public policy layered atop traditional academy expectations. This, then, becomes a catch-22 situation in that the lack of success on the part of schools of education could subsequently be interpreted as caused not by the unique position they hold, but instead by their inability to compete. Their position in colleges/universities could be questioned even further, with restructuring, resource reallocation, and even program elimination conceivable realities.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This is a legitimate concern in Louisiana, particularly with the institution of the Practitioner Teacher Program as the new alternate certification program in the state. Not only will it likely result in a very competitive environment in which Louisiana SCDEs will be forced to compete with often more savvy private providers for alternate certification program students, but the absence of restrictive requirements for the alternate certification program in contrast to the seemingly inflexible requirements of the New Certification Structure could very well result in a drain of undergraduate students who choose to obtain noneducation degrees and then participate in the fast-track program offering employment with minimal coursework requirements. This is a real possibility being considered by SCDEs as they work toward undergraduate program revision mandated as a result of Commission recommendations, affecting the directions being considered for these revisions.

However, not all share this pessimistic outlook for teacher education. Funds from such sources as Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Teacher Empowerment Act of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are dedicated to the development and growth of school-college partnerships aimed at improving K-12 achievement and teacher "quality," partnerships strongly promoted in Commission recommendations. Increased federal funding for teacher training along with greater attention to "quality" teaching are viewed by some as positive signs for the future of teacher education. Similar funding has been called for at the state level in the Commission's list of commitments needed to support its recommendations.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Additionally, monies are now being pledged to new teacher assistance during the first three to four years of teaching. This "pledge," though from the federal level, is being called for at the state, university, and district levels. Partially in response to the expected demand for new teachers over the next decade because of retirements and the high percentage of beginning teachers who quit within the first four years of teaching, Congressional acts and administrative policies focus on beginning teacher support.

> Among the allowable activities in the administration's proposal are: a) mentoring and coaching by trained mentor teachers that last for at least two school years, b) team teaching with experienced teachers, c) time for observation of, and consultation with, experienced teachers, d) assignment of fewer course preparations, and 3) provision of additional time for course preparation. (Imig, 2000, p. 18)

While acceptable proposals for many grants are generally invited from the local level rather than the IHE, colleges and universities are not excluded as long as they can find ways to link with districts as co-partners in support of local proposals. Two possible scenarios await such support: "These efforts will either draw the teacher education program and the school based professional development program closer together or force a separation in the system . . . [and] will require new consideration of compensating and rewarding faculty" (Imig, 2000, p. 18). For the latter to be successful, academia's expectations regarding tenure and promotion issues (in short, research versus K-12 in-school activity) will have to change. This is yet another change recommended by the Commission for Louisiana's universities in its list of commitments necessary—that work in and service to K-12 schools be factored into promotion and tenure reviews.

This change in responsibility is not occurring solely at the college and university levels, however, but also at the state level. Whereas state departments of education have

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

traditionally been responsible for approval of teacher education programs and licensure, that responsibility is now "gradually shifting to other state, national and professional authorities . . . [toward] the *federalization of teacher education policy*, a move . . . embraced by both political parties" (Imig, 2000, p. 18). A situation favored by professionalization advocates and deplored by de-regulation advocates, examples of this shifting are evident in Louisiana. With implementation of the Commission's recommendations, responsibility for initial licensure of in-state program completers would be transferred from the LDOE directly to IHEs once new teacher preparation programs are approved and in operation. Program approval responsibility has already begun to be shared somewhat by several agencies, evidenced by the collaborative partnerships represented by the Commission, which determined the New Certification Structure. Title II requirements with mandates for low performance labels and state and university report cards also bring Congress and the U.S. Department of Education into the approval process.

The consensus between political parties as well should not be surprising, given the history of teacher education reform over the past twenty years or so. The competition here seems to be that of one-upmanship: "Seemingly, both political parties believe that colleges and universities need to be more accountable for the education of teachers and both parties want to out-do another in providing some sort of authority to accomplish that accountability" (Imig, 2000, p. 18). The Commission has played a lead role in insuring that accountability in Louisiana.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Louisiana's Reform Movement

This study has shown that such a consensus is characteristic of Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality as well. Unique to Louisiana because of the strong partnership among the Governor's Office, BoR, and BESE from the first conversations concerning the possibility of such a commission and throughout its first year (J. Burns, personal interview, June 16, 2000), the Commission drew together representatives from diverse segments of the community to examine teacher education issues and to formulate recommendations intended to effect program improvement related to K-12 student achievement.

Whether or not the Commission will be successful in meeting this goal through its recommendations is yet to be known. Certainly, undertaking the reform of all components of teacher education at one time over a nine month period (September-May)—from the certification structure to content knowledge consortia to program redesign to alternate certification programs to professional development schools to program accountability—is ambitious at best, damaging at worst. Yet this is what the Commission, guided by a small planning committee, attempted to do. And, while all involved parties were represented in deliberations, it seemed at times that the experiences, judgements, and opinions of teacher educators (i.e., deans) were viewed simply as defensiveness and an unwillingness to participate in needed change. In this way the atmosphere frequently reflected the philosophy of those advocating de-regulation—an attempt to take "control" away from the SCDEs and put it in the hands of others.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A scan of the current scene nationally shows clearly that "blue ribbon" commissions and other agencies are leading reform movements in teacher education. Whether or not these reform movements are truly based on standards and empirical evidence or are simply giving lip-service to such a base while establishing accountability systems and certification structures still reliant on head counts is questionable. This study of the proceedings of Louisiana's Commission reveals the latter. It also uncovers the Commission's role as one of approving what a smaller group designed, rather than of creating its own design.

Commission drafts concerning programmatic changes—the new alternate certification program, for example—at times seemed to reflect a lack of awareness of empirical evidence supporting strong pedagogical foundations necessary for K-12 learning. Yet Commission materials distributed by the Director often spoke to such evidence. The 2000-2005 Work Plan provided to the BoR/BESE with the Year One Report included "national data pertaining to relationships between teacher quality and improved student achievement." This data provided several examples from research that student achievement is negatively affected by "ineffective"or "least well-prepared" teachers and positively affected by "effective" (i.e., well-prepared) teachers. Yet the new alternate certification program would provide for certification of teachers from minimalist, fast track programs.

Relatedly, while attention nationwide is turning to teacher preparation and reform at the campus level, neither national nor Louisiana focus has "address(ed) the policy dilemmas inherent in either the *professionalization* or the *de-regulation* strategy" (Imig,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2000, p. 3). Should Louisiana's IHEs begin to address these dilemmas, they will first need to distinguish between the conflicting mixture of professionalization and de-regulation influences in Commission policy recommendations. Imig likens these debates to a contest which will continue to be played in the political arena.

A related component of this "contest" is reflected in the development of guidelines for Title II, representing a Congressional consensus for stringent accountability mandates in the form of the required annual state and institutional report cards focusing on such standards as teacher test scores. Concurrently with Presidential summits and ACE task forces, "the (Washington higher education) community sought to find common ground with Ed officials . . . [to] moderate the impact of the accountability expectations" (Imig, 2000, p. 15). Final implementation guidelines, not published until January 2000, followed much discussion over terminology and methodology. States and, in turn, colleges and universities attempted to interpret this terminology and methodology to meet the Congressional April 1, 2001, deadline, finding "contest rules" to be vague and ambiguous, despite the high stakes of the end results.

Clearly, teacher test scores will continue to be examined closely by policy makers and the public, nationally and in Louisiana, especially with the release of state report cards which include individual institutional reports, followed by composite national reports as required by Title II. Issues that will no doubt increase in importance because of this close examination include difficulty of test questions and variations among states of cutoff scores. A positive outcome of questioning the alignment of licensure tests with teacher knowledge standards as developed by individual learned societies (e.g., the National

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the National Council of Teachers of English) is NCATE's assumption of the lead in helping learned society representatives review appropriate Praxis assessments so that ETS can adjust content-area tests as needed.

> The profession has been at work for more than 15 years, developing new, more rigorous standards and a system for their use. States are beginning to integrate the profession's standards into their requirements. This is the same process the states have used to upgrade standards in the established professions. The teaching profession must continue on its journey, implementing the new system of high standards to serve America's schoolchildren and American society well into the new millennium. (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 621)

This alignment is a component of the professionalization agenda, as well as of some Commission initiatives. Various Blue Ribbon consortia (English/language arts, mathematics, et al.) are charged with aligning curriculum with standards for K-12 content, Praxis, NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS. However, while they are doing so, IHEs are expected to redesign and design programs according to Commission recommendations—which were made prior to the availability of consortia recommendations. One wonders then how alignment can occur.

Results documented in institutional report cards, including test scores, will be viewed as reflective of an institution's "effectiveness" in preparing its candidates to teach, with attention then likely "fall(ing) more heavily on the academic departments that provide instruction in the subject-matter majors, and thus the institution as a whole will come under review" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 621). Reports such as *To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers Are Taught* and *To Touch the Future: Strengthening the Preparation of Teachers for the Next Century*, both released by ACE, emphasize the need for institutional priorities to include teacher education.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The latter report, with its "Action Plan for College and University Executives," was shared with the Commission. It encourages administrators "to examine the fit of the teacher education program in the overall institutional mission, promote collaboration and communication across the divisions responsible for teacher education on the campus, and . . . spread the message about the importance of teacher education to civic and community groups" (Imig, 2000, p. 14). Administrators were further encouraged to look at questions regarding program entry requirements and implications for teacher quality, ongoing assessment of candidates, issues of quality versus quantity and resulting demands on institutions, content preparation provided by colleges outside education, and institutional role regarding emergency certification. The Commission's actions reflected a similar approach as university presidents/chancellors were frequently included in meetings or policy recommendations.

This is a positive step, on the surface at least. Institutions experiencing the direct involvement of their chief administrators/academic officers should definitely benefit from the attention given to teacher education programs, attention which traditionally and historically has been minimal. The questions suggested for administrative consideration are certainly pertinent questions for institutions; however, historically, attention has been less than consistent. "While the release of the [ACE] report attracted unprecedented media attention for teacher education, the actions that have followed have been modest" (Imig, 2000, p. 15).

Whether or not such leadership "at the top" will, or even can, occur at all institutions—given the responsibilities, inclinations, time demands of administration—is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

also in doubt. While they may serve as leaders on paper, many university administrators will likely assign responsibilities for teacher education reform to those more directly involved (i.e., deans of SCDEs). Or, what could happen is that a bureaucratic layer is added to the university system, inhibiting the effectiveness of those directly involved in work with preservice teachers and K-12 schools. Certainly bureaucratic demands created by the Commission's accountability system and Title II mandates have already added many more responsibilities to the plates of IHE teacher educators, pulling them away from program demands and needs.

Struggles with mandates from Congress and the Commission itself (through the BoR's and BESE's approval of its recommendations) were reflected in the efforts of the Commission's Director and the Planning Committee as they attempted to identify, collect, interpret, and report mounds of data from IHEs and ETS in significant and constructive ways. The process of meeting Commission recommendations, now state policy directives, has been difficult at best at all levels—due in part, at least at the IHE level, to the multiple reforms implemented at once and the vagaries within some reforms

The challenges faced now by Louisiana IHEs as a result of Congressional and resulting Commission actions are great. Title II requirements are characterized as "a bold 'federal' step . . . [and] further evidence of the federalization of teacher education policy. . . . (T)he regulations enable the federal government to forcefully intrude into an area where state prerogatives relative to 'program approval' and teacher licensure have held sway" (Imig, 2000, p. 15). Of additional concern are incumbent financial burdens these requirements impose on institutions: "These were unfunded mandates imposed by

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Congress on colleges and universities as a way to stimulate reforms in the preparation of teachers. These costs plus the threat of fines and sanctions for programs that failed to comply represented a punitive message for all colleges and universities" (Imig, 2000, p. 15). The "unfunded mandates" were supported and expanded by the Commission in its recommendations. Within a context of open doors to private providers contrasted with a complex and detailed accountability system for SCDEs, minimal requirements for alternate certification contrasted with narrowly specified requirements for SCDE undergraduates, and the requirement of major program reforms without accompanying resource allocations, one could easily focus on these reform initiatives, both at the national and Commission levels, as solely "punitive messages."

However, despite concerns over increasing federal control and the real and potential costs of meeting mandates, colleges and universities have had to quickly implement steps to do so. This has certainly been the case in Louisiana. At the national level, IHEs have found some assistance in confronting the unwieldy task of defining ambiguous terms and requirements, as well as uncovering and reporting required data, in the efforts of the Teacher Preparation Accountability and Evaluation Commission (TPAEC). A group representing such associations as AACTE, TPAEC has focused on the development of "a model report card . . . responsive to the statutory reporting requirements of the law but that also will enable state authorities and teacher preparation institutions to communicate what the public and policy makers should understand about teacher education programs" (Imig, 2000, p. 15). The stakes for teacher education are high, both nationally and in Louisiana. While meeting requirements set by Congress and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Commission, Louisiana's IHEs are conscious of potential public reaction stemming from the public's lack of understanding of what may be insufficient and thus misleading information in the mandated report cards.

In addition to these accountability measures, teacher educators are currently seeing increased administrative and Congressional decisions that support alternate programs as well as local and state decision-making. Initiatives from both branches seem intent "to establish, expand, or improve 'rigorous' alternative routes to state certification or licensure," including reauthorization of the ESEA and recruitment programs in former President Clinton's Teacher Quality Initiative which "[continue] a trend of this Administration of putting ($1 billion) in the hands of 'consumers' rather than directing it to SCDEs" (Imig, 2000, p. 5). As evidenced in this study, in Louisiana this support for alternative programs was played out in the Commission's development of the Practitioner Teacher Program, though without the "rigor" expected at the national level.

Perhaps the most important implication of initiatives such as these is their "appeal for so-called traditional programs to compete with alternative programs. . . . (T)he question for Ed Schools to consider is whether they are capable of responding with high quality preparation programs that 'out perform' the alternative programs" (Imig, 2000, p. 5). This is quickly becoming a prevailing question and concern in educational and political circles, a concern discussed earlier in this section. Here, too, Commission proceedings and recommendations provide examples of national initiatives.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Impact at the National and State Levels

These initiatives at both the national and state levels are receiving unprecedented attention from policy-makers in particular and the public in general. One might question the cause of this increased attention. Some see it as stemming at least in part from a historical shift in societal focus regarding standards in general. Imig (2000) speaks of such a shift when he discusses the social context of election year 2000 and the "preoccupation by all of the (Presidential) candidates with issues of morality and spirituality" (p. 5).

Analyses of societal standards following events such as the Columbine shootings and exposure of former President Clinton's alleged sexual encounters further define this shift as a new era: "Observers of the American social scene speculated that the era of radical or 'utilitarian individualism,' permissiveness, and nonjudgmentalism is drawing to a close and an era of responsibility and social activism is emerging" (Imig, 2000, p. 6). Seemingly policy makers find that this "era of responsibility" warrants an "age of accountability" label, in the education arena at least, with accountability at the K-12 and teacher education levels an issue at both state and national levels.

It may seem on the surface that policy makers are "simply" listening to the public cry for accountability and thus answering with various K-12 and teacher education standards movements, as well as alternate teacher education programs intended to "fix what doesn't work"; i.e., breaking up the "monopolies" of schools of education. This, of course, is a mantra of de-regulation advocates. However, a deeper analysis points to a lessening of public interest in the midst of an increasing intensity of political agendas driving actions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The 1999 National Education Summit involving former President Clinton, state governors, and IBM Chair Louis Gerstner "did confront the challenge of a public increasingly seen as 'wavering' on their commitment to national standards and high performing schools. The conversation . . . was about finding ways to rekindle commitment to standards-based reform" (Imig, 2000, p. 11). With former President Clinton speaking to "pain in the moment . . . but . . . painful consequences" if the standards agenda were to be abandoned, the Summit focused on three challenges comparable to those of the Commission: "a) improving educator quality, b) helping all students achieve high standards, and c) strengthening accountability, and concluded with the message of 'staying the course' . . . challeng(ing) business leaders, politicians and educators to work together to reform education" (Imig, 2000, p. 11).

This study has explored standards reform initiatives at the national level to determine how standards-based reform was reflected in Commission work. To understand better the impetus behind current national policy directions as defined by the Commission, one needs to explore even further the standards movement in terms of motivations and changes in establishing and implementing standards by examining the following questions. The answers should subsequently provide insight into the motives behind the Commission's recommendations.

- Over time, what have been the motivations or the reasons for setting standards?
- To what extent have the content and the process of standards changed?
- What changes in teacher education over the last 130 years have resulted from various standards efforts?
- What factors have detracted from applying standards?
  (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, pp. 16-19)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reasons for setting standards include program clarification and consistency, economics, international testing, and "the availability of new science or knowledge to give direction where it was absent in the past" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 20). Upon further investigation, these are somewhat suspect.

Advocates often look to standards to identify teaching "effectiveness" and related knowledge and skills, as well as to address the vastness of program types and levels of "effectiveness" to the point of program elimination. With all of these as areas for which teacher educators have often sought agreement, the quest for agreement at times seems to exceed in importance the quest for accuracy. There seems to be a fear that "with variation there must be error, and error must be snuffed out" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 20). Behind this fear lies the basis, one might assume, for the sameness that is characteristic of teacher education programs in many institutions. This "sameness" seemed to be a goal of the Commission. Though it claimed to encourage individualization of IHE and private provider programs through its recommendations, the Commission actually promoted sameness of IHE programs through the new IHE teacher preparation accountability system.

Economic motivations for setting standards stem from "perceptions of dire national need" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 20), a belief that schools are responsible for downturns or insufficient growth in the economy. Works such as *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996) illustrate the view of schools often serving as "scapegoats" in times of economic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

crisis (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 17). Louisiana's ranking at the bottom of virtually every economic poll and its difficulty in attracting new business and industry are frequently attributed to the "failure" of its K-12 schools. Thus the Commission was charged with improving K-12 education through teacher education reform.

Comparisons of international test scores as reasonable comparisons of school "effectiveness," often in relation to economic growth, have fostered yet another reason for standards setting. Comparisons of United States student achievement with that of students in countries such as Germany, Japan, and Korea, for example, when those countries were experiencing strong economies and their students were achieving high scores on tests, resulted in the "logic" that schools in those countries must be more "effective." This rationale is questionable, however, in light of these countries' current economic recession. [See Ben-Peretz, 2001; Edelfelt & Raths, 1999; Lockwood, 1998; Ravitch, 1995.] Despite such changes in economic situations, whether or not there is an actual relationship between education and economic development, political forces will not allow teacher educators to ignore globalization issues.

The perception of inadequate K-12 student achievement based on standardized test scores has led the cry for teacher education reform, both nationally and in Louisiana. This perception is evidenced in the inundation of negative news stories.

> The current news stories have several negative themes: Test scores are too low; schools must test students more; students are not learning enough (rare specificity as to enough of what); no more new resources are available (in fact, in most areas of the country, fewer resources are available). Above all else, we see the *test, test, test* urgings without supporting resources as untenable to remedy what some conclude to be poor performance. Schools seek more time for instruction, but testing and retesting in various states consumes more and more of the instructional hours. (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1997, p. 163)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The use of test scores for national assessment and comparisons is a relatively recent phenomena. While state and local testing programs existed as far back as the 19th century, the first use of achievement tests for national assessment dates back to the 1970s (Heubert & Hauser, 1999). The next thirty years reflect increasing acceptance of their use for accountability of K-12 schools and now, of teacher education programs.

> The focus on teacher standards and teacher quality follows on the heels of the focus on student achievement (or lack thereof) that arose as a result of the findings of such national and international assessments as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). The concern over student achievement brought the issue of teacher quality front and center as policy makers grappled with the relatively low scores of American students on international tests and with low scores on the NAEP tests across the nation. How do we improve student achievement? Are there any silver bullets? What are the most promising ways of improving student achievement? (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 614)

The focus of education policy has shifted to accountability—not just of K-12 students and schools, but also of teachers and administrators and schools of education and universities as a whole. "The status quo is crumbling. The norms for teacher preparation and licensing that we have known are beginning to change. Policy makers are passing legislation and regulations that address teacher accountability and academic ability" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, pp. 614-615).

This shift in policy is clearly evident in new accountability requirements and the implicit threats within. This shift is personified at the state level in the work of the Commission. With Title II requiring that states submit to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education annual report cards reflecting state performance, sub-categorized by individual institutional teacher preparation performance, Congress has placed into motion a series of hoops through which institutions must jump to continue to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

receive federal funding. Included is a requirement that institutions report passing rates on licensure exams through institutional and state report cards distributed to the public. Required to determine the level of "effectiveness" of its individual institutions, each state is allowed to add additional requirements for its report card. Responsibility for determination of these requirements in Louisiana fell to the Commission. Representative requirements established by states such as New York and Texas include stipulated percentages of graduates that must pass all required parts of these exams, ranging from 75-90% (Imig, 2000; Kleiner, 2001; Wise & Leibbrand, 2000). In its accountability system, the Commission has set its expectation that the pass rate for all IHEs would eventually be 100%.

Choosing not to meet these requirements, or demonstrating an inability to do so at "acceptable" levels, will result not only in negative public attention and very possibly the eventual closing of programs, but also ultimately in the withdrawal of federal funds from the entire institution—not just the SCDE. Just as with K-12 testing, these are high stakes situations for teacher educators—and for the entire institution wherein the teacher education program resides. As a result, standards for teacher education are now being defined from a high stakes perspective in the form of performance assessment. Although acknowledging "a host of legal, moral, and philosophical problems in using teacher competency tests, Ed Schools and their faculties have accepted their use and acknowledged them as a political reality" (Imig, 2000, p. 19).

Despite this acquiescence to standardized testing, the high stakes perspective has prompted much concern over this and other means of evaluating whether or not standards

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

are met. Discussions related to the most effective means of assessment have dominated the nineties.

> Finally, as the standards movement matured and as the debates over content waned, the next big question loomed in the 1990s: how to determine whether teachers, administrators, and students have met the standards. . . . The focus is on finding reliable and valid ways to assess teachers' performance—the ability to integrate content with ways to teach it to students in the diverse classrooms of today. (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 615)

The key adjectives here are "reliable" and "valid." The question, explored earlier in this study, becomes once again, "how do we know when teachers know and do . . ." This question will gain in importance as IHEs are held accountable for the "value added" by their graduates to K-12 achievement (just as it will as districts and individual schools are held accountable for the "value added" by their teachers). Such accountability is now required of Louisiana IHEs because of Commission action. Some institutions have turned to performance assessment in an attempt to assure reliability and validity of teaching "effectiveness." But there is uncertainty as to the potential for success of such strategies. An exploration of content standards, resulting programmatic changes, and empirical relation to K-12 achievement explains this uncertainty as historically based, due to various stumbling blocks, including traditions in academia.

A historical review of the development and application of standards in teacher education reflects many programmatic changes. These include variations in length of programs (in contrast to exclusively traditional four-year programs); full-time and more diverse student teaching assignments in public schools; greater depth and breadth of pre-student teaching field experiences; student teaching supervision generally by trained, qualified teachers and university faculty (though still some variation here); teachers-in-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

residence participating directly in teacher education programs; lead teachers in schools serving in multiple teacher education roles; greater collaboration between university and K-12 faculties, particularly in methods instruction; cohort groupings of preservice teachers; use of technology for communication (e-mail); and use of portfolios for instructional and assessment purposes (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999).

The assumption is that the effect of these changes is positive. In fact, Edelfelt and Raths (1999) discovered a pattern of "uncommon zeal for the standards (others) were promulgating" (p. 20) in the studies and projects they reviewed. However, because there has been little to no assessment of impact on instruction and learning, this assumption is unproven and the "zeal" has no base other than representing "'self-evident' beliefs" (p. 20).

The feasibility of such changes must be questioned, given the lack of empirical support on one hand and the sacrifices on the other. "The costs of mounting such programs in terms of weakening the arts and sciences components of teacher education programs, and the escalating costs of teacher education because of these additional clinical requirements, have not been assessed against the purported gain that candidates were expected to achieve" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 18).

The reasons for lack of data, while unfortunate, are somewhat understandable. The difficulty of identifying evidence needed, a "credible criterion variable" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 18), likely dissuades would-be evaluators from accepting the task. Also, traditionally, several components of a program are changed at once, not just one at a time.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The possibilities for successfully determining the impact of a single change are questionable.

Despite uncertainties as to effect, assessment in the form of "performance assessment" has emerged as the focus of accreditation under NCATE 2000 accreditation as well. Its revisions reflecting a new focus on "performance," NCATE accreditation now requires that teacher education programs institute this change in focus through evidence of teacher candidate demonstration of mastery of content and the ability to teach this content "effectively," along with an understanding of "criteria by which their professional competence will be judged. Multiple assessments of candidate performance will be the rule . . . [with] benchmark levels of performance, based on exemplars provided by NCATE-affiliated professional associations" (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000, p. 615). Additionally, institutions will be expected to create comprehensive, continuous assessment programs by which they will determine the "effectiveness" of their own programs based on professional, state, and institutional standards. These changes will address what some view as a failure of most contemporary schools of education; i.e., lack of specification regarding expectations for graduates as well as "performance assessments" with specified levels of acceptability. (Wise & Leibbrand, 2000)

But applying standards is difficult because of many factors. In her study of nine teacher education programs across the United States, Tatto (1998) discovered a wide diversity of programs—from conventional to constructivist. She concludes that

> current [standards-based] educational reform . . . may serve as catalyzer to norm cohesiveness but may also clash against the diversity of views across the field of teacher education. . . . The prevalent lack of agreement across the teacher education programs studied and teaching regarding good practice may significantly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> contribute to educational reform failure in our schools. The fact that teacher educators and teachers can with legitimacy hold opposing ideas regarding education's purposes makes it difficult to agree on how to implement the goals the current reforms call for in actual school settings. (p. 76)

Tatto sees a need for "shared understandings" among teacher education programs to support conditions necessary for critical and reflective practice in a standards-based environment.

Just as many reforms stem from common sense and experience, so do many of the detractors. Several issues affect the application of standards, including the role teacher education plays within the university environment, socialization of the workplace, poor public relations, and the impact of supply and demand of teachers (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999; Imig, 2000).

Some of the primary stumbling blocks to the implementation of standards may result from the situating of teacher education programs within colleges and universities. The shift from normal schools to the university "for purposes of 'reputation' and 'image' . . . as the proper home of professional studies" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 18) carried a price: in exchange for what is often perceived as greater credibility and academic stature, teacher education faculty have become mired in the traditions and expectations of academia.

Many age-old complaints from teacher educators regarding the purely theoretical world of academia echo here. "Unlike the professions of law and medicine, teacher education has been unable to escape campus regulations and customs governed by faculty senates" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 18). The threat "publish or perish" came to apply to teacher educators just as it did to faculty in other colleges. This would not necessarily be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

damaging to programs, except that many teacher education faculty have seemingly translated this threat into justification for avoidance of field supervision and undergraduate advising.

Additionally, the gulf between the constituencies of PK-16+ education is vast. This "gap between the cultures of school and university faculties . . . [is reflected in] work lives, prestige, personal and academic freedom, professional climates, and financial rewards" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 19). These differences have the potential to hinder effective working relationships between the two groups; while not insurmountable, they are challenges nonetheless—challenges that can slow standards development and diminish support. The argument "that teacher education had to free itself from the shackles of higher education with the aid of state government and state policy" (Smith, qtd. in Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 18) in order to find success in standards-based reform rings true.

Relatedly, the expenses involved in supporting standards and their assessment are often prohibitive in environments that value the work of other colleges more than that of teacher education, despite the fact that most SCDEs serve as "cash cows" for their universities. But, once again, without empirical evidence supporting the claims of program "effectiveness," justification of increased expenses is difficult at best, a difficulty only compounded by the socialization prevalent in the profession once the graduate enters the workplace (Andrew, 1977; Edelfelt & Raths, 1999).

The effects of this socialization contribute to another stumbling block for standards: the lack of understanding and appreciation by the public and policy-makers of teacher education work. While engrossed in the all-consuming challenges and demands of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teaching, scholarship, and service, teacher educators have not effectively informed the public about their roles in education or the importance of teacher education to society—let alone trumpeted their accomplishments and those of their students and graduates.

> Education has never been packaged as effectively as news or science. There are no Jim Lehrers, Carl Sagans, Joan Ganz Cooneys, or National Geographic Societies purveying education. The profession has not made learning appealing, attractive, and stimulating in the minds of laypersons. No one thinks much about, nor spends much money on, developing standards for informing people about education. Thus public opinion does not demand greater support for education, and state legislators regularly get reelected without funding education or teacher education adequately. The resources required to produce quality education are comparable to those going into production of television programs or distance learning. The public and policy makers have never recognized that fact. (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 19)

Another stumbling block relates to the sheer numbers in the teaching profession. With 2.5+ million teachers, large teacher education programs in most institutions, and state and district control over standards related to all components of teacher education, the idea of gaining approval for and implementing even a small change in standards is formidable—"not only incredibly expensive but difficult and complicated to enforce" (Edelfelt & Raths, 1999, p. 19).

Supply and demand realities continue to impact the standards problem. Wise and Leibbrand (2000) capture the dilemma well.

> All these standards do not solve the perennial problem that administrators face every fall: hiring enough qualified teachers to fill every classroom. Everyone likes high standards until hiring season, and then states and districts begin to use loopholes in the law or seek legislation allowing for alternative certification to fill the empty classrooms. . . . There is no question that standards for entry into the teaching profession have been low. States originally set the standards low to allow a ready supply of teachers. (p. 621)

Supporting "the educational equivalent of a truth-in-labeling law" (p. 621), Wise and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Leibbrand (2000) suggest differentiating between levels of preparation through use of such labels as "teacher" and "para-teacher," thus "generat(ing) parental and public awareness of the unevenness of teacher qualifications . . . and [forcing] public officials . . . to decide what steps to take to ensure that a competent, caring, and qualified teacher teaches every child" (p. 621).

One can find a similar call for "truth-in-labeling" related to social justice in Roger Soder's 1999 exploration of the class and social structure implications behind the phrases "school reform" and "school renewal." Though referring to K-12 reform, Soder's argument can be applied to teacher education reform as well.

Soder (1999), co-director of the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington, finds "embedded in both 'reform' and 'renewal' . . . basic views of the world, basic views of human nature, and basic views of the way individuals do business in this world" (p. 568). Much state and federal school reform is "a rather complacent acceptance or even affirmation of given class and other social structures" (Soder, 1999, p. 568). In an exposition of "ways of doing business in the world" (p. 568), Soder points to approaches such as force from above and compliance from below, bribery and punishment, and threatening force—all intended to result in compliance, or what Soder labels a "tyranny of oppression. . . . But compliance is never edifying, it never rings with human dignity, and it never pulsates with excitement and curiosity and wonder" (p. 569). Such compliance is of little value in the civilized world.

However, the "tyranny of oppression" is not the only type of tyranny resulting in compliance. Soder (1999) identifies yet another type of tyranny, one much "subtler" than

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that of oppression:

> the tyranny of omission . . . [which] demands its own kind of compliance. The tyranny of omission denies a hearing, denies consideration of things, denies voices. . . . In a tyranny of omission, the unwelcome, the nontraditional, the threatening, the irritating, and the inconvenient are the songs that never make society's playlist. (pp. 569-570)

This "tyranny of omission" is evident in current K-12 reform movements in the form of ignoring underlying assumptions regarding social justice. The subtlety of this tyranny makes it far worse in effect than the "tyranny of oppression."

Applying Soder's (1999) concerns to teacher education reform, one can discern a "tyranny of oppression" in the federal government's approach at reform through bribing institutions with grant monies and punishing with the threatened withdrawal of funds. Unlike the de-regulation agenda, however, the federal government is neither avoiding nor ignoring social justice issues among diverse populations of K-12 students.

In contrast, one might find in the de-regulation reform agenda evidence of "tyranny of omission" comparable to that Soder sees in K-12 reform. Through its advocacy of certification based solely on content knowledge, the de-regulation camp ignores issues related to diversity of student population in the classroom. Advocates aver no value in course work focused on instruction based on student need stemming from difference. They see no purpose in preservice education aimed at democracy and social reform, the realm of what is termed as the social reconstructionists in teacher education. (See Britzman & Dippo, 2000; Claus, 1999; Cochran-Smith, 2001; Liston & Zeichner, 1987, 1991; McNeil, 2000a, 2000b; Ohanian, 1999; Zeichner, 1993.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Focus on content knowledge alone ignores the importance of critical reflection and inquiry in teacher education in promoting social justice and equity. The teacher's role as "transformative intellectual" as seen by Giroux (Claus, 1999; Giroux, 1985, 1988; Giroux & McLaren, 1986) is absent from this approach. (See also hooks, 1994). Through this omission, the de-regulation camp, implicitly at least, declares its indifference to social justice issues, issues of critical importance to many authors (e.g., Alfie, 2000; Apple, 1993a, 1993b; Berliner & Biddle, 1996).

Despite these origins of and concerns regarding standards, groups such as the Commission created new "standards" for teacher education reform in Louisiana. Rather than centering on a conceptual research base, most of these new "standards" reflected focus on superficial concerns such as numbers—whether these be test scores, enrollments, or semester credit hours. These "standards" do not reflect concern with larger issues related to the learning of all students—both those at the K-12 and the higher education levels.

Situating the Commission: Re-reflecting

The two questions guiding this research focused on where Commission recommendations situated the Commission in current national reform movements and how standards-based reform was reflected in Commission recommendations. When I began the study, I thought the answers to these questions would be clear. I even thought that I would be able to focus first on the "situatedness" question, and then on the standards question. I had begun to see the standards question as a subset to the other.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

I did not think that all recommendations would clearly point to one side or the other, but I did believe that most would lean more in one direction. In fact, I had recorded in my personal journal several thoughts concerning the direction I thought these would lean. I did not want these thoughts to cloud what was really there.

However, as I continued to ask these questions throughout the study, I frequently found the answers to change. Sometimes, I was not satisfied with applying a label. It was relatively clear that the new alternate certification program was reflective of the de-regulation movement. The coursework was minimal in the summer: nine hours that were expected to address classroom management, pedagogy, content, psychology, reading, field experiences (though I was uncertain where these could occur during a summer). The academic year coursework was also minimal: nine hours total, with three of those the internship. (I questioned how a faculty member could be assigned supervisory responsibilities for a three hour internship over two semesters.) The baccalaureate degree and content area assessment were considered to be sufficient to validate content knowledge. The 2.5 gpa was desired, but not required in all cases. Private providers, including local school districts, would be encouraged to propose a program. In fact, public funds were earmarked for one provider not approved so that the proposed program could begin anyway. The track was fast and simple, intended to attract "nonteacher education types" into the field, bypassing traditional teacher education programs. Clearly these were patterns related to the de-regulation movement.

I looked at the new undergraduate programs. These were filled with requirements of all types . . . from coursework to primary and secondary areas. Upon looking at these

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in relation to other Commission requirements, particularly those related to beginning teacher involvement in professional development, graduate support from the university as well as the school district, my first response was to label these programs as characteristic of the professionalization movement. And, in many ways they probably were.

Thus the undergraduate programs were much more demanding than that of alternate certification, yet the students in each would be awarded the same certification on the same salary schedule. This situation is comparable to that described in Chapter Two in which rigorous requirements from admission to coursework and clinical experiences to professional development are required on one hand, as one would expect with the professionalization movement, yet a fast track to certification is allowed on the other, as one would expect with the de-regulation movement. This is the "schizophrenia" as described by Weiss and Leibbrand (2000) that characterizes teacher preparation programs in some states. But I did not want to make that diagnosis here too quickly.

This split reaction to teacher education reform did seem to characterize that of several Commission members. These members were intent on creating demanding, extensive undergraduate programs at the university level, yet they were willing to allow private providers (albeit IHEs as well) to offer alternate certification programs far less demanding in coursework and experience. Their responses to alternate certification as well as "solutions" to teacher shortages tend to associate this group more closely with the de-regulation movement.

This is somewhat understandable in light of demographic trends that point to a need for at least two million more teachers over the next decade. The loss of more than

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

20 percent of newly certified teachers plus a substantial number of retirements will place additional employment pressures on districts, "prompt(ing) fears that school districts will respond by lowering standards and hiring unqualified individuals" (Imig, 2000, p. 7). Ben-Peretz (2001) concurs: "Professional standards are in danger of being ignored because of extreme teacher shortages, which may lead to a teaching workforce that lacks the necessary competencies for dealing with the demands of the profession" (p. 48). The degree of this impact will likely be market-driven, as less desirable and/or less financially strong districts will probably suffer most from shortages.

The Commission tried to address these shortages by requiring that IHEs take aggressive actions to recruit for shortage areas, as well as by opening the door to a more streamlined, fast-track alternate certification program that would be offered by IHEs and private providers alike. In sync with advocates of the de-regulation agenda, several Commission members joined many policy makers in seeing alternate certification programs as potential sources for teachers, with targets in some states of up to 20 percent set for the beginning teacher pool. Adding to the challenge for teacher educators are the implications of such programs as

> the Title II recruitment program and the class-size reduction legislation [to] send funds "to high-need" school districts "to ensure that those districts and their high-need schools are able to recruit highly qualified teachers." . . . (T)hese programs channel money to the so-called consumers and not to the suppliers; monies are not provided to build the capacity of Ed Schools or to increase the enrollments of teacher education programs. This is a significant constraint on Ed Schools and needs to be understood as an effort by both the Congress and the Clinton administration to support alternative providers. (Imig, 2000, p. 9).

But I would review my notes on meeting proceedings, conversations, materials, presentations, and interviews and still question the labels I was considering. Sometimes I

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

would think that I had found one pattern leading in one direction, only to find another leading in the opposite. I began to attribute the problems I was experiencing to my inability to find the "right" connections. So I continued to search. And, I continued to feel that I was stretching to identify them in some cases.

Then I re-read a piece by Cochran-Smith (2001a) about various questions that have dominated the history of reform and policy. These questions, which change from time to time, have varied from what Cochran-Smith labels the attributes question, the effectiveness question, the knowledge question, and, currently, the outcomes question. As I considered this perspective on what drives reform and read about each question, I did begin to notice a pattern, though not at all one that I had expected.

I began to see what I could only describe as an absence of standards-based thought behind Commission recommendations, an absence of members' asking questions concerning programmatic goals. The Commission did not delve into the key questions that have dominated teacher education reform: "What should teachers know and be able to do?" and "How do we know when teachers know and are able to do. . . ?" This absence caused me to re-reflect on the questions.

I began to wonder if there could be an underlying Commission philosophy or thought if there were no standards as a base. I began to see in my notes on presentations, discussions, and interviews Commission comments and decisions that were based on numbers of courses and/or hours, course topics, issues related to convenience. I saw little, if any, focus on underlying programmatic goals guiding proposed reform.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Although content area consortia were meeting throughout the year as well, final discussions and decisions were not shared with all consortia members until several months after they had met . . . let alone with Commission members during their meetings. Rather than basing decisions regarding course curricula on what those in the field (K-12 teachers, COE faculty, academic college faculty) were determining that teachers needed to know and be able to do in that particular content area, on the standards they were identifying, Commission conversations were focused on numbers of hours, on what primary and secondary fields would mean to a junior just deciding to become a teacher. I also realized that the "draft" structure had been distributed to members for their comments. Though it at times incorporated their questions and suggestions, it was not their creation, but instead, evidently that of the planning committee.

I then looked at the new alternate certification program. I wondered here, too, why those on the consortia were not involved in this decision-making process. Once again, the people with expertise in an area could have shared standards teacher candidates needed to address.

Then I began to question whether or not this information was being factored into the recommendation. The Commission Director was actively involved with the consortia. Perhaps other members of the planning committee were as well. But even if they were, open discussions were in order to determine requirements and expectations. And these needed a basis other than "25% of a curriculum" or "x number of hours."

So, what does this mean for this study? Actually, the lack of attention to standards, to a base, to programmatic goals reflects a variation of the de-regulation

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

agenda. On one hand the Commission members were asked to focus on an "outcomes question" (Cochran-Smith, 2001a); on the other hand, they were given no guidance as to what this question means. According to Cochran-Smith (2001a), initially two questions dominate:

- What should the outcomes of teacher education be for teacher learning, professional practice, and student learning?
- How, by whom, and for what purposes should these outcomes be documented, demonstrated, and/or measured?

Cochran-Smith cautions against seeking specificity here, stating that the differences in beliefs about the construction of outcomes may point to deep, philosophical differences, obviating any chance for consensus. Cochran-Smith, as many other educators, raises some of the same questions raised within this study. These will be recapped before moving to the next section.

What is the history of teacher education reform? How can this history inform current reform initiatives? Are current reform initiatives really new? What role do standards play in these initiatives? What do standards really mean? Is it possible to truly come to a consensus regarding this meaning? Despite the seeming agreement among many educators evidenced by the proliferation of standards in several areas, is this truly a consensus . . . or is it just affirmation based on the trend of the era? Does consensus preclude critique? What are the real differences between the professionalization and the de-regulation movements? Can K-12 student achievement really be a measure of teaching "effectiveness"? What is the meaning of "effective," "quality" teaching?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Blue Ribbon Commission gave its stamp of approval on several recommendations which will totally revise teacher preparation in Louisiana. Whether this stamp of approval followed their full involvement in the creation of these recommendations or was simply an affirmation of what others had created is questionable.

In another attempt to revisit this study's final questions and to address my own concern about assigning labels, I reviewed yet again my notes on Commission processes, conversations, and recommendations. I realized that the diversity of the Commission—representatives from the K-12 sector, higher education administration, K-12 human resources, business, state agencies, alternate routes—contributed somewhat to my confusion. Their understandings of and motivations concerning teacher education differed immensely. I continued to find patterns related to de-regulation more than to professionalization.

Recommendations implying that a fast track to certification is all that is needed for Louisiana's K-12 schools definitely belong to the de-regulation movement. The implication here is that the word "certified" is all that is important . . . not what should be behind that word . . . such as understanding of issues of diversity, individual needs, multiple experiences to learn about differences and commonalities in schools and among student populations . . . pedagogical considerations of how to teach that content, not just to know it . . . even time to consider teaching and learning, to reflect . . .

Commission procedures directed at quieting voices from any segment, but particularly that of teacher educators, unquestionably belong to the de-regulation

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

movement. Intentionally or not, the message was that these voices were neither valued nor wanted.

Inclusion on the planning committee of representatives from nontraditional programs, as well as noneducators, . . . yet again excluding teacher educators, is definitely aligned with the beliefs of de-regulation advocates that the "Ed cartel" is the cause of problems in education and as such must be removed from the decision-making process.

Thus, though demonstrating some goals of the professionalization movement in its recommended revisions of undergraduate programs and IHE support of graduates, the Commission can also be seen as aligned with the de-regulation movement. Whether truly of its making or simply reflecting its stamp of approval, the Commission's recommendations overall speak to circumventing and/or controlling IHE teacher preparation programs. Recommendations, though extensive and complex, were based more on superficial measurable components than on substantive, programmatic ones.

This juxtaposition of de-regulation and professionalization goals points to a blurring of the two movements as represented in the various Commission recommendations. The research reveals some recommendations as reflective of professionalization goals, yet others as reflective of attempts to remove "the profession" from professionalization. This blurring of professionalization and de-regulation in the actions and policy recommendations of the Commission is a critical finding of this study, for it illustrates increasing tensions between professionalization, a paradigm of thought of continued importance in the field, and de-regulation, a movement characterized by increasing dominance in policy making arenas.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Future for Teacher Education as a Profession

What does the future hold for teacher education? It is likely to remain on the front lines of national policy debates and "the subject of intense scrutiny by public officials and others concerned with the quality of schooling" (Imig, 2000, p. 21). In the immediate future, state commissions such as Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality will continue to define measurable components they find most necessary in "effective" teacher education programs while meeting federal mandates. Colleges and universities, including those in Louisiana, will "recast programs . . . emphasiz(ing) outcomes, expectations, or performance results" (Imig, 2000, p. 20), attempting to meet NCATE 2000 standards all within a frame of increasingly prescriptive state guidelines and with heightened awareness of competition from private providers, both nonprofit and for-profit. Despite its support from teacher unions, NCATE will likely face a viable challenge to its monopoly on accreditation from the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), resulting in further ambiguity concerning accreditation. Federal agencies will continue to support the efforts of school districts in the areas of recruitment, licensing, and professional development—with or without college and university partnerships.

What looks at first blush as attempts at standards-based teacher education reform reflects, upon more critical review, a struggle of far greater scope. The February 2000 issue of AACTE's "President's Environmental Scan" warns its readers—AACTE leaders and members—about

> five issues or concerns . . . that need to be carefully considered by Ed School leaders and faculty. All challenge higher education's traditional and dominant role in the education of teachers and other school personnel. These include: 1) policy maker acceptance of a new paradigm for professional development for school

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> personnel that is job embedded, site delivered, practitioner oriented, and standards focused; b) policy maker determination to recast leadership development into a non-higher education delivered system of courses and experiences that are both school and system embedded; c) policy maker efforts to by-pass Ed Schools and create and/or expand alternative certification opportunities for prospective teachers and other school personnel; d) policy maker acceptance and recognition of a host of alternative providers to address the perceived need to make teachers technologically literate and/or skilled in the use of the new technologies; and, 3) policy maker demand for educational research that is more practical, timely, focused directly on school problems, and contributes to K-12 student performance. (Imig, 2000, pp. 20-21)

Current teacher education standards-based reform movements have not emerged, it seems, solely from calls for greater K-12 student achievement. Instead, through the professionalization and de-regulation agendas, one sees debate over the control of education. The question here is, Should education be controlled at the national level or should it be decentralized? The issues, far deeper than those normally touted—recruitment, preparation, and retention—, are ones of control.

Louisiana's 1999-2000 Blue Ribbon Commission adds an important layer to the history of teacher education reform not only in this state, but also in the country. Its processes and recommendations reflect the development and tensions of teacher education reform history. Its recommendations reflect pieces of both the professionalization and the de-regulation movements, thus placing it squarely in the increasingly typical schizophrenic role of urging "quality" on one hand and dismissing it on the other in the name of "quantity."

Most important, and most unfortunately, the Commission has turned teacher education in Louisiana topsy-turvy in the name of reform. It has called for revisions in every segment without giving thought to the demands on time and resources for those

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

who have to make the revisions. At the same time it has opened the floodgates for outside agencies to enter the teacher education field, with little to no check-and-balance system while creating a gargantuan accountability system for Louisiana's IHEs.

The Commission has created recommendations based on numbers and potentially meaningless categories. It has not based recommendations on solid foundations of what is needed to instruct the K-12 child.

All educators should be aware and knowledgeable of national and state reform initiatives and their implications for teacher education and subsequently for K-12 education. While attention to the needs of K-12 students may be implicit in the debates, teacher educators must aggressively insure that this attention is explicit for all students. They risk not being able to do so if they are uninformed, or misinformed, as to the philosophical and political underpinnings of involved agendas. They cannot assume, even, that the policy makers themselves, including "blue ribbon commissioners," understand the implications of recommendations and directives. They must accept their professional responsibility to lead reform initiatives from an informed perspective.

Clearly the Age of Accountability for teacher education is here, with high-stakes challenges for colleges and universities not yet clearly defined in ongoing state and national debates. But the field has squared off with two primary competitors.

> The policy choices between professionalization and deprofessionalization, between regulation and de-regulation, between relying upon national standards or setting local standards for teacher performance, and between investing in existing structures and institutions or leaving to 'the market' the capacity to set expectations and requirements is commanding a great deal of attention in the shaping of policy for teacher education. (Imig, 2000, p. 21)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The "winner," if there is to be one, is yet to be decided. The blurring of these two movements in Louisiana's reform environment reflects an obfuscation that threatens to undermine any potential for meaningful and lasting change in teacher education in the state.

Meanwhile, established teacher education programs, including those in Louisiana, continue to prepare and send out teacher candidates with an anxious eye on budding alternative providers. Ultimately, decisions made in teacher education will affect the real players of the game, the real winners or losers . . . the K-12 students.

Suggestions for Additional Research

Additional research seems needed on various topics and issues raised in this study. Studies of the state's IHEs as they attempt to implement the recommendations of Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality would extend the findings of this study. Similarly, studies might focus on the state's new alternate certification program, the Practitioner Teacher Program, highlighting implementation by IHEs as compared to those implemented by private providers, the performance of students in these programs during the first year, and comparisons of performance, student-employer satisfaction, and retention rates after one or more years.

The work of Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission continued into 2000-2001, with emphasis on professional development for practicing teachers and administrators. Studies of the second year of the Commission could add the next chapter to this study's historical account, as well as explore the evolution of the Commission's work. As similar blue ribbon commissions are formed in other states, studies of these would provide other

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

states' responses to federal mandates and national teacher education reform initiatives, as well as insight into reform initiatives within those states. Similarly, as the Louisiana PK-16+ Council (a progeny of sorts of the Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission) is formed and begins its work, case studies and ethnographies would extend the findings of studies such as this, as well as add to the field of knowledge related to teacher education reform and university-district partnerships.

As Louisiana and other states begin to identify institutions as at-risk and low-performing, case studies of these institutions would enable teacher educators and policy makers to study the origins of the problems experienced by these institutions, the support provided as a result of these labels, the effects of sanctions imposed by the state, and outcomes for their programs. Data on public perceptions and impact on the institutions as a whole would be valuable as well. These studies could serve as companion pieces to similar studies related to K-12 education and schools labeled as "failing," providing a K-16+ picture of education in the midst of national reform initiatives and accountability movements.

Work of the Louisiana Commission speaks to the aligning of state, national, and professional standards. As this work is translated into action plans at IHEs, studies of the actual application of these standards and their impact on teacher education programs would be valuable. As institutions attempt to integrate INTASC, NBPTS, and NCATE standards into their programs, comparisons of the performance of their graduates with those of other programs are necessary to determine the effects of such integration. Studies of institutions currently basing their teacher education programs on performance

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

assessment, such as Alverno College, would benefit the field as all NCATE institutions begin to do so with the implementation of NCATE 2000 standards. Of particular interest would be the work of large public institutions. Studies of the effects of Professional Development Schools would also provide understandings of processes, conflicts, and results of such partnerships.

As the debates between the professionalization and de-regulation movements continue, studies comparing the performance of graduates of programs aligned with each movement could provide documentation necessary to determine efficacy of each. Both case studies and ethnographies would provide data helpful to states and institutions as they determine teacher education paths to pursue. The historical perspective of this study leads to the suggestion of studies related to NCTAF's work as an extension to that following the report *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

This study represents a historical account of one state's attempt to address Congressional mandates and teacher education reform initiatives. In doing so, its actions and proceedings provided many examples of the conflicts evident in national reform movements. As these conflicts continue, studies of the schizophrenic nature of these national movements, of the struggle for control of education at both the national and state levels, and of states' attempts to interpret and integrate these movements into their own programs would provide opportunities for educators to learn from others' experiences.

Clearly, the field of topics is wide in this era of reform and accountability. While the areas mentioned above are needed, perhaps the most important research at this time is that connected with K-12 student achievement: how can K-12 achievement best be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

measured, how can a teacher be evaluated according to "value added" to K-12 achievement, how can institutions of higher education be evaluated according to the "value added" by their graduates. These are among the critical issues at this time as teacher educators, policy-makers, and the general public alike look to ways to improve K-12 education. The K-12 student must remain at the center of all of our efforts.

End Notes

1. Information on proceedings and materials of the Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality comes from Commission member packets, official correspondence to Commission members, Louisiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (LACTE) meeting packets, and personal notes on Commission and LACTE meetings unless noted otherwise.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

REFERENCES

Adler, M. (1982). *The paideia proposal.* New York: Macmillan.

Altheide, D., & Johnson, J. (1994). Criteria for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

American Council on Education. (1999). To touch the future: Transforming the way Teachers are taught. Washington, D.C.: Author.

American Council on Education. (2001). Mission statement. Available Internet: http://www.acenet.edu/about/mission.cfm

Andrew, M. (1997). What matters most for teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education, 48* (3), 167-176.

Apple, M. (1993a). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age.* New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. (1993b). The politics of official knowledge: Does a national curriculum make sense? *Teachers College Record, 95,* 222-241.

Association of Teacher Educators. (1997). *Standards for field experiences.* Reston, VA: ATE.

Ball, D., & Cohen, D. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ben-Peretz, M. (2001). The impossible role of teacher educators in a changing world. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52* (1), 48-56.

Berliner, D., & Biddle, B. (1996). Standards amidst uncertainty and inequality. *School Administrator, 53,* 42-44+.

Bestor, A. (1953). *Educational wastelands: The retreat from learning in our public schools.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Bloom, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain.* New York: David McKay.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Briggs, C. (1986). *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Britzman, D., & Dippo, P. (2000). On the future of awful thoughts in teacher education. *Teaching Education, 11* (1), 31-37.

Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education.* New York: Vantage.

Bruner, J. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction.* New York: Norton.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burns, J. (2000, May 25). Executive summary, section 1. In *Blue ribbon commission on teacher quality recommendations: Year one report* [On-line]. Available Internet: http://www.doe.state.la.us/blueribbon/section1.htm

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* New York: Author.

Claus, J. (1999). You can't avoid the politics: Lessons for teacher education from a case study of teacher-initiated tracking reform. *Journal of Teacher Education, 50* (1), 5-16.

Cochran-Smith, M. (Ed.). (2000a). The questions that drive reform. [Editorial]. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51* (5), 331-333.

Cochran-Smith, M. (Ed). (2000b). Teacher education at the turn of the century. [Editorial]. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51* (3), 163-165.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001a). Constructing outcomes in teacher education: Policy, practice and pitfalls. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9 (11). Available Internet: http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n11.html

Cochran-Smith, M. (Ed.). (2001b). Learning to teach against the (new) grain. [Editorial]. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52* (1), 3-4.

Council for a Better Louisiana. (2001). Available Internet: http://www.cabl.org/index.html

Cremin, L. (1961, 1964). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education 1876-1957.* New York: Vintage.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ball, D. (1998, November). Teaching for high standards: What policymakers need to know and be able to do. Available Internet: http://www.gse.upenn.edu/cpre/docs/pubs/reports.html

Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, B., Haselkorn, D., & Fideler, E. (1999). Teacher recruitment, selection, and induction: Policy influences on the supply and quality of teachers. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (Eds.) (1999). *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Wallin, M. (1999). Investing in teaching as a learning profession. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Daupert, D. (1996). The Osborne-Parnes creative problem solving process manual. Available Internet: http://ideastream.com/create/

Denzin, N. (1994). The art and politics of interpretation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ducharme, E., & Ducharme, M. (Eds.). (1997). The news, a fable, and books. *Journal of Teacher Education, 48* (3), 163-165.

Edelfelt, R., & Raths, J. (1999). A brief history of standards in teacher education. [Monograph]. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Eisner, E. (1979, 1985). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs.* New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice.* New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E. (1992). Objectivity in educational research. *Curriculum Inquiry, 22,* 1, 9-15.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Farkas, S., & Johnson, J. (1997). Different drummers: How teachers of teachers view public education. New York: Public Agenda.

Finn, C., Jr. (2000). Comment. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), *Brookings papers on education policy 2000.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Fishman, A. (1988). *Amish literacy: What and how it means.* Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books.

Foley, D. (1990). *Learning capitalist culture: Deep in the heart of Tejas.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fullan, M., Gulluzzo, G., Morris, P., & Watson, N. (1998). *The rise and stall of teacher education reform.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of culture.* New York: Basic Books.

Giroux, H. (1985). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. *Social Education, 49,* 376-379.

Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review, 56* (3), 213-238.

Goodlad, J. (1964). *School curriculum reform in the United States.* New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Goodlad, J. (1990a). *Places where teachers are taught.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. (1990b). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greene, J. (1994). Qualitative program evaluation: Practice and promise. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Greene, M. (1965). *The public school and the private vision: A search for American in education and literature.* New York: Random House.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Greene, M. (1975). Curriculum and consciousness. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (299-317). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Griffin, G. (Ed.) (1999). *The education of teachers: Ninety-eighth yearbook of the national society for the study of education.* Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Heubert, J., & Hauser, R. (Eds.) (1999). *High stakes: Testing for tracking, promotion, and graduation.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Hill, P. (2000). The federal role in education. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), *Brookings papers on education policy 2000.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Hirsch, E. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools.* East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York: Routledge.

Imig, D. (2000, February). President's environmental scan. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1992). *Model standards for beginning teacher licensing and development.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Jackson, P. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 3-40). New York: Macmillan.

Jennings, J. (1998). *Why national standards and tests? Politics and the quest for better schools.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Kanstoroom, M., & Finn, C., Jr. (Eds.) (1999). *Better teachers, better schools.* Washington, D.C.: The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Kennedy, M. (1999). The role of preservice teacher education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kinchloe, J., & McLaren, P. (1994). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kirp, D. (2000). Education has become the nation's top issue. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), *Brookings papers on education policy 2000.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Kliebard, H. (1975a). Bureaucratization and curriculum theory. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (51-69). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Kliebard, H. (1975b). Metaphorical roots of curriculum design. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (84-85). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Kliebard, H. (1975c). Persistent issues in historical perspective. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (39-50). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Kliebard, H. (1975d). Reappraisal: The Tyler rationale. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (70-83). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Kliebard, H. (1986). *The struggle for the American curriculum 1893-1958.* Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kliebard, H. (1987). A century of growing antagonism in high school-college relations. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 3 (1), 61-70.

Kleiner, C. (2001, February 21). Change comes to teacher education. *U.S. News* [On-line]. Available: www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/beyond/grad/gbed.htm

Kohn, A. (2000). *The case against standardized testing: Raising the scores, ruining the schools.* Westport, CT: Heinemann.

Koppich, J. (2000). The federal role in teacher professional development. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), *Brookings papers on education policy 2000.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Kordalewski, John. (2000). *Standards in the classroom: How teachers and students negotiate learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lampert, M., & Ball, D. (1999). Aligning teacher education with contemporary K-12 reform visions. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Langness, L., & Frank, G. (1991). *Lives: An anthropological approach to biography.* Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp, Inc.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1987). Reflective teacher education and moral deliberation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 38* (6), 2-8.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling.* New York: Routledge.

Lockwood, A. (1998). *Standards from policy to practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Louisiana Department of Education. (2001). Blue ribbon commission. Available Internet: http://www.doe.state.la.us/DOE/department/blueribbon.html

McNeil, L. (2000a). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing.* New York, NY: Routledge.

McNeil, L. (2000b). Creating new inequalities: Contradictions of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81* (10), 729-734.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1986). *Qualitative data analysis.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Murrell, P., Jr. (2001). Development of practice and teacher preparation in the age of education reform. [Book Review Essay]. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52* (1), 78-83.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). *A call for change in teacher education.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.

Nelson, W. (1998). The naked truth about school reform in Minnesota. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79* (9), 679-684.

Nelson, W. (1999). The emperor redux: Extending the Minnesota metaphor. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80* (5), 387-392.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ohanian, S. (1999). *One size fits few: The folly of educational standards*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

Olesen, V. (1994). Feminisms and models of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pinar, W. (1988). Whole, bright, deep with understanding: Issues in qualitative research and autobiographical method. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Contemporary curriculum discourses*. Scottsdale: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (1996). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Pitton, D. (1999). The "naked truth" isn't very revealing: A response to Wade Nelson on school reform in Minnesota. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80* (5), 383-387.

Public Agenda. (2001). Public agenda online. Available Internet: http://www.publicagenda.org/aboutpa/aboutpa.htm

Rallis, S., & MacMullen, M. (2000). Inquiry-minded schools: Opening doors for accountability. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81* (10), 766-773.

Ravitch, D. (1993). Launching a revolution in standards and assessments. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*, 767-772.

Ravitch, D. (1995). *National standards in American education: A citizen's guide*. New York: Brookings Institution.

Ravitch, D. (Ed.) (2000). *Brookings papers on education policy 2000*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Rhodes, L., & Bellamy, G. (1999). Choices and consequences in the renewal of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 50* (1), 17-26.

Richardson, L. Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rippa, S. (1988). *Education in a free society: An American history.* New York: Longman.

Schwartz, R., & Robinson, M. (2000). Goals 2000 and the standards movement. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), *Brookings papers on education policy 2000.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Seguel, M. (1966). *The curriculum field: Its formative years.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sindelar, P., & Rosenberg, M. (2000). Serving too many masters: The proliferation of ill-conceived and contradictory policies and practices in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51* (3), 188-193.

Soder, R. (1999). When words find their meaning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80* (8), 568-570.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2000). About the board. Available Internet: http://www.sreb.org/main/SREB/aboutboard.asp

Spradley, J. (1980). *Participant observation.* Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Sykes, G. (1999). Introduction: Teaching as the learning profession. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Tanner, D. (1966). Curriculum theory: Knowledge and content. *Review of Educational Research, XXXVII* (3), 362-372.

Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (1980). *Curriculum development: Theory into practice.* New York: Macmillan.

Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (1990). *History of the school curriculum.* New York: Macmillan.

Tatto, M. (1998). The influence of teacher education on teachers' beliefs about purposes of education, roles, and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49* (1), 66-77.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Thiessen, D. (2000). Developing knowledge for preparing teachers: Redefining the role of schools of education. *Educational Policy, 14* (1), 129-144.

Thomas, W.I. (1932). *The child in America: Behavior problems and programs.* New York: A.A. Knopf.

Tujinman, A.C., & Postlethwaite, T.N. (Eds.) (1994). *Monitoring the standards of education.* New York: Elsevier Science Inc.

Vinovskis, M.A. (2000). The federal role in educational research and development. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), *Brookings papers on education policy 2000.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Wise, A., & Leibbrand, J. (2000). Standards and teacher quality: Entering the new millennium. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81* (8), 612-616+.

Wolcott, H. (1967). *A Kwakiutl village and school.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Wolcott, H. (1988). Ethnographic research in education. In R. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education.* Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Wolcott, H. (1990). On seeking—and rejecting—validity in qualitative research. In E Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K. (1993). Traditions of practice in U.S. preservice teacher education programs. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 9* (1), 1-13.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

AACTE:	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
AATC:	American Association of Teachers Colleges
AASCU:	American Association of State Colleges and Universities
AAU:	American Association of Universities
ACE:	American Council on Education
AFT:	American Federation of Teachers
APEL:	Associated Professional Educators of Louisiana
ASI:	Assessor Survey Index
BESE:	Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (Louisiana)
BOE:	NCATE Board of Examiners
BoR:	Board of Regents (Louisiana)
CABL:	Council for a Better Louisiana
CCSSO:	Council of Chief State School Officers
CI:	Certification Index
Commission:	Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality
CPRE:	Consortium for Policy Research in Education
CSA:	Certification Shortage Areas
ESEA:	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ETS:	Educational Testing Service
GSI:	Graduate Satisfaction Index

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

HEA:	Higher Education Act
IHEs:	Institutions of Higher Education
INTASC:	Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium
IPI:	Institutional Performance Index
LACTE:	Louisiana Association for Colleges of Teacher Education
LAE:	Louisiana Association of Educators (NEA affiliate)
LDOE:	Louisiana Department of Education
LFT:	Louisiana Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO affiliate)
NCATF:	National Commission on Teaching & America's Future
NAEP:	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NASDTEC:	National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification
NBPTS:	National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
NCATE:	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
NC TEACH:	North Carolina Teachers of Excellence for All Children
NEA:	National Education Association
NTE:	National Teacher Examination
OBE:	Outcome-Based Education
PC:	Program Completers
PCT:	Program Completer Target
PI:	University-District Partnership Index
PLT:	Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Test
PPST:	Praxis Pre-Professional Skills Test

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PTP:	Practitioner Teaching Program (Louisiana)
RI:	Retention Index
RM:	Racial Minority
RSA:	Rural Shortage Areas
SCDEs:	Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education
SREB:	Southern Regional Education Board
TEAC:	Teacher Education Accreditation Council
TEPS:	National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards
TM:	Teaching Minority
TOPS:	Tuition Opportunity Program for Students (Louisiana)
TPAEC:	Teacher Preparation Accountability and Evaluation Commission
TQI:	Teacher Quality Index
TPPAS:	Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System (Louisiana)
TPPS:	Teacher Preparation Performance Score (Louisiana)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX B

TITLE II: STATE REPORT CARD

TITLE II, SECTION 207(b)
HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (P.L. 105-244)
STATE REPORT CARD ON THE QUALITY OF TEACHER PREPARATION

Each State that receives funds under this Act shall provide to the Secretary, within 2 years of the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, and annually thereafter, in a uniform and comprehensible manner that conforms with the definitions and methods established in subsection (a), a State report card on the quality of teacher preparation in the State, which shall include at least the following:

(1) A description of the teacher certification and licensure assessments, and any other certification and licensure requirements, used by the State.

(2) The standards and criteria that prospective teachers must meet in order to attain initial teacher certification or licensure and to be certified or licensed to teach particular subjects or in particular grades within the State.

(3) A description of the extent to which the assessments and requirements described in paragraph (1) are aligned with the State's standards and assessments for students.

(4) The percentage of teaching candidates who passed each of the assessments used by the State for teacher certification and licensure, and the passing score on each assessment that determines whether a candidate has passed that assessment.

(5) The percentage of teaching candidates who passed each of the assessments used by the State for teacher certification and licensure, disaggregated and ranked, by the teacher preparation program in that State from which the teacher candidate received the candidate's most recent degree, which shall be made available widely and publicly.

(6) Information on the extent to which teachers in the State are given waivers of State certification or licensure requirements, including the proportion of such teachers distributed across high- and low-poverty school districts and across subject areas.

(7) A description of each State's alternative routes to teacher certification, if any, and the percentage of teachers certified through alternative certification routes who pass State teacher certification or licensure assessments.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(8) For each State, a description of proposed criteria for assessing the performance of teacher preparation programs within institutions of higher education in the State, including indicators of teacher candidate knowledge and skills.

(9) Information on the extent to which teachers or prospective teachers in each State are required to take examinations or other assessments of their subject matter knowledge in the area or areas in which the teachers provide instruction, the standards established for passing any such assessments, and the extent to which teachers or prospective teachers are required to receive a passing score on such assessments in order to teach in specific subject areas or grade levels.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX C

TITLE II: STATE FUNCTIONS

TITLE II, SECTION 208
HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (P.L. 105-244)
STATE FUNCTIONS

(a) STATE ASSESSMENT- In order to receive funds under this Act, a State, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, shall have in place a procedure to identify, and assist, through the provision of technical assistance, low-performing programs of teacher preparation within institutions of higher education. Such State shall provide the Secretary an annual list of such low-performing institutions that includes an identification of those institutions at-risk of being placed on such list. Such levels of performance shall be determined solely by the State and may include criteria based upon information collected pursuant to this title. Such assessment shall be described in the report under section 207(b).

(b) TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY- Any institution of higher education that offers a program of teacher preparation in which the State has withdrawn the State's approval or terminated the State's financial support due to the low performance of the institution's teacher preparation program based upon the State assessment described in subsection (a)--

(1) shall be ineligible for any funding for professional development activities awarded by the Department of Education; and

(2) shall not be permitted to accept or enroll any student that receives aid under title IV of this Act in the institution's teacher preparation program.

(c) NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING- If the Secretary develops any regulations implementing subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall submit such proposed regulations to a negotiated rulemaking process, which shall include representatives of States, institutions of higher education, and educational and student organizations.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX D

TITLE II: INSTITUTIONAL REPORT CARD

TITLE II, SECTION 207(f)
HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (P.L. 105-244)
INSTITUTIONAL REPORT CARD ON QUALITY OF TEACHER PREPARATION

(1) REPORT CARD- Each institution of higher education that conducts a teacher preparation program that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 and annually thereafter, shall report to the State and the general public, in a uniform and comprehensible manner that conforms with the definitions and methods established under subsection (a), the following information:

(A) PASS RATE-

(i) For the most recent year for which the information is available, the pass rate of the institution's graduates on the teacher certification or licensure assessments of the State in which the institution is located, but only for those students who took those assessments within 3 years of completing the program.

(ii) A comparison of the program's pass rate with the average pass rate for programs in the State.

(iii) In the case of teacher preparation programs with fewer than 10 graduates taking any single initial teacher certification or licensure assessment during an academic year, the institution shall collect and publish information with respect to an average pass rate on State certification or licensure assessments taken over a 3-year period.

(B) PROGRAM INFORMATION- The number of students in the program, the average number of hours of supervised practice teaching required for those in the program, and the faculty-student ratio in supervised practice teaching.

(C) STATEMENT- In States that approve or accredit teacher education programs, a statement of whether the institution's program is so approved or accredited.

(D) DESIGNATION AS LOW-PERFORMING- Whether the program has been designated as low-performing by the State under section 208(a).

(2) REQUIREMENT- The information described in paragraph (1) shall be reported through publications such as school catalogs and promotional materials sent to potential

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

applicants, secondary school guidance counselors, and prospective employers of the institution's program graduates.

(3) FINES- In addition to the actions authorized in section 487(c), the Secretary may impose a fine not to exceed $25,000 on an institution of higher education for failure to provide the information described in this subsection in a timely or accurate manner.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX E

INTERSTATE NEW TEACHER ASSESSMENT AND SUPPORT CONSORTIUM STANDARDS

Principle #1: ***The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.***

Knowledge

The teacher understands major concepts, assumptions, debates, processes of inquiry, and ways of knowing that are central to the discipline(s) s/he teaches.

The teacher understands how students' conceptual frameworks and their misconceptions for an area of knowledge can influence their learning.

The teacher can relate his/her disciplinary knowledge to other subject areas.

Dispositions

The teacher realizes that subject matter knowledge is not a fixed body of facts but is complex and ever-evolving. S/he seeks to keep abreast of new ideas and understandings in the field.

The teacher appreciates multiple perspectives and conveys to learners how knowledge is developed from the vantage point of the knower.

The teacher has enthusiasm for the discipline(s) s/he teaches and sees connections to everyday life.

The teacher is committed to continuous learning and engages in professional discourse about subject matter knowledge and children's learning of the discipline.

Performances

The teacher effectively uses multiple representations and explanations of disciplinary concepts that capture key ideas and link them to students' prior understandings.

The teacher can represent and use differing viewpoints, theories, "ways of knowing" and methods of inquiry in his/her teaching of subject matter concepts.

The teacher can evaluate teaching resources and curriculum materials for their comprehensiveness, accuracy, and usefulness for representing particular ideas and concepts.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The teacher engages students in generating knowledge and testing hypotheses according to the methods of inquiry and standards of evidence used in the discipline.

The teacher develops and uses curricula that encourage students to see, question, and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives.

The teacher can create interdisciplinary learning experiences that allow students to integrate knowledge, skills, and methods of inquiry from several subject areas.

Principle #2: ***The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.***

Knowledge

The teacher understands how learning occurs--how students construct knowledge, acquire skills, and develop habits of mind--and knows how to use instructional strategies that promote student learning.

The teacher understands that students' physical, social, emotional, moral and cognitive development influence learning and knows how to address these factors when making instructional decisions.

The teacher is aware of expected developmental progressions and ranges of individual variation within each domain (physical, social, emotional, moral and cognitive), can identify levels of readiness in learning, and understands how development in any one domain may affect performance in others.

Dispositions

The teacher appreciates individual variation within each area of development, shows respect for the diverse talents of all learners, and is committed to help them develop self-confidence and competence.

The teacher is disposed to use students' strengths as a basis for growth, and their errors as an opportunity for learning.

Performances

The teacher assesses individual and group performance in order to design instruction that meets learners' current needs in each domain (cognitive, social, emotional, moral, and physical) and that leads to the next level of development.

The teacher stimulates student reflection on prior knowledge and links new ideas to already familiar ideas, making connections to students' experiences, providing opportunities for active engagement, manipulation, and testing of ideas and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

materials, and encouraging students to assume responsibility for shaping their learning tasks.

The teacher accesses students' thinking and experiences as a basis for instructional activities by, for example, encouraging discussion, listening and responding to group interaction, and eliciting samples of student thinking orally and in writing.

Principle #3: ***The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.***

Knowledge

The teacher understands and can identify differences in approaches to learning and performance, including different learning styles, multiple intelligences, and performance modes, and can design instruction that helps use students' strengths as the basis for growth.

The teacher knows about areas of exceptionality in learning--including learning disabilities, visual and perceptual difficulties, and special physical or mental challenges.

The teacher knows about the process of second language acquisition and about strategies to support the learning of students whose first language is not English.

The teacher understands how students' learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, and prior learning, as well as language, culture, family and community values.

The teacher has a well-grounded framework for understanding cultural and community diversity and knows how to learn about and incorporate students' experiences, cultures, and community resources into instruction.

Dispositions

The teacher believes that all children can learn at high levels and persists in helping all children achieve success.

The teacher appreciates and values human diversity, shows respect for students' varied talents and perspectives, and is committed to the pursuit of "individually configured excellence."

The teacher respects students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, talents, and interests.

The teacher is sensitive to community and cultural norms.

The teacher makes students feel valued for their potential as people, and helps them learn to value each other.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Performances

The teacher identifies and designs instruction appropriate to students' stages of development, learning styles, strengths, and needs.

The teacher uses teaching approaches that are sensitive to the multiple experiences of learners and that address different learning and performance modes.

The teacher makes appropriate provisions (in terms of time and circumstances for work, tasks assigned, communication and response modes) for individual students who have particular learning differences or needs.

The teacher can identify when and how to access appropriate services or resources to meet exceptional learning needs.

The teacher seeks to understand students' families, cultures, and communities, and uses this information as a basis for connecting instruction to students' experiences (e.g. drawing explicit connections between subject matter and community matters, making assignments that can be related to students' experiences and cultures).

The teacher brings multiple perspectives to the discussion of subject matter, including attention to students' personal, family, and community experiences and cultural norms.

The teacher creates a learning community in which individual differences are respected.

Principle #4: ***The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.***

Knowledge

The teacher understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning (e.g. critical and creative thinking, problem structuring and problem solving, invention, memorization and recall) and how these processes can be stimulated.

The teacher understands principles and techniques, along with advantages and limitations, associated with various instructional strategies (e.g. cooperative learning, direct instruction, discovery learning, whole group discussion, independent study, interdisciplinary instruction).

The teacher knows how to enhance learning through the use of a wide variety of materials as well as human and technological resources (e.g. computers, audio-visual technologies, videotapes and discs, local experts, primary documents and artifacts, texts, reference books, literature, and other print resources).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dispositions

The teacher values the development of students' critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performance capabilities.

The teacher values flexibility and reciprocity in the teaching process as necessary for adapting instruction to student responses, ideas, and needs.

Performances

The teacher carefully evaluates how to achieve learning goals, choosing alternative teaching strategies and materials to achieve different instructional purposes and to meet student needs (e.g. developmental stages, prior knowledge, learning styles, and interests).

The teacher uses multiple teaching and learning strategies to engage students in active learning opportunities that promote the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance capabilities and that help student assume responsibility for identifying and using learning resources.

The teacher constantly monitors and adjusts strategies in response to learner feedback. The teacher varies his or her role in the instructional process (e.g. instructor, facilitator, coach, audience) in relation to the content and purposes of instruction and the needs of students.

The teacher develops a variety of clear, accurate presentations and representations of concepts, using alternative explanations to assist students' understanding and presenting diverse perspectives to encourage critical thinking.

Principle #5: ***The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.***

Knowledge

The teacher can use knowledge about human motivation and behavior drawn from the foundational sciences of psychology, anthropology, and sociology to develop strategies for organizing and supporting individual and group work.

The teacher understands how social groups function and influence people, and how people influence groups.

The teacher knows how to help people work productively and cooperatively with each other in complex social settings.

The teacher understands the principles of effective classroom management and can use a range of strategies to promote positive relationships, cooperation, and purposeful learning in the classroom.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The teacher recognizes factors and situations that are likely to promote or diminish intrinsic motivation, and knows how to help students become self-motivated.

Dispositions

The teacher takes responsibility for establishing a positive climate in the classroom and participates in maintaining such a climate in the school as whole.

The teacher understands how participation supports commitment, and is committed to the expression and use of democratic values in the classroom.

The teacher values the role of students in promoting each other's learning and recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning.

The teacher recognizes the value of intrinsic motivation to students' life-long growth and learning. The teacher is committed to the continuous development of individual students' abilities and considers how different motivational strategies are likely to encourage this development for each student.

Performances

The teacher creates a smoothly functioning learning community in which students assume responsibility for themselves and one another, participate in decisionmaking, work collaboratively and independently, and engage in purposeful learning activities.

The teacher engages students in individual and cooperative learning activities that help them develop the motivation to achieve, by, for example, relating lessons to students' personal interests, allowing students to have choices in their learning, and leading students to ask questions and pursue problems that are meaningful to them.

The teacher organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, activities, and attention to provide active and equitable engagement of students in productive tasks.

The teacher maximizes the amount of class time spent in learning by creating expectations and processes for communication and behavior along with a physical setting conducive to classroom goals.

The teacher helps the group to develop shared values and expectations for student interactions, academic discussions, and individual and group responsibility that create a positive classroom climate of openness, mutual respect, support, and inquiry.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The teacher analyzes the classroom environment and makes decisions and adjustments to enhance social relationships, student motivation and engagement, and productive work.

The teacher organizes, prepares students for, and monitors independent and group work that allows for full and varied participation of all individuals.

Principle #6: ***The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.***

Knowledge

The teacher understands communication theory, language development, and the role of language in learning.

The teacher understands how cultural and gender differences can affect communication in the classroom.

The teacher recognizes the importance of nonverbal as well as verbal communication.

The teacher knows about and can use effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques.

Dispositions

The teacher recognizes the power of language for fostering self-expression, identity development, and learning.

The teacher values many ways in which people seek to communicate and encourages many modes of communication in the classroom.

The teacher is a thoughtful and responsive listener.

The teacher appreciates the cultural dimensions of communication, responds appropriately, and seeks to foster culturally sensitive communication by and among all students in the class.

Performances

The teacher models effective communication strategies in conveying ideas and information and in asking questions (e.g. monitoring the effects of messages, restating ideas and drawing connections, using visual, aural, and kinesthetic cues, being sensitive to nonverbal cues given and received).

The teacher supports and expands learner expression in speaking, writing, and other media.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The teacher knows how to ask questions and stimulate discussion in different ways for particular purposes, for example, probing for learner understanding, helping students articulate their ideas and thinking processes, promoting risk-taking and problem-solving, facilitating factual recall, encouraging convergent and divergent thinking, stimulating curiosity, helping students to question.

The teacher communicates in ways that demonstrate a sensitivity to cultural and gender differences (e.g. appropriate use of eye contact, interpretation of body language and verbal statements, acknowledgment of and responsiveness to different modes of communication and participation).

The teacher knows how to use a variety of media communication tools, including audio-visual aids and computers, to enrich learning opportunities.

Principle #7: ***The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.***

Knowledge

The teacher understands learning theory, subject matter, curriculum development, and student development and knows how to use this knowledge in planning instruction to meet curriculum goals.

The teacher knows how to take contextual considerations (instructional materials, individual student interests, needs, and aptitudes, and community resources) into account in planning instruction that creates an effective bridge between curriculum goals and students' experiences.

The teacher knows when and how to adjust plans based on student responses and other contingencies.

Dispositions

The teacher values both long term and short term planning.

The teacher believes that plans must always be open to adjustment and revision based on student needs and changing circumstances.

The teacher values planning as a collegial activity.

Performances

As an individual and a member of a team, the teacher selects and creates learning experiences that are appropriate for curriculum goals, relevant to learners, and based upon principles of effective instruction (e.g. that activate students' prior knowledge, anticipate preconceptions, encourage exploration and problem-solving, and build new skills on those previously acquired).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The teacher plans for learning opportunities that recognize and address variation in learning styles and performance modes.

The teacher creates lessons and activities that operate at multiple levels to meet the developmental and individual needs of diverse learners and help each progress.

The teacher creates short-range and long-term plans that are linked to student needs and performance, and adapts the plans to ensure and capitalize on student progress and motivation.

The teacher responds to unanticipated sources of input, evaluates plans in relation to short- and long-range goals, and systematically adjusts plans to meet student needs and enhance learning.

Principle #8: ***The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.***

Knowledge

The teacher understands the characteristics, uses, advantages, and limitations of different types of assessments (e.g. criterion-referenced and norm-referenced instruments, traditional standardized and performance-based tests, observation systems, and assessments of student work) for evaluating how students learn, what they know and are able to do, and what kinds of experiences will support their further growth and development.

The teacher knows how to select, construct, and use assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to the learning outcomes being evaluated and to other diagnostic purposes.

The teacher understands measurement theory and assessment-related issues, such as validity, reliability, bias, and scoring concerns.

Dispositions

The teacher values ongoing assessment as essential to the instructional process and recognizes that many different assessment strategies, accurately and systematically used, are necessary for monitoring and promoting student learning.

The teacher is committed to using assessment to identify student strengths and promote student growth rather than to deny students access to learning opportunities.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Performances

The teacher appropriately uses a variety of formal and informal assessment techniques (e.g. observation, portfolios of student work, teacher-made tests, performance tasks, projects, student self-assessments, peer assessment, and standardized tests) to enhance her or his knowledge of learners, evaluate students' progress and performances, and modify teaching and learning strategies.

The teacher solicits and uses information about students' experiences, learning behavior, needs, and progress from parents, other colleagues, and the students themselves.

The teacher uses assessment strategies to involve learners in self-assessment activities, to help them become aware of their strengths and needs, and to encourage them to set personal goals for learning.

The teacher evaluates the effect of class activities on both individuals and the class as a whole, collecting information through observation of classroom interactions, questioning, and analysis of student work.

The teacher monitors his or her own teaching strategies and behavior in relation to student success, modifying plans and instructional approaches accordingly.

The teacher maintains useful records of student work and performance and can communicate student progress knowledgeably and responsibly, based on appropriate indicators, to students, parents, and other colleagues.

Principle #9: ***The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.***

Knowledge

The teacher understands methods of inquiry that provide him/her with a variety of self- assessment and problem-solving strategies for reflecting on his/her practice, its influences on students' growth and learning, and the complex interactions between them.

The teacher is aware of major areas of research on teaching and of resources available for professional learning (e.g. professional literature, colleagues, professional associations, professional development activities).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dispositions

The teacher values critical thinking and self-directed learning as habits of mind.

The teacher is committed to reflection, assessment, and learning as an ongoing process.

The teacher is willing to give and receive help.

The teacher is committed to seeking out, developing, and continually refining practices that address the individual needs of students.

The teacher recognizes his/her professional responsibility for engaging in and supporting appropriate professional practices for self and colleagues.

Performances

The teacher uses classroom observation, information about students, and research as sources for evaluating the outcomes of teaching and learning and as a basis for experimenting with, reflecting on, and revising practice.

The teacher seeks out professional literature, colleagues, and other resources to support his/her own development as a learner and a teacher.

The teacher draws upon professional colleagues within the school and other professional arenas as supports for reflection, problem-solving and new ideas, actively sharing experiences and seeking and giving feedback.

Principle #10: ***The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.***

Knowledge

The teacher understands schools as organizations within the larger community context and understands the operations of the relevant aspects of the system(s) within which s/he works.

The teacher understands how factors in the students' environment outside of school (e.g. family circumstances, community environments, health and economic conditions) may influence students' life and learning.

The teacher understands and implements laws related to students' rights and teacher responsibilities (e.g. for equal education, appropriate education for handicapped students, confidentiality, privacy, appropriate treatment of students, reporting in situations related to possible child abuse).

Dispositions

The teacher values and appreciates the importance of all aspects of a child's experience.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The teacher is concerned about all aspects of a child's well-being (cognitive, emotional, social, and physical), and is alert to signs of difficulties.

The teacher is willing to consult with other adults regarding the education and well-being of his/her students.

The teacher respects the privacy of students and confidentiality of information.

The teacher is willing to work with other professionals to improve the overall learning environment for students.

Performances

The teacher participates in collegial activities designed to make the entire school a productive learning environment.

The teacher makes links with the learners' other environments on behalf of students, by consulting with parents, counselors, teachers of other classes and activities within the schools, and professionals in other community agencies.

The teacher can identify and use community resources to foster student learning.

The teacher establishes respectful and productive relationships with parents and guardians from diverse home and community situations, and seeks to develop cooperative partnerships in support of student learning and well being.

The teacher talks with and listens to the student, is sensitive and responsive to clues of distress, investigates situations, and seeks outside help as needed and appropriate to remedy problems.

The teacher acts as an advocate for students.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX F

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

The Five Propositions of Accomplished Teaching

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards seeks to identify and recognize teachers who effectively enhance student learning and demonstrate the high level of knowledge, skills, abilities and commitments reflected in the following five core propositions.

Teachers are committed to students and their learning.
Accomplished teachers are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They act on the belief that all students can learn. They treat students equitably, recognizing the individual differences that distinguish one student from another and taking account of these differences in their practice. They adjust their practice based on observation and knowledge of their students' interests, abilities, skills, knowledge, family circumstances and peer relationships.

Accomplished teachers understand how students develop and learn. They incorporate the prevailing theories of cognition and intelligence in their practice. They are aware of the influence of context and culture on behavior. They develop students' cognitive capacity and their respect for learning. Equally important, they foster students' self-esteem, motivation, character, civic responsibility and their respect for individual, cultural, religious and racial differences.

Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.
Accomplished teachers have a rich understanding of the subject(s) they teach and appreciate how knowledge in their subject is created, organized, linked to other disciplines and applied to real-world settings. While faithfully representing the collective wisdom of our culture and upholding the value of disciplinary knowledge, they also develop the critical and analytical capacities of their students.

Accomplished teachers command specialized knowledge of how to convey and reveal subject matter to students. They are aware of the preconceptions and background knowledge that students typically bring to each subject and of strategies and instructional materials that can be of assistance. They understand where difficulties are likely to arise and modify their practice accordingly. Their instructional repertoire allows them to create multiple paths to the subjects they teach, and they are adept at teaching students how to pose and solve their own problems.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.
Accomplished teachers create, enrich, maintain and alter instructional settings to capture and sustain the interest of their students and to make the most effective use of time. They also are adept at engaging students and adults to assist their teaching and at enlisting their colleagues' knowledge and expertise to complement their own.

Accomplished teachers command a range of generic instructional techniques, know when each is appropriate and can implement them as needed. They are as aware of ineffectual or damaging practice as they are devoted to elegant practice.

They know how to engage groups of students to ensure a disciplined learning environment, and how to organize instruction to allow the schools' goals for students to be met. They are adept at setting norms for social interaction among students and between students and teachers. They understand how to motivate students to learn and how to maintain their interest even in the face of temporary failure.

Accomplished teachers can assess the progress of individual students as well as that of the class as a whole. They employ multiple methods for measuring student growth and understanding and can clearly explain student performance to parents.

Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.
Accomplished teachers are models of educated persons, exemplifying the virtues they seek to inspire in students -- curiosity, tolerance, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity and appreciation of cultural differences -- and the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual growth: the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation.

Accomplished teachers draw on their knowledge of human development, subject matter and instruction, and their understanding of their students to make principled judgments about sound practice. Their decisions are not only grounded in the literature, but also in their experience. They engage in lifelong learning which they seek to encourage in their students.

Striving to strengthen their teaching, accomplished teachers critically examine their practice, seek to expand their repertoire, deepen their knowledge, sharpen their judgment and adapt their teaching to new findings, ideas and theories.

Teachers are members of learning communities.
Accomplished teachers contribute to the effectiveness of the school by working collaboratively with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development. They can evaluate school progress and the allocation of school resources in light of their understanding of state and local educational objectives. They are knowledgeable about specialized school and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

community resources that can be engaged for their students' benefit, and are skilled at employing such resources as needed.

Accomplished teachers find ways to work collaboratively and creatively with parents, engaging them productively in the work of the school.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Guiding Questions for Interview with Dr. Jeanne Burns, Director
Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality
June 16, 2000

1) What are the origins of Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality?

2) What fostered collaboration between the Board of Regents and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education behind Commission efforts?

3) How have Congress' Title II directives driven Commission goals/actions?

4) Why were Texas and North Carolina the two states most often used as reference points for Commission discussions and the sources for Commission consultants?

5) Why did Commission materials include the Fordham Foundation Report?

6) How did you become involved with the Commission?

7) How has your assignment through the Governor's Office affected Commission proceedings?

8) Who served on the smaller Planning Committee that met in between Commission meetings? What was this committee's role?

9) What are the Commission's goals?

10) What do you see as possible barriers to these goals? Flaws?

11) What have been responses at the national level to the Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX H

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOCUS AREAS

YEAR ONE: 1999-2000

A. ***More Effective Certification Structure.*** A more effective performance based (as compared to course driven) certification structure for individuals pursuing traditional certification pathways (e.g., Bachelor's Degree: Education), alternate certification pathways (e.g., Bachelor's Degree Outside Education), and advanced/continuing certification pathways (e.g., Graduate Programs; National Board Certification, etc.).

B. ***Accountability of Teacher Preparation Programs.*** A more effective process that bases state program and degree approval of teacher preparation programs upon multiple factors (e.g., national accreditation, program approval, successful performance of teachers, success of K-12 students taught by new teachers, etc.) Areas to be addressed include:

1) ***Higher Expectations for New Teachers.*** Consistent high expectations for what new teachers should know and be able to do in the areas of classroom management (behavioral and developmental), educational technology, and the four core content areas (English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) as they exit public and private universities and enter the teaching profession.

2) ***Process to Assess the Effectiveness of Teacher Preparation Programs.*** A more effective process to assess teacher preparation programs. *(The process should address the: [a] alignment of requirements for national accreditation, degree approval [BoR], and program approval [BESE] and [b] use of data pertaining to the demonstrated effectiveness of new teachers (e.g., performance-based assessments; academic achievement of K-12 students, etc.) Who graduate from teacher preparation programs. This process should also include procedures to identify and assist "at-risk" and "low performing" teacher preparation programs and terminate programs that are not approved by the State.)*

3) ***Report to the Public.*** Annual Report Card with meaningful data (e.g., passage rate of teachers on national exams, performance of K-12 students of university graduates, etc.) Pertaining to the effectiveness of public and private teacher preparation programs in preparing new teachers.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

C. ***Recruitment and Retention.*** More effective strategies for universities and districts to recruit and retain a greater number of quality teachers. Areas to be addressed include strategies for universities and districts to recruit individuals to enter the teaching profession, strategies for districts to recruit certified teachers, strategies for universities and districts to recruit individuals to enter the teaching profession, stratgies for districts to recruit certified teachers, strategies for unviersities and districts to retain effective new and experienced teachers, and an Annaul Report Card with meaningful data pertaining to the recruitment and retention of high quality teachers.

D. ***Alignment of Teacher Quality Initiatives and Funding of New Policies.*** An alignment of existing and new teacher quality initiatives and identification of funding strategies for universities and districts to implement recommended policies and strategies.

YEAR TWO: 2000-2001

E. ***Professional Support for All Teachers.*** Meaningful opportunities for new and existing teachers to pursue advanced levels of professional development.

F. ***Effective Principals.*** A more effective process to recruit, prepare, certify, and retain effective principals who possess the necessary leadership skills to create learning communities wherein K-12 students demonstrate improved academic achievement.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX I

NEW TEACHER CERTIFICATION STRUCTURE

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

NEW CERTIFICATION STRUCTURE

A. RECOMMENDED CHANGES

1. Have the universities recommend that teachers be issued Level 1 Teaching Certificates when they have met state certification requirements and hold the universities accountable for the success of the teachers that they recommend for certification.

   This would eliminate the need for the Louisiana Department of Education to count hours on transcripts and allow the department to become more involved in providing support to universities to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs. (Note: The Louisiana Department of Education would still continue to review transcripts and issue certificates to out-of-state teachers.)

2. Change the certification structure to allow teachers to develop more content knowledge in the grade levels in which they are expected to teach and provide them with more flexible hours to add special education and other grade levels to their certification areas. This would allow new teachers to be certified in one or two areas when completing a 124 credit hour undergraduate degree program.

   See "B. New Certification Areas and Courses" for the areas of certification that are more content specific.

   See "C. Additional Certifications" for requirements to add additional areas of certification.

3. Require all new teachers to receive mentoring during their first year of the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program and have them undergo the assessment during the second year.

4. Require all teachers to pass the teacher assessment and teach for a total of three years before being issued a Level 2 teaching certificate.

5. Require all new teachers to undergo a predetermined amount of professional development during a five year time period in order to have their teaching certificates renewed for 5 years. Have the Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality develop the details for the professional development system during 2000-2001.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

B. NEW CERTIFICATION AREAS AND COURSES

1. Common Elements of Basic Certification for All Grade Levels:

a. General Education Coursework	Same general coursework areas and hours (e.g., 54 hours) for Grades 1-6 and 4-8.
b. Knowledge of the Learner and Learning Environment	Same general coursework areas and hours (e.g., 15 hours) for all PK-12 teachers.
c. Teaching Methodology	Varying requirements based upon focus areas.
d. Student Teaching	Same requirements and hours (e.g., 9 hours) for all PK-12 teachers.

2. Differing Elements of Basic Certification:

a. Focus Areas	Four new focus areas: (1) Preschool to Grade 2 (Focus: Greater Depth in Early Childhood, Reading/Language Arts, and Mathematics) (2) Grades 1-6 (Focus: Greater Depth in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics) (3) Grades 4-8 (Focus: Greater Depth in Content - Generic or Two In-depth Teaching Areas) (4) Grades 7-12 (Focus: Greater Depth in Content - Primary Teaching Area and Secondary Teaching Area) *Primary Teaching Area:* Preservice teachers must complete at least 31 credit hours in a specific content area (e.g., English, Mathematics, etc.). AND *Secondary Teaching Area*: Preservice teachers must complete at least 19 credit hours in a second content area (e.g., Science, Social Studies, etc.).
b. Flexible University Hours	Flexible hours that may be used by the universities to create quality teacher preparation programs.

3. Additional Certifications:

Additional grade level certifications that would require approximately 12-15 credit hours. Universities could create programs that would allow teachers to obtain more than one type of certification within the 124 total hours by using the "flexible hours" to add additional grade level or special education certifications.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

B. NEW CERTIFICATION AREAS AND COURSES (CONT'D)

AREAS		GRADES PK - 2 BASIC CERTIFICATION (FOCUS: GREATER DEPTH IN EARLY CHILDHOOD, READING/LANGUAGE ARTS, AND MATHEMATICS)	GRADES 1-6 BASIC CERTIFICATION (FOCUS: GREATER DEPTH IN READING/LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS)	GRADES 4-8 BASIC CERTIFICATION (FOCUS: GREATER DEPTH IN CONTENT - GENERIC OR TWO IN-DEPTH TEACHING AREAS)	GRADES 7-12 BASIC CERTIFICATION (FOCUS: GREATER DEPTH IN CONTENT - PRIMARY TEACHING AREA AND SECONDARY TEACHING AREA
GENERAL EDUCATION COURSEWORK	English	12 Hours	12 hours	12 hours	6 hours
	Mathematics	9 Hours	12 hours	12 hours	6 hours
	Sciences	9 Hours	15 hours	15 hours	9 hours
	Social Studies	6 Hours	12 hours	12 hours	6 hours
	Arts	3 Hours	3 hours	3 hours	3 hours

FOCUS AREAS	Young Child		Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics		Generic OR Two In-depth Teaching Areas: Generic		Generic OR Two In-depth Teaching Areas: Two In-depth Teaching Areas		Primary Teaching Area and Secondary Teaching Area	
	Nursery School and Kindergarten	12 hours	Reading/ Language Arts (Additional Content and Teaching Methodology)	12 hours	Additional Content:		In-depth Teaching Area #1		Primary Teaching Area	22 or more hours if in Science OR 25 or more hours if in English, Social Studies, or Math. OR 31 or more hours if in other areas
	Reading/ Language Arts (Additional Content and Teaching Methodology)	12 Hours			English	3 hours	English/ Social Studies/ Mathematics OR Science	7 or more hours	*General Education (if applicable) and Focus Area hours should equal 31 total hours.*	
	Mathematics (Additional Content and Teaching Methodology)	9 hours			Mathematics	3 hours	*General Education and Focus Area hours should equal 19 total hours.*	4 or more hours		
					Science	3 hours				
					Social Studies	3 hours				
			Mathematics (Additional Content and Teaching Methodology)	9 hours			In-depth Teaching Area #2: English/ Social Studies/ Mathematics OR Science	7 or more hours	Secondary Teaching Area	13 or more hours if in English, Social Studies, or Math OR 10 or more hours if in Science OR 19 or more hours if in other areas
							General Education and Focus Area hours should equal 19 total hours.	4 or more hours	*General Education (if applicable) and Focus Area hours should equal 19 total hours.*	

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

B. NEW CERTIFICATION AREAS AND COURSES (CONT'D)

AREAS		GRADES PK - 2 CERTIFICATION (FOCUS: GREATER DEPTH IN EARLY CHILDHOOD, READING/LANGUAGE ARTS, AND MATHEMATICS)	GRADES 1-6 CERTIFICATION (FOCUS: GREATER DEPTH IN READING/LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS)	GRADES 4-8 CERTIFICATION (FOCUS: GREATER DEPTH IN CONTENT - GENERIC OR TWO IN-DEPTH TEACHING AREAS)		GRADES 7-12 CERTIFICATION (FOCUS: GREATER DEPTH IN CONTENT - PRIMARY TEACHING AREA AND SECONDARY TEACHING AREA)
KNOWLEDGE OF LEARNER AND THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT *(These hours may be integrated into other areas when developing new courses.)*	Child/Adolescent Development/Psychology, Educational Psychology, The Learner with Special Needs, Classroom Organization and Management, Multicultural Education (Note: All of these areas should address the needs of the regular and exceptional child.)	15 hours Emphasis Upon Early Childhood	15 hours Emphasis Upon Elementary School Student	15 hours Emphasis Upon Middle School Student		15 hours Emphasis Upon Middle and High School Student
METHODOLOGY AND TEACHING	Reading	[illegible]	[illegible]	6 hours		3 hours
	Teaching Methodology	6 hours	6 hours	9 hours		6 hours
	Student Teaching**	9 hours	9 hours	9 hours		9 hours
FLEXIBLE HOURS FOR THE UNIVERSITY'S USE		22 hours***	19 hours	Generic	Two In-depth Teaching Areas	17-26 hours
				19 hours	17-20 hours	
TOTAL HOURS****		124 hours	124 hours	124 hours		124 hours

* If students do not possess basic technology skills, they should be provided coursework or opportunities to develop those skills early in their program.

** Students must spend a minimum of 270 clock hours in student teaching with at least 180 of such hours spent in actual teaching. A substantial portion of the 180 hours of actual student teaching shall be on an all-day basis.

*** Three of the flexible hours must be in the "humanities". This must occur to meet General Education Requirements for the Board of Regents.

*** In addition to the student teaching experience, students should be provided actual teaching experience (in addition to observations) in classroom settings during their sophomore, junior, and senior years within schools with varied socioeconomic and cultural characteristics. It is recommended that preservice teachers be provided a minimum of 180 hours of direct teaching experience in field-based settings prior to student teaching.

Notes: Minimum credit hours have been listed. Programs may use the flexible hours to add more content hours to the various elements of the program.
The Board of Regents defines a "major" as being 25% of the total number of hours in a degree program; thus, 25% of 124 credit hours is 31 credit hours.
The Board of Regents defines a "minor" as being 15% of the total number of hours in a degree program; thus 15% of 124 credit hours is 19 credit hours.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

C. ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATIONS

It is recommended that universities consider using their flexible hours to provide preservice teachers opportunities to select additional areas to add to their certification - either special education or extended grade level certifications - when they obtain their Bachelor degree. The additional hours would provide preservice teachers with the necessary core knowledge to teach the additional content necessary for the new certification areas .

BASIC CERTIFICATIONS	ADD-ON CERTIFICATIONS			TOTAL HOURS
	NEW CERTIFICATIONS	ADDITIONAL COURSES AND HOURS		
GRADES PK - 2	GRADES 1-6	Content Emphasis: Sciences Social Studies Mathematics	 6 Hours 6 Hours 3 Hours	15 Hours
GRADES 1-6	GRADES PK - 2	Content Emphasis: Nursery School and Kindergarten	 12 Hours	12 Hours
GRADES 1-6	GRADES 4-8 (Generic)	Content Emphasis: English Mathematics Science Social Studies	 3 Hours 3 Hours 4 Hours 3 Hours	13 Hours
GRADES 4-8	GRADES 1-6	Reading/Language Arts and Math Emphasis: Reading/ Language Arts Mathematics	 9 Hours 3 Hours	12 Hours
GRADES 1-6, GRADES 4-8, OR GRADES 7-12	Mild/Moderate Special Education	Special Education Emphasis*: Methods and Materials for Mild/Moderate Exceptional Children, Assessment and Evaluation of Exceptional Learners, Behavioral Management of Mild/Moderate Exceptional Children, and Vocational and Transition Services for Students with Disabilities Practicum in Assessment and Evaluation of Mild/Moderate Exceptional Children (Note: This should not be required if students participate in student teaching that combines regular and special education teaching experiences.) * General knowledge of exceptional students and classroom organization should be addressed in the curriculum for all teachers under "Knowledge of Learner and the Learning Environment".	 12 Hours 3 Hours	12 Hours (Additional 3 Hour Practicum if not Integrated into Other Field-Based Experiences and Student Teaching)

APPENDIX J

PRACTITIONER TEACHING PROGRAM

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

PRACTITIONER TEACHER PROGRAM

A. MAJOR COMPONENTS OF THE PRACTITIONER TEACHER PROGRAM

1. Universities, school districts, or private providers (e.g., Teach for America) will be able to offer a Practitioner Teacher Program.

2. Individuals will be considered for admission to a Practitioner Teacher Program if they possess a baccalaureate degree and already possess the content knowledge to teach the subject area(s). To demonstrate knowledge of subject area(s), all individuals (with the exception of those who already possess a graduate degree) will be required to pass the Pre-Professional Skills Test (e.g., reading, writing, and mathematics) for the PRAXIS. Teachers of grades 1-6 (regular and special education) must pass the *Elementary School: Content Area* specialty examination on the PRAXIS, and teachers of grades 4-8 (regular and special education) must pass the *Middle School: Content Area* specialty examination. Teachers of grades 7-12 (regular and special education) must pass the *specialty examination* on the PRAXIS in the content area(s) (e.g., English, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, etc.) in which they intend to be certified.

3. All individuals admitted to the Practitioner Teacher Program ,who intend to be certified to teach grades 1-6, 4-8, or 7-12, must successfully complete 9 credit hours (or 135 contact hours) of instruction during the summer prior to the first year of teaching. Practitioner teachers will be exposed to teaching experiences in field-based schools while involved in course work.

4. All practitioner teachers will teach during the regular school year in the area(s) in which they are pursuing certification and participate in 9 credit hours (or 135 contact hours) of seminars and supervised internship during the fall and spring that will address their immediate needs. Practitioner teachers will be observed and provided feedback about their teaching from the program provider. In addition, practitioner teachers will be supported by school-based mentors from the Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program and principals.

5. Practitioner teachers who complete the required course requirements (or equivalent contact hours) and demonstrate *proficiency* during their first year of teaching can obtain a Level 2 Professional License after successfully completing all requirements for the Practitioner Teacher Program (which includes successful completion of the Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program and passing scores on the PRAXIS) and completing a total of three years of teaching.

6. Practitioner teachers who complete the required courses (or equivalent contact hours) and demonstrate *weaknesses* during their first year of teaching will be required to complete from 1 to 12 additional credit hours/equivalent contact hours. A team composed of the program provider, school principal, mentor teacher, and practitioner teacher will determine the types of courses and hours to be completed. Number of hours will be based upon the extent of the practitioner teachers' needs and must be completed within the next two years. The team will also determine when the practitioner teachers should be assessed for the Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program during the next two year time period. The practitioner teachers must successfully complete all requirements for the Practitioner Teacher Program (which includes successful completion of the Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program and passing scores on the PRAXIS in the specialty areas) and teach for a total of three years before receiving a Level 2 Professional License.

7. The state's new Teacher Preparation Accountability System will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of all Practitioner Teacher Programs.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

B. STRUCTURE FOR ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL PRACTITIONER TEACHER PROGRAM

PROGRAM PROVIDERS

Practitioner Teacher Programs may be developed and administered by:

- universities;
- school districts; and
- other agencies (e.g., Teach for America, Troops for Teachers, Regional Service Centers, etc.).

The same state Teacher Preparation Accountability System will be utilized to assess the effectiveness of the Practitioner Teacher Programs provided by universities, school districts, and other agencies.

PROGRAM PROCESS

Areas	*Course/Contact Hours*	*Activities*	*Support*
I. ADMISSION TO PROGRAM (Spring and Early Summer)		Program providers will work with district personnel to identify Practitioner Teacher Program candidates who will be employed by districts during the fall and spring. To be admitted, individuals must: a. Possess a baccalaureate degree. b. Pass the Pre-Professional Skills Test (e.g., reading, writing, and mathematics) on the PRAXIS. (Individuals who already possess a graduate degree will be exempted from this requirement.) c. Pass the content specific examinations for the PRAXIS: (1) Practitioner candidates for Grades 1-6 (regular and special education): Pass the *Elementary School - Content Knowledge* examination; (2) Practitioner candidates for Grades 4-8 (regular and special education): Pass the *Middle School - Content Knowledge* examination. (3) Practitioner candidates for Grades 7-12 (regular and special education): Pass the *content specialty examination(s)* (e.g., English, Mathematics, etc.) on the PRAXIS in the content area(s) in which they intend to teach. d. Meet other noncourse requirements established by the program providers.	

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

B. STRUCTURE FOR AN ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE, AND HIGH SCHOOL PRACTITIONER TEACHING PROGRAM (CONT'D)

PROGRAM PROCESS (CONT'D)

Areas	*Course/Contact Hours*	*Activities*	*Support*
2. TEACHING PREPARATION (Summer)	9 credit hours or 135 equivalent contact hours (5-8 weeks)	All teachers will participate in field-based experiences in school settings while completing the summer courses (or equivalent contact hours). Grades 1-6, 4-8, and 9-12 practitioner teachers will complete courses (or equivalent contact hours) pertaining to child/adolescent development/psychology, the diverse learner, classroom management/organization, assessment, instructional design, and instructional strategies before starting their teaching internships. Mild/moderate special education teachers will take courses (or equivalent contact hours) that focus upon the special needs of the mild/moderate exceptional child, classroom management, behavioral management, assessment and evaluation, methods/materials for mild/moderate exceptional children, and vocational and transition services for students with disabilities.	Program Providers
3. TEACHING INTERNSHIP AND FIRST YEAR SUPPORT (Fall and Spring)	9 credit hours or 135 equivalent contact hours throughout the year. (Note: No fewer than 45 contact hours should occur during the fall.)	Practitioner teachers will assume full-time teaching positions in districts. During the school year, these individuals will participate in two seminars (one seminar during the fall and one seminar during the spring) that address immediate needs of the Practitioner Teacher Program teachers and receive one-on-one supervision through an internship provided by the program providers. The practitioner teacher will also receive support from school-based mentor teachers (provided by the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program) and principals.	Program Providers, Principals and Mentors
4. TEACHING PERFORMANCE REVIEW (End of First Year)		Program providers, principals, mentors, and practitioner teachers will form teams to review the first year teaching performance of practitioner teachers and determine the extent to which the practitioner teachers have demonstrated teaching proficiency. If practitioner teachers demonstrated proficiency, they will enter into the assessment portion of the Louisiana Teacher and Assessment Program during the next fall. If weaknesses are cited, the teams will identify additional types of instruction needed to address the areas of need. Prescriptive plans that require from 1 to 12 credit hours (or 1-180 equivalent contact hours) of instruction will be developed for practitioner teachers. In addition, the teams will determine if the practitioner teachers should participate in the new teacher assessment during the fall or if the practitioner teachers should receive additional mentor support and be assessed after the fall.	

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

B. STRUCTURE FOR AN ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE, AND HIGH SCHOOL PRACTITIONER TEACHING PROGRAM (CONT'D)

PROGRAM PROCESS (CONT'D)

Areas	*Course/Contact Hours*	*Activities*	*Support*
5. PRESCRIPTIVE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION (Second Year)	1-12 credit hours (or 15-180 equivalent hours)	Practitioner teachers who demonstrate areas of need will complete prescriptive plans.	Program Providers
6. LOUISIANA ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (Second Year)		Practitioner teachers will be assessed during the fall or later depending upon their teaching proficiencies.	Program Providers
7. PRAXIS REVIEW (Second Year)		Program providers will offer review sessions to prepare practitioner teachers to pass remaining components of the PRAXIS.	Program Providers
8. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS (Requirements must be met within a 3 year time period. The Practitioner Teaching License will not be renewed.)		Program providers will submit signed statements to the Louisiana Department of Education which indicate that the practitioner teachers completed Practitioner Teacher Programs and met the following requirements within a three year time period: 1. Passed the PPST components of the PRAXIS. *(Note: This test was required for admission.)* 2. Completed the Teaching Preparation and Teaching Internship segments of the program. 3. Passed the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program. 4. Completed prescriptive plans (if weaknesses were demonstrated). 5. Passed the speciality examination (PRAXIS) for their area(s) of certification. a. Grades 1-6: *Elementary School - Content Knowledge (Note: This test was required for admission)* b. Grades 4-8: *Middle School - Content Knowledge (Note: This test was required for admission.)* c. Grades 7-12: *Specialty content test in areas to be certified. (Note: This test was required for admission.)* d. Mild/Moderate Special Education: *Special Education* 6. Passed the *Principals of Learning and Teaching* examination (PRAXIS). a. Grades 7-12: *Principles of Learning and Teaching* b. Grades 4-8: *Principles of Learning and Teaching* c. Grades 1-6: *Principles of Learning and Teaching*	

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

B. STRUCTURE FOR AN ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE, AND HIGH SCHOOL PRACTITIONER TEACHING PROGRAM (CONT'D)

PROGRAM PROCESS (CONT'D)

Areas	*Course/Contact Hours*	*Activities*	*Support*
9. ONGOING SUPPORT (Second and Third Year)		Program providers will provide support services to practitioner teachers during their second and third years of teaching. Types of support may include: on-line support, Internet resources, special seminars, etc.	Program Providers
10. LEVEL 1 to Level 2 PROFESSIONAL LICENSE		Practitioner teachers will be issued a Level 1 - Practitioner License when they enter the program. They will be issued a Level 2 Professional License once they complete the Practitioner Teacher Program and have a total of 3 years of teaching.	
11. RELICENSURE		Practitioner teachers will be required to complete a predetermined amount of professional development over a five year time period in order to have their licenses renewed. Licences must be renewed every five years. Details for the professional development structure should be developed by the Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality during 2000-2001.	

UNDERGRADUATE/GRADUATE COURSES AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Universities may offer the courses at undergraduate or graduate levels. Efforts should be made to allow students to use graduate hours as electives if pursuing a graduate degree.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

C. PROPOSED TYPES OF LICENSES

TYPES OF LICENSES	*CRITERIA FOR LICENSES*		
TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE *(Teachers may hold a Temporary Certificate for a maximum of 3 years while pursuing a specific certification area. They may not be issued another Temporary Certification at the end of the three years for the same certification area unless the Louisiana Department of Education designates the certification area as one that requires extensive hours for completion.)*	Districts may recommend that teachers be given one year temporary certificates for one of the following reasons:	*CONDITIONS*	*REQUIREMENTS TO MOVE TO ANOTHER LICENSURE LEVEL*
		a. Uncertified teachers who graduate from teacher preparation programs but do not pass the PRAXIS.	Teachers must prepare for the PRAXIS and take the necessary examinations at least twice a year.
		b. Uncertified teachers who apply for admission to Practitioner Teacher Programs but do not pass the PPST or content specialty examinations on the PRAXIS.	Teachers must take a minimum of 6 credit hours per year in the subject area(s) they are attempting to pass on the PRAXIS.
		c. Uncertified teachers hired after the start of the Practitioner Teacher Programs.	Teachers must apply for admission to a Practitioner Teacher Program and take the appropriate PRAXIS examinations.
		d. Certified teachers hired to teach in areas outside of their field of certification.	Teachers must take a minimum of 6 credit hours per year of courses that lead toward certification in the area in which they are teaching.
LEVEL 1 LICENSE *(Teachers may hold a Level 1 license for a total of 3 years in their careers.)*	Practitioner License	Teachers must be admitted to a Practitioner Teacher Program to receive a Level 1 Practitioner License.	
	Professional License	Teachers must graduate from a state approved teacher preparation program, pass PRAXIS, and be recommended by a university to receive a Level 1 Professional License.	
LEVEL 2 PROFESSIONAL LICENSE	Practitioner License Holders	Teachers with Level 1 Practitioner Licenses must complete all requirements for the Practitioner Teacher Program and teach for a total of three years to receive a Level 2 Professional License.	
	Level 1 License Holders	Teachers with Level 1 Professional Licenses must pass the Louisiana Assistance and Assessment Program and teach for three years to receive a Level 2 Professional License.	
LEVEL 3 PROFESSIONAL LICENSE	Teachers must complete a Masters Degree and teach for a minimum of three years to receive a Level 3 Professional License.		
RENEWAL OF LICENSES	Teachers must complete a predetermined amount of professional development over a 5 year time period in order to have Level 2 and Level 3 Professional Licenses renewed. Professional development should include university courses, National Board Certification, and other forms of professional development. Details pertaining to the professional development should be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality during 2000-2001.		

APPENDIX K

TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

QUESTIONS	CONSIDERATIONS
Conditions to Offer Teacher Preparation Program 1. What conditions should exist in 2000-2001 for universities to offer teacher preparation programs for state teacher certification?	Universities should meet the following preconditions to offer teacher preparation programs: a. Possess NCATE accreditation and state approval (public universities) or state approval (private universities). b. (Spring, 2001) Possess a PK-16+ Council that is chaired by the university president/chancellor. c. (Spring, 2001) Possess a PK-16+ Coordinator who answers to the president/chancellor. d. (Spring, 2001) Begin developing or possess a Blue Ribbon Professional Development School.
Condition to Maintain Teacher Preparation Programs 2. What future condition should exist for universities to maintain teacher preparation program approval?	Universities should demonstrate growth as defined by the Louisiana Teacher Preparation Accountability System to maintain Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education program approval.
Indicators 3. What indicators should be used to determine if teacher preparation programs have demonstrated growth?	The following indicators are being considered to determine if teacher preparation programs have demonstrated growth. A subcommittee of the Blue Ribbon Commission will meet during summer, 2000 to finalize recommendations for indicators. a. Amount of development demonstrated by preservice teachers in a cohort from the point of entering the teacher preparation program (e.g., PRAXIS: Pre-Professional Skills Test or ACT) to the point of exiting the teacher preparation program (e.g., PRAXIS: Principles of Learning and Teaching). *(During undergraduate program.)* b. % of teachers in a cohort who pass all areas of the PRAXIS for state certification. *(End of undergraduate program.)* c. Teachers' evaluation of their teacher preparation programs - mean score on survey instrument. *(End of first year.)* d. Principals' evaluation of the teacher preparation programs of individual teachers - mean score on survey instrument. (End of second year.) e. Increase in % of regular and alternate certification teachers who graduate from teacher preparation programs and meet certification requirements in teacher shortage areas (e.g., mathematics, science, special education, and middle school). f. Increase in total % of regular and alternate certification teachers who graduate from teacher preparation programs and meet certification requirements. g. Growth in academic achievement of students in grades 4-8. *(Note: This indicator may be used in the future.)*

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D)

QUESTIONS	PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS
Teacher Preparation Program Performance Score 4. How should effectiveness of teacher preparation programs be measured?	A key component of the Teacher Preparation Accountability System should be the creation of *single composite scores* for individual universities, called *Teacher Preparation Performance Scores*. The calculation of these scores should be based upon a formula that examines how well universities perform on each of the indicators identified in question three. These scores should range from 0 to beyond 100, with a score of 100 indicating that a university possesses a quality program. Universities should be given labels based upon their teacher preparation program Scores. All universities should be expected to achieve a Teacher Preparation Performance Score of 100 and achieve a "Quality" status by 2004-2005. It is recommended that the labels be the following: Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program = Performance Score of 125 and above Quality Teacher Preparation Program = Performance Score of 100-124 Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program = Performance 80- 99 At-Risk Teacher Preparation Program = Performance Score of cut-off score - 79 Unacceptable Teacher Preparation Program = Performance Score below the cut-off score Criteria should be established to specify the values that must be attained in order to receive points at each of the five levels (e.g., Unacceptable, At-Risk, Satisfactory, Quality, and Exemplary). The same criteria should be used from 2001-2005. New criteria should be established for 2005 - 2009, 2009-2013, etc. for each of the five labels. Universities should be expected to demonstrate additional growth to meet the new criteria and maintain the labels.
Growth Targets 5. How should the state determine if improvement is being demonstrated?	Baseline data should be gathered for all universities. The baseline data should be used to assign each university its first Teacher Preparation Performance Score during spring, 2001. Each university should be given four years to move from its initial Teacher Preparation Performance Score to a score of 100 or better. Each university should be given a *growth target* which represents how much a university's teacher preparation program is expected to improve. Once universities obtain a "Quality" status, they should be given growth targets to reach the "Exemplary" status.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D)

QUESTIONS	PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS
Rewards 6. Should universities be rewarded for high performance and/or growth?	Universities should receive rewards. Types of rewards could be: ***Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program*** a. Positive label. b. Public ceremony to recognize universities. c. Public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports. d. Extra 5 points assigned to universities when grant proposals pertaining to education are submitted for state funds. e. Preference given to universities when grant proposals are submitted for funds from private foundations in Louisiana. ***Quality Teacher Preparation Program*** a. Positive Label b. Public ceremony to recognize universities. c. Public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports. ***Attainment of Growth Target*** a. Positive Label. b. Public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports. c. Additional funds to teacher preparation programs through performance funding.
Corrective Actions 7. What should happen when universities obtain an "unacceptable" status or fail to meet their growth targets?	If teacher preparation programs fall below a minimum level of acceptable performance or they fail to meet their growth targets, they should enter into corrective actions. A subcommittee of the Blue Ribbon Commission will meet during summer, 2000 to finalize recommendations for corrective actions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D)

QUESTIONS	PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS
Timelines 8. When should universities be given their first "Teacher Preparation Performance Score"?	The first "Teacher Preparation Performance Score" should be announced during spring, 2001. Data from the following cohort groups should be used to calculate the first Teacher Preparation Performance Scores: 1999-2000 Cohort: PRAXIS Examination 1999-2000 Cohort: Graduates in Teacher Shortage Areas 1999-2000 Cohort: Total Number of Graduates 1998-1999 Cohort: Teacher Survey 1997-1998 Cohort: Principal Survey The first cycle should be: July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2005. All universities should be expected to be at a "Quality" status by June 30, 2005.

VITA

Patricia Ann Davis Exner has twenty-six years of experience in secondary and teacher education. She graduated from Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College in 1973 with a bachelor of science degree in English and Social Studies Education and in 1980 with a master's of education degree in Administration and Supervision.

A teacher of middle and high school English and social studies in the East Baton Rouge Parish Public School System, Patricia also taught secondary English at the Louisiana State University Laboratory School. In 1988, she began the next stage of her professional career as Louisiana State University supervisor of English and social studies student teachers, general supervisor of the postbaccalaureate alternative certification internship program, and instructor of English and social studies pedagogy classes. She assumed administrative responsibilities first in 1991 as Coordinator of Clinical Experiences and presently serves as Assistant Dean in the College of Education. She began her doctoral studies in teacher education in the early 1990s, focusing on teacher education reform.

Active in various professional organizations including the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators, Patricia served as 1998-99 president of the Louisiana Association of Teacher Educators. She has served on numerous committees at the college and university levels, including those charged with curricular redesign and with collaborative partnerships with regional public schools and Southern University. She has also served on several committees at the Louisiana State

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

University Laboratory School, including its first Town Meeting Advisory Board and the Parent-Teacher-Student Advisory Council, serving as president in 1998-99.

Patricia is married to Jerry L. Exner, a 1974 graduate in accounting from Louisiana State University and a partner with Soileau and Exner, CPAs. They are the parents of John Benjamin, a senior majoring in Finance in the E.J. Ourso College of Business Administration, Louisiana State University; Sara Elizabeth, a sophomore majoring in public relations in the Manship School of Mass Communication, Louisiana State University; and Amanda Leigh, a junior and member of the first International Baccalaureate class at the Louisiana State University Laboratory School. Patricia is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Johnny H. Davis, her father a Professor Emeritus, Department of Agronomy, and Director Emeritus, Iberia Research Station, Louisiana State University. She will be awarded the doctor of philosophy degree in August, 2001.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

DOCTORAL EXAMINATION AND DISSERTATION REPORT

Candidate: Patricia Ann Davis Exner

Major Field: Curriculum and Instruction

Title of Dissertation: Teacher Education Reform and Accountability: A Study of the Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality

Approved:

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Date of Examination:

April 2, 2001

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.