

Approved: 3/7/01
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE K-12 EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Ralph Tanner at 9:00 a.m. on February 15, 2001 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present: Ben Barrett, Legislative Research
Avis Swartzman, Revisor of Statutes
Ann Deitcher, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Peg Dunlap, Kansas National Education Association

The Chair introduced Senator Dwayne Umbarger, Chairman of the Senate Education Committee who, along with members of his Committee were present.

Dale Dennis then introduced the 2000 Kansas Recipients of the Milken Family Foundation National Educators Award.

Speaking briefly of their backgrounds in teaching were: Alice Bertels of the State Street Elementary School in Topeka; Nancy Harman of the Kathryn O'Loughlin McCarthy Elementary School in Hays and Jeffery McAdoo of the Quail Run Elementary School in Lawrence. Others introduced were former recipients of the Milken Award who were in the audience.

Dale Dennis explained the Milken award to new Committee members.

HB 2217 - School districts, transportation of nonresident pupils.

The motion was made by Representative Lloyd and seconded by Representative Horst that HB 2217 be moved favorably for passage. The Chair, being in doubt of the vote, asked for a show of hands. The motion carried.

Representative Tomlinson wished to be recorded as a nay vote.

Peg Dunlap appeared as a proponent of both **HB 2288** and **HB 2335**. (Attachment 1).

Chairman Tanner spoke to the Committee in support of **HB 2288**. (Attachment 2). He also provided copies of a Minority Report on an Action Plan for Kansas Public Education in the 21st Century. (Attachment 2).

Representative Kenny Wilk, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, spoke in support of **HB 2288** and **HB 2335**. (Attachment 4.)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 16, 2001.



KANSAS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION / 715 SW 10TH AVENUE / TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1686

Peg Dunlap testimony
House Education Committee
February 13, 2001

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on behalf of the members of Kansas National Education Association, I am here to speak with you today about HB 2288 and HB 2335, both dealing with alternate teacher preparation programs.

Since 1991, Kansas NEA has had a position on alternative routes to certification/licensure. I would like you to know what that position says:

Kansas NEA believes that alternative routes to certification/licensure should be available for persons already holding baccalaureate degrees in other fields. To receive a certificate, an alternative route candidate must achieve the same state standards in basic skills, subject matter knowledge, and pedagogy as those required of traditional route candidates.

We respectfully request that you take no action on these two bills, as the License Redesign passed last year by the State Board of Education provides for alternative route programs already.

House Education Committee

Date: 2/15/01

Attachment # 1-1

Comparison of Alternative Certification models

Prepared by Peg Dunlap, Director of Instructional Advocacy
 Kansas National Education Association
 February 12, 2001

	HB 2288 Rep. Tanner	HB 2335 Reps. Landwehr, DeCastro, Huebert	S.B.R. 91-1-200 et. seq. Redesign of Licensure Kansas State Board of Education
Prerequisites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BA or higher degree • 2.75 gpa on 4.0 scale • credits to meet subject & field requirements • NTE core battery, at national mean score • offer of employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BA or higher degree • 2.75 gpa on 4.0 scale • credits to meet subject & field requirements • PPST or other, at scores established by SBOE • offer of employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BA or higher degree • 2.5 gpa on 4.0 scale • degree in content area where endorsement(s) sought • offer of employment
License & endorsement possibilities	Everything but special education, including elementary (by specific subject only)	Secondary only, no special education	Everything
Length of license	1 year, renewable once	3 year restricted license	3 year restricted license, with yearly progress report

<p>Program description</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 clock hour orientation • internship – 2 years (4 semesters) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 semester hours prior to entry • 10 clock hour orientation • internship – 2 years (4 semesters) – with 3 credit hours each semester • 3.0 gpa 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written plan with IHE, not longer than 3 yrs., to achieve full licensure and meet approved program standards • USD – yearly report (contract renewed, content assessment(s) passed by end of 2nd year) • IHE – yearly report (progress as planned, 2.5 gpa)
<p>Support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team of 2: mentor or NBCT, principal • Meet with applicant at least 3 times per year • Guidelines for supervision developed by SBOE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team of 3: mentor, principal, faculty member • Meet with applicant at least 3 times per year • Guidelines for supervision developed by IHE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team of 2: mentor, faculty member; USD provides released time for meetings
<p>Verification of successful completion</p>	<p>USD</p>	<p>IHE</p>	<p>IHE, based on applicant's meeting approved program standards</p>
<p>Eligibility for next license</p>	<p>License, provisional license, no license</p>	<p>Licensure (unspecified)</p>	<p>(unspecified)</p>
<p>Other</p>		<p>Fee, determined by SBOE, to cover cost of program including credit hours and costs of supervision (including principal's and mentor's time – split 50/50 with USD)</p>	

STATE OF KANSAS

House of Representatives



THE CAPITOL

RALPH TANNER

Representative, Tenth District

TESTIMONY ON

HB 2288

(An alternative to teacher training and Licensure)

Rep. Ralph M. Tanner

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

CHAIR: EDUCATION
JOINT COMMITTEE ON
LEGISLATIVE PROCESS/CD/ROM
NCSL (AFI)
EDUCATION, LABOR AND
JOB TRAINING

MEMBER: BUDGET COMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION
FISCAL OVERSIGHT
KANSAS COMMISSION ON TEACHING
AND AMERICA'S FUTURE
KANSAS READING AND LITERACY
PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL

ADVISORY BOARD: NATURAL AND SCIENTIFIC AREAS

TOPEKA ADDRESS:
STATE CAPITOL—426-S
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-1504
(785) 296-7654
TOPEKA HOTLINE
DURING SESSION - 1-800-432-3924
BALDWIN CITY ADDRESS:
1201 NINTH ST., P.O. Box 647
BALDWIN CITY, KANSAS 66006
(785) 594-3502
E-Mail: rmtanner@ink.org
CELLULAR PHONE (785) 979-7977

The impending teacher shortage speaks volumes to the notion that we have fallen into a rut in the recruitment, training, and deployment of teachers. It is the opinion of many of us that we must change the ways we use to bring competency to the classroom. Some of the difficulties we perceive are:

1. There are many teachers who are assigned to teach fields in which they have little or no college or university training. Put differently, many teachers are assigned to teach courses without having majored in the field.
2. The educational community has pressed for more and more pedagogical training at the expense of subject matter mastery.
3. Knowing "how to teach" is important, but knowing "what to teach" is of a much higher order of magnitude.
4. Teaching as a second career is particularly appealing to a number of individuals, but Kansas continues to be unfriendly to such ventures, unlike New Jersey and many other states.
5. The attached materials are complications of comment (a minority report to the KCTAF Commission) and supporting documents which bear upon teaching.

The article by Dr. J. E. Stone (Appendix p. B-1) is of particular importance to legislators.

House Education Committee

Date: 2/15/01

Attachment # 2-1

**The Kansas Commission on Teaching and
America's Future**

**A Minority Report on
An Action Plan for
Kansas Public Education in the 21st Century**

Ralph M. Tanner, Ph.D., L.H.D.

Executive Summary – Recommendations and Goals

A Minority Report on an Action Plan for Kansas Public Education in the 21st Century

A quick study of the five goals statements of the Kansas Commission on Teaching and America's Future will show that the goals – on their face – are worthy of accomplishment. For me however, difficulties arise in the methodology and philosophical underpinning of the various propositions that are set forth.

An examination of the report reveals few new ideas, or thinking “outside the box,” or a sense of “bravura” in the development of teachers. The report is rather pedestrian. It plods along, appearing more than anything else to be a restatement of the *status quo*. The recommendations are primarily old stuff that has been dusted off and repackaged. Perhaps this is not surprising when one looks at the percentage of the members – 65 to 70% – who are products of teachers colleges, and who appear to be in the mode of protecting turf in their projections..

My immediate impulse was one of disappointment that there was no excitement at the new prospects that might have been incorporated into new modalities in teacher preparation in this new millennium.

But if one assumes that this is merely a work in progress and that new ideas will spring into life as the dialogue continues, we will profit from what has already happened.

As we continue to explore teacher preparation, the State Board of Education is challenged to:

- Use real thought in arriving at where you wish to be in preparing for a “re-invented” school.
- Look with a critical eye at the philosophical statements of NCATE. There is more than a modicum of radical socialism in their ideas. They are using schools for the accomplishment of social change, not academic progress. In their attempt to emphasize self esteem, they project an unreal aspect of life. Where have the notions gone on the worth of individual differences? This country was built on the basis of a competitive spirit. NCATE attempts to destroy competition. Where has that gotten us? Re-examine teacher education standards. What is the rationale for having the state standards for accreditation of teacher's colleges or departments equate to those of NCATE? .
- Exercise your leadership potential. Use it or lose it! Good public policy demands a partnership for progress among those who are charged with educating the young. Approximately two-thirds of the state budget dollar is spent for education. Good stewardship for those dollars comes in accountability. Other governmental agencies will follow your leadership with enthusiasm if you lead!
- Devise and implement a career path to teaching as a second career, using something like the New Jersey Model. In a time when teacher shortages are upon us, it is ridiculous to assume that it is necessary for second career persons to return to school for two years of pedagogy.
- The creation of an independent professional board is not likely to win legislative approval, and even less likely to meet the approval of voters in a referendum on a constitutional amendment.
- Become aware of the Milken model for teacher and school improvement that is being piloted by Arizona in 2000-2001 and consider a pilot in Kansas!

Teacher training schools/colleges are challenged to:

- Consider admitting candidates to teacher education programs only after the completion of their sophomore year, with a required GPA of 2.75, and interviews. The first two years should be spent in liberal arts in a core curriculum.
- Many of the better universities offer only graduate programs in education. Consider the elimination of undergraduate programs in education.
- For those candidates for graduation with an intention to teach, make it mandatory that they have a major in an academic discipline that they wish to teach. For elementary and early childhood teachers, require a liberal arts major with a professional capability in one of the basic skills within the primary/elementary curriculum. If such curricula do not exist, these should be devised at the post secondary level with dispatch.
- Require a passing grade (with reasonably demanding marks) on Praxis or a similar test like the Miller Analogies Test which would qualify them for admission into a graduate school.
- Graduates should “major” in an academic field, not “education.”
- Re-examine the philosophical notions that have crept into the teacher-training curriculum that minimize individual achievement as the primary goal of schools. “Academic equality” is not a probable outcome of schools. Equality of opportunity should be afforded, but . *egalitarianism* undermines the quality of a public school education.
- Redefine what is meant by “. . . every child can be educated.” Right now, you sound rather foolish in repeating this tired mantra. It may be that every child can be educated *to some degree*, but you must re-establish the fact that educational achievement will differ from child to child.

The notion that every child has a “right” to an education is correct. But that does not mean that all will achieve the same levels of accomplishment. There is a notion that is being promoted that suggests that, somehow, all children will come out even in the end product. The real right is the right of opportunity.

(i-a)

Table of Contents

Foreword.....2

The Vision.....3

Comments on the Recommendations of the Commission.....5

 Goal I.....5

 Goal II.....6

 Goal III.....6

 Goal IV.....6

 Goal V.....8

Sources and Appendices.....9

The Kansas Commission on Teaching and America's Future

A Minority Report on An Action Plan for Kansas Public Education in the 21st Century

by

Ralph M. Tanner, Ph. D., L.H.D.

Foreword

A final report of the Kansas Commission on Teaching and America's Future has now been released. In a very narrow way, this report continues the dialogue begun many years ago on what is required in the preparation of teachers for K-12 education.

This dialogue really had its beginning almost immediately after the advent of the Dewey school of educational philosophers before the "Great Depression" of the past century, and it has continued, with only slight abatement, through the course of years since then.

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education issued a publication entitled, *A Nation at Risk*. The principal thrust of this study was directed at what were called "problems with teacher quality."

Too many teachers had poor academic records and received low scores on cognitive ability. Teacher education programs were graduating large numbers of marginal students who did not know enough about the subjects they were teaching. On College Board exams, education students were below nearly all other majors, and had been declining through the 1970's. (Weaver, 1983, cited in Ballou and Podgursky, "Reforming Teacher Training and Recruitment," *Government Union Review*, Vol 17, No. 4.

A period of lamentation has generally followed studies with these sorts of findings, but no essential change has occurred. Now comes the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, the parent of the Kansas Commission, with a report that continues an indictment of teacher quality. But the message has changed significantly. A NCTAF report suggests the problem with teachers is one of preparation. Scarcely any mention is made of the need to recruit smarter teachers. Under a heading, "Unenforced Standards," state education departments and some education schools are blamed for this state of affairs.

Because most states do not require schools of education to be accredited, only about 500 of the nation's 1200 education schools have met common professional standards. States meanwhile, routinely approve all of their teacher education programs. . . .

The lack of accreditation mentioned here refers to NCATE accreditation, not accreditation by one of the regional associations of colleges and schools. (Note: See below for comment on the nature of NCATE's standards and the interlocking directorate among NCTAF, NCATE, NEA and NFT, the professoriate of schools of education, members of the National association of the teachers of something or other, and other organizations making up the professional educational community.)

And so the stage is set for another round of dialogue on teacher quality. NCTAF and its Kansas entity, KCTAF, do not trouble themselves with looking at intellectual capacity in those who are certified to teach. If those in positions of shaping public policy do not choose to be informed about the various facets of this issue, we will move in a rather blind fashion to follow the education establishment – schools of professional education, NCTAF, NCATE, NEA, AFT, and others – into an arena where courage is absent, and critical thinking is not in evidence. It is clear that the dedication to an essential status quo found in the KCTAF majority report derives from the make-up of the membership of the Commission. There is a strong bias towards maintenance of the current policies on teacher preparation because of the predominance of teacher education persons on the list.

As a member of KCTAF, who came rather late to the deliberations of the Commission, I would have preferred not to write a minority report. I will give great credit and respect to the efforts of the commissioners with most of their work, and especially their motives. There is much to suggest that the entire body found common ground in a statement of broad principles. In many cases, I believe noble goals are stated, only to have agreement on the nature of the goals fail because KCTAF's refinement and restatement of the goals fall at some considerable distance from my own thinking.

Even though some "plain talk" will creep into this commentary, I intend no disparagement of any member of the Commission, and insist that my disagreement with any part of the majority report rises out of sincerely held and basic philosophical differences.

The Vision

The opening vision statement of the report restates a truism: "If we are going to change our schools, we have to get back to a fundamental truth about education: A well-prepared teacher is the critical ingredient in student learning."

William Sanders, a master statistician from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, a guru in Value-Added qualities in teaching, testifying before the Education Committee of the Kansas House of Representatives, observed that a grade school student may well survive a poor teacher for one year, and move on to successful learning. If that student has a poor teacher for two years, he/she may not overcome that disability.

Qualified teachers are the secret to reinventing schools. But we must discover and agree upon a set of criteria that speak to quality. NCATE standards are not adequate to the task. New licensure standards being considered by the Kansas State Board of Education do not reach a satisfactory goal.

The "Vision" statement goes on to observe that the public barely knows of the variances between standards for teacher preparation and actual performance of teachers. This is true. But the Commission grossly offends scholarly discourse in its statement that '... schools' most closely held secret amounts to a national shame: Roughly one-fourth of newly hired teachers lack the qualifications for the job. More than 12% of new hires enter the classroom without any formal training at all, and another 14% arrive without fully meeting standards for the state in which they teach."

The standards mentioned are NCATE standards. They are hardly standards of intellectual or cognitive knowledge or of academic competence. Standards on teacher preparation promulgated by NCATE speak primarily to pedagogical strategies, are overly much concerned with "political correctness," and "diversity," or "multiculturalism," and seem not to be influenced substantially by subject matter mastery or "common knowledge." One of the members of the Kansas State Board of Education was quoted in the media to the effect that he was told by an education expert that grade averages of teachers had little positive correlation with the ability to teach. (See my statement on political correctness and diversity, below.)

The dividing line on issues relating to teacher preparation is quite visible on college and university campuses. Colleges of Education are frequently held in some disdain by faculty in other parts of the academy. Sandra Stotsky, research associate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and Deputy Commissioner of Academic Affairs for the Massachusetts Department of Education authored a significant study (The Free Press, 1999), entitled, *Losing our Language: How Multicultural Classroom Instruction is Undermining our Children's Ability to Read, Write, and Reason*.

Stotsky observes,

... education schools have always been at the low end of the academic totem pole because their courses, their research, and their ideas on pedagogy and curriculum have not been viewed as warranting intellectual respect. Regrettably, there is good reason for this judgement.

Education schools have not tended to promote pedagogical ideas that result in qualities that college faculty have traditionally sought in their students; disciplined study habits, a knowledge base that enables them to study the subject matter of their courses in its mature form, a capacity for analytical thinking, and the ability to write clearly and cogently about the substance of their courses. ... Today, in a stunning perversion of their primary mission, education schools now promote pedagogical and curricular ideas – whether associated with a multicultural approach or a constructivist (or a developmentalist) approach – that undermine or inhibit the development of analytical thinking, the ability to read advanced levels of English prose, and an adequate knowledge base for informed participation in our civic life, all in the name of

broadening the curriculum to include "other ways of knowing," and to address "equity concerns."

Thinking in the field of K-12 education in the public at large and in state legislatures is moving with some significant speed toward "accountability." This notion generally is understood to mean that students will be able to demonstrate advancement in intellectual and academic ability. Failing that, we will surely come to the conclusion that such educational efforts that annually claim more than one-half of this state's general fund dollars are misspent. It is clear to this observer that we cannot simply continue blindly to add to education appropriations in the *hope* of change that will effect measurable gains.

This writer believes that the "partnership" between NCATE and NCTAF and the state's educational community rests on faulty public policy, has no governmental commission, and ought to be re-examined. Both organizations are private bodies, and are clearly in the clutches of the professional educators. Critics of such an alignment add the U.S. Department of Education into this "partnership." In the face of a claim that "... recent graduates of education schools have had higher levels of academic achievement than most college graduates . . ." (P. 52, NCTAF report) cited in Ballou and Podgursky (p. 11), these writers comment,

This is preposterous. The Commission's [and the Department's] claim ignores differences in grading criteria familiar to virtually everyone in higher education. Data gathered by the [U. S.] Department of Education from 1992-93 graduates speak to this point. The average grade awarded in education courses was 4.41 on a four-point scale. By contrast, the averages in the social science courses was 2.96. In science and engineering it fell to 2.67. (Henke et al., 1996) (Note: For annotation on bibliographical data, see Appendices, below.)

One is compelled to ask, "How did Kansas become a partner with NCTAF," and "How is it that NCATE standards and State standards for accreditation of teacher training schools come together?" If this decision was made by the State Board of Education, serious questions are raised about the ability of the Board to make good public policy.

Comments on the Recommendations of the Commission

Goal 1.1. Get serious about standards, for Both Students and Teachers

Comment: I, or anyone, can agree with this generality. However, the devil is in the details. Standards must include basic skills, academic competency, demonstrated general knowledge, and for middle and high school teachers, an academic major in the area of certification or Licensure. Licensure should also include a requirement for a test of general knowledge.

Assessments of students may include criterion-referenced tests, and will, of necessity, include NAEP tests. Adequate bases for comparison of students with other students and those in different schools must be available. School districts will participate in NAEP according to a rotating system to be devised by the State Board of Education.

Goal 1.3 (References to NCATE accreditation)

Comment: NCATE accreditation, *per se*, will not be accepted as an index of reliable standards. Presently, 13 colleges in Kansas are NCATE accredited, while 9 are not. We will eliminate those schools that cannot afford or choose not to afford NCATE affiliation to our sorrow. In a study recently released by the American Council on Education (see, below) presidents of member schools were cautioned to become aware of what was happening in their schools of education. (Note: See *To Touch the Future: Transforming the way Teachers are Taught*, Appendices, below.)

Goal II. Reinvent teacher preparation and Professional Development

Comment: I agree with this goal, although I believe that my views on implementation will coincide with those of the Commission. I fear that this goal merely recommends that we rearrange teacher preparation as we have been doing since the 1930's. Each crisis in the Nation's schools has produced an outcry for change in the way we prepare teachers. We have made very little – almost unmeasurable – progress in changing teacher's colleges. Whenever we have changed, standards have been relaxed to a point below where we were at the outset of change. Curricula have been "dumbed down" and the new excuse for student failure is being found in social conditions which are beyond the power of the school to change. "Johnny Can't Read" has been a persistent cry since the 1950's. In 1998, the NAEP test of reading placed Kansas students among the top achievers in the Nation. As we began to celebrate, however, we learned that "Johnny still can't read." At fourth grade level, some two-thirds of our students were operating below expected levels of achievement.

The Milken Family Foundation has evolved a design for a TAP program (Teacher Advancement Program) Which is being launched in Arizona in the fall of this year (2000). A brief statement by Lowell Milken on TAP is included in this commentary, below.)

Goal III. Overhaul Teacher Recruitment and Put a Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom

Comment: This is a worthy goal. Again, however, the Commission has weakened its position by suggesting that diversity is a requirement of the goal. It is true that civility requires us to be mindful of the gifts and graces of those individuals who differ from us in ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Diversity is not, in itself, a quality that demands attention in the recruiting of teachers. Recruitment practices must be free of artificial standards that speak to anything other than abilities to teach. Also, I reject as specious the notion that "qualified" equates to NCATE accreditation of the training program from which the candidate graduated.

Equally important is the design of a program that will bring teachers as second career persons to the classroom. Currently, Kansas has one program – at Wichita State University – which is described as an alternative approach to teaching. In the face of an impending shortage of teachers in this and other states, we must begin to tap those individuals who are interested in teaching and hold subject matter mastery and allow them to begin teaching on a provisional license. (See the New Jersey plan, below) NCTAF and KCTAF follow the line of NCATE by insisting that nothing short of a full exposure to pedagogy (essentially a two year program) is able to produce a qualified teacher. This is faulty reasoning. Other states are making considerable strides in developing alternative routes to the classroom, and Kansas must join this effort.

Peer mentoring and assistance, improved induction, and peer review components of due process are issues which ought to be considered and approved whenever possible. National Board Certification has claimed legislative approval in Kansas, and ought to be continued as a part of teacher development.

Goal IV. Encourage and reward Teacher Knowledge and Skill

Comment: Taken on its face, this is a good goal. Care must be taken, however, to introduce a measure of greater accountability (improved performance) into the course of teacher evaluations. Merit pay is being debated currently by the national teacher unions. While merit pay has an attractive "ring" to it in the ears of the public, devices must be developed for measuring performance. The "watchword" for GPA has been "outcomes based." Yet we obfuscate understanding of outcomes by reliance on criterion references assessments.

There is no way to have a significant increase in teacher salary without a number of possible concomitant happenings. Among these are improved student performance on norm referenced tests (NAEP), and a lengthened school year or day or both.

The Milken TAP contains elements of teacher advancement that make it highly attractive, and some studies have indicated that the costs might be as little as a five percent advance over present scales. (Note: An Executive summary of "Teaching as The Opportunity: The Teacher Advancement Program" is included as a part of the Appendices. The State of Arizona will pilot the TAP beginning this coming fall. I have encouraged officers of the State Department of Education in Kansas to examine the program very carefully with an eye toward implementation of a pilot study in our state.)

IV.1.1 Renewing professional licenses on growth and knowledge and skills

Comment: Again this is a worthy goal. What is to be measured in terms of "growth in knowledge" is not anything without a substantial mastery of subject matter that is to be taught. Pedagogical courses can never, of themselves, qualify one to teach. In mid and high schools, licensure must carry with it an equivalency of a major concentration in a discipline. Certain non disciplines, such as "social studies," should be removed from the areas for which licensure may be had. This process will include a re-examination of the curriculum for possible removal of courses placed there because of the whims of popular culture. Further, a general knowledge examination must be included as a part of the licensing process. Cut-off scores must be fixed so as to disallow those with little subject matter mastery into the classroom. In elementary licensing, a degree in the liberal arts should be required, together with subject matter mastery in the teaching of one of the basic skills. (Note: For qualifying tests, the PRAXIS, with meaningful levels at cut off, or a passing score on the Miller Analogies Test – one that would qualify the test taker to enter a good graduate school. The PRAXIS is in use by several states as a screening device, but the passing scores are so low as to render the tests meaningless.)

I recommend the awarding of a provisional license to a second-career person based on something like the New Jersey Plan (See Appendices) upon presenting the following credentials: a college diploma with a major in a subject that is to be taught, and a passing mark on the standardized test that is chosen for administering to the graduating candidate from a college of university (Praxis or MAT). I assume that provisional status may be removed by the completion of a program of limited duration to be designed by the State Department of Education. I totally reject the idea that the provisional licensee must attend an education college or school to complete the full gamut of pedagogical courses.

(Note: Recently, the State Board of Education passed a program for licensure. I remain quite unconvinced that anything by way of progress was passed in the process. In the Appendices, I have included a statement of my concerns rising out of this recent action.)

IV.2 Recognize and Reward Exemplary Teaching

Comment: Look to the Milken TAP for a model to address this element. Promoting excellent classroom teachers to administrative posts so that they may be paid more indicates a broken system.

IV. 3 Remove teachers who do not meet the standards

Comment: Teachers' unions will defeat this goal unless some peer review system is incorporated into the paths of "due process."

Goal V. Create Schools that are Organized for Student and Teacher Success

Comment: Much of the articulation of this goal is imprecise in its language. A few observations are in order. I have never been comfortable with QPA because I believe its canons are empty of real meaning or of the ability of the user of standard English to comprehend. The program is weighed down with "education-speak," which William Bennett characterizes as an effort to put off critics of schools because the pedagogues believe – quite correctly - that we cannot understand.

I must insist on meaningful assessments that are norm referenced. The NAEP – the National Assessment of Educational Progress – is commonly recognized as providing information which public policy makers require in any evaluation of performance. If we are approaching assessment "overload," which some believe, then we should eliminate some of the criterion referenced state assessments. If public policy makers cannot comprehend the results of state assessments, we cannot act responsibly in any evaluation of needs.

There are those who believe we have not kept pace with real costs as we have appropriated funds for schools. In very fact, there are legislators who insist that we should not increase funding beyond our present levels until we can have accountability.

As one who has spent a rather long career in education, and has taught in elementary and secondary levels in the public schools, in colleges and universities at undergraduate and graduate school levels, I find it interesting that colleges and universities pay no significant attention to the taking of pedagogical courses in the training or development of their faculty, except in the schools of education.

Sources and Appendices (Annotated)

The following list of articles and other publications is included in this commentary to assist any reader who might be interested in deeper inquiry into the subject at hand. It is also incorporated here in the hope that some broader view of teacher preparation and deployment may be had. It is hoped that the reader will not be offended by the occasional error in form that will appear.

Ballou, Dale and Michael Podgursky. "Reforming Teacher Training and Recruitment," *Government Union Review*, Vol. 17, No.4.

Dr. Ballou is a Professor of Economics in the Department of Economics at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Dr. Podgursky is a Professor of Economics and Chairman of the Department of Economics in the University of Missouri, Columbia. These two were colleagues at U. Mass before Dr. Podgursky came to Missouri.

The article cited here runs to significant length and is an opposition view of teacher preparation from that espoused in the writings of Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond, leader of NCTAF. It may be found on the Internet and downloaded.

Darling-Hammond, Linda and Chester Finn, Jr. "Two Paths to Quality Teaching: Implications for Policymakers," Based on a Debate between Darling-Hammond and Finn at the Spring meeting of the **Education Commission of the States**, March 26, 2000.

Text of the full remarks, with a side-by-side columnar comparison of the two may be downloaded from the ECS Publications Main Page on the Internet. (www.edc.org)

Dr. Darling-Hammond heads NCTAF, and is a Professor at Stanford. Dr. Finn is CEO of the Heritage Foundation, a Washington-based research body. Finn is also a former Deputy Secretary of Education for the United States. For more information about the positions of NCTAF and The Heritage Foundation, one may sample NCTAF at www.tc.columbia.edu/teachcomm/, and the web site for Fordham is www.edexcellence.net.

The headnote to the debate was written by Dr. Ted Sanders, newly come to the Presidency

of the ECS. Sanders is a member of the Board of NCTAF, and is the former president of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Banchero, Stephanie. "Requirements for Teachers May Increase," *The Chicago Tribune*, June 16, 2000.

This article reports on actions taken recently by the Illinois State Board of Education as reform measures in its accreditation of teacher's colleges. The present posture of the Illinois Board may be contrasted sharply with the action of the BOE in Kansas in the adoption of newly crafted regulations on licensure. The full text of the article is appended.

Center for Policy Analysis. "To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers are Taught (Executive Summary), *An Action Guide for College and University Presidents. American Council on Education*. (The full text of this executive summary is appended.)

This writer views this report to the chiefs of the member schools of the American Council as a wake-up call. Conflict between faculties in schools of education and those of other colleges in the university setting has been present in the academy for a number of years. Implications are quite clear that central administrators have been content to let the deans and faculties "do their thing." A salient comment from the study suggests, "The public rightly insists, and the times surely demand, that . . . schoolchildren perform at much higher levels than in the past."

The full text of this summary is appended.

Stone, J. E. "Aligning Teacher Training with Public Policy," *The State Education Standard*. Vol. I, No.1, 35-38.

Dr. Stone, Professor of Education at East Tennessee University, is a prolific writer and a sharp critic of current methodologies in teacher training. He begins this article with comments on the ACE study mentioned above, and continues with an analysis of how and why – from his perspective – the public has tolerated poor performance from our public schools in the past, and how and why that tolerance is now being challenged by policymakers. The ACE study, and Stone in this article, suggest that ". . . if campus reforms of teacher training are to affect learning in public schools, the presidents will need the help of policymakers in aligning teacher training with public policy." Stone cites a conclusion drawn from Farkus, Johnson, and Duffett, *Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Public Education* (New York, NY: Public Agenda, 1997), ". . . teacher educators take a view that 'differs markedly from that of most parents and taxpayers. They conceive of good teaching not as teaching that improves test scores, but as teaching that is correctly aligned with pedagogical theory.' The complete Stone article is appended.

Stone, J. E. "Developmentalism: An Obscure but Pervasive Restriction on Educational Improvement." *Education Policy Analysis Archives: Vol 4 No. 8*. (This article, a serious review of the trends in educational philosophy from the French *Philosophes* to the present date, is available from the Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, or from stone@eduserv.east-tenn-st.edu.)

Stone's erudite article speaks to the origins of developmentalism – the heart of NCATE educational philosophy – sometimes labeled as "learner-centered instruction." This writer believes that anyone interested in the theories that drive our public schools these days must read this article. This is a philosophical theory that is grossly inimical to structure and learning in schools. It is a developmentalism theory that has driven educational philosophy from the days of John Dewey to the present time, and it is this theory that has caused schools to deteriorate into laboratories of social experimentation, where learning has been made to give way before the desire for building self-esteem and having students invent their own agendas. It is this theory that has offended standards of intellectual growth and academic rigor, and has contributed to the stripping of college curricula of those courses that formed the basis for a core-knowledge. It is this theory that has perpetuated the inability of "Johnny" to read. It is in the application of this theory that we have come to the time when recent graduates of most colleges and universities in this country are functionally illiterate in a sense of history or in *belles lettres*.

Due to the overall length of this article, it has not been appended to this commentary.

Jennings, Marianne, Sally L. Satel, Sandra Stotsky, and Michael Krauss, "Symposium: Professional Education and Our Culture." *Academic Questions*, Vol. XIII, No. 2, Spring, 2000. Transaction Periodicals Consortium, Rutgers - The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ, 10-47. Dr. Stotsky is cited, above, as the writer of the book, *Losing our Language: How Multicultural Instruction is Undermining our Children's Ability to Read, Write, and Reason*.

Tanner, Ralph M. "Diversity and Political Correctness." This is a brief essay which sets out this writer's view of the adverse impact made by the attempt to apply these two ideas our educational arena since the mid-sixties.

New Jersey State Board of Education. Provisional Teacher Program. (Adopted, 1984) NCATE and NCTAF eschew any route to teaching which does not include graduation from an NCATE accredited teacher training program. The KCTAF report avoids any reference to alternative routes to teaching.

Milken, Lowell, Chairman of the Milken Family Foundation. Executive Summary of "Teaching as The Opportunity: The Teacher Advancement Program.

It is the Teacher Advancement Program highlighted by the Milken Family Foundation in each of the past two National Educational Conferences, that might very well become a model for reordering teacher deployment, and for the reinventing of public schools.

Horn, Joseph M. *Special Report: A Critical Look at Texas Colleges of Education*. The Texas Public Policy Foundation, San Antonio, TX.

Dr. Horn is Professor of Psychology at the University of Texas, Austin, and a Senior Fellow in the Texas Public Policy Foundation. The private non-profit research organization has as its goal the improvement of "... Texas government by generating academically sound research and data on major issues, and by recommending the findings to opinion leaders, policy makers, the media and the general public."

Much of what is contained in the Horn study would have found its way into the body of this minority report if it had been available to me earlier. I have resorted to this bibliographical annotation as a place for this reference and for brief comment on some of the findings that are in the study and which apply quite strongly to the present situation in Kansas.

In an Executive Summary, Horn notes,

- A. The education establishment's policy recommendations have failed miserably.
- B. Educators' preoccupation with academic equality holds back academically talented kids.
- C. Colleges of Education are part of the problem.
- D. The TPPF (Texas Public Policy Foundation) survey demonstrates differences between education major's attitudes and liberal arts majors attitudes.

Conclusions in the Summary are,

The standards for admission to undergraduate teacher training in Texas Colleges of Education are too low, and academically weak students are not screened out efficiently. Therefore a steady stream of marginal teachers enters the teaching profession each year. These teachers can retard the academic development of their students.

Colleges of education are committed to a radical egalitarianism, reflected in the beliefs of education majors. These teacher preferences and beliefs act to undermine the quality of a public school education.

CPA ■ ■ ■

Center for
Policy Analysis

A Program of ACE's
Division of Programs and Analysis

American
Council on
Education

ACEnet

ACE HOME

WASHINGTON

NEWS

BOOKSTORE

CONTACT US

SEARCH

To Touch the Future

Transforming the Way Teachers are Taught

An Action Agenda for College and University Presidents

Executive Summary

- Why Presidents Must Act
- What the Data Show
- What College and University Presidents Need to Do
- What Can Presidents Do?
- ACE Presidents' Task Force on Teacher Education
- Obtain the full report
- Background Papers
- Sign up for for further information on the improvement of teacher education.

Why Presidents Must Act

Over the next decade, the nation will need to put into America's classrooms more than 2.5 million new teachers. They will be responsible for teaching the very children who, before the middle of the 21st century, will be the country's movers and shakers, its workers and savers, its leaders and caretakers, its engines of social and economic well-being. In sum, they will be preparing the citizens of America in the next century. The public rightly insists, and the times surely demand, that these schoolchildren learn and perform at much higher level than in the past.

All the empirical evidence presented in the full report of the American Council on Education Presidents' Task Force on Teacher Education tells us that the single most important

refers to

element in a child's success at learning— probably the element more important than all the others put together— is the quality of the teacher. Only if the quality of teachers entering the profession improves will we effectively adapt to a new economy that depends far more than ever on knowledge— its acquisition, analysis, synthesis, communication, and application.

Colleges and universities have educated virtually every teacher in every classroom in every school in the country; thus, it is colleges and universities that must take responsibility for the way teachers are taught, and ultimately the way children are taught.

The report addresses what college and university presidents can do, in their roles as academic and institutional leaders, to transform the quality of teachers serving the nation's classrooms, and why presidential leadership is so crucial to the success of this venture. The first and most important action for college and university presidents is to move the education of teachers to the center of their professional and institutional agendas.

What the Data Show

We now know from empirical data that teachers make a difference— a huge difference— in the academic achievement of their students. Databases developed over the last two decades give us clear and convincing evidence that the single most powerful factor in student achievement gain is the quality of the teacher.

The evidence also is clear that effective teachers must have a firm command of their subject matter, receive sound professional preparation, and demonstrate a high overall achievement.

Critics charge that too little attention has been paid to subject matter competence in the preparation of teachers. We concur and recommend steps to address that issue. But studies show that command of the subject alone is insufficient. Knowledge that is specific to the profession of teaching— pedagogical method, curriculum design, adolescent development, student cognition and learning, and classroom management skills—also must be mastered.

Strong teacher education programs tend to share several characteristics: a common vision of what good teaching

actually is; well- defined standards of practice and performance; a rigorous core curriculum; extensive use of problem-based methods such as case studies and portfolio evaluation; and strong relationships between the teacher education program and reform-minded schools.

Evidence is also available on the academic performance of college students who enter teaching. The academic records of students who become secondary school teachers are generally comparable to all other undergraduate students; students who go on to teach in the earlier grades have poorer academic records than their peers.

Research data reveal specific problem areas in the education of teachers. For example, teachers are inadequately prepared to apply technology to teaching. Also, current mechanisms of academic quality control in colleges and universities, in schools and school systems, and in state laws and regulations fall short of ensuring that only qualified teachers teach.

The nation's schools will need 2.5 million new teachers over the next 10 years to replace retiring teachers, to meet projected enrollment increases in certain states, to reduce class sizes, and to replace the tens of thousands of teachers who leave their jobs each year in search of more attractive and rewarding career opportunities. Only about two-thirds of the newly prepared teachers graduating from the nation's colleges and universities enter the profession immediately after graduation. Currently, teacher quality too often is compromised in response to teacher demand. If teaching careers were made more attractive and competitive, and if the attrition of teachers already in the schools were reduced, the quality of teachers could be strengthened and the increased demand of the next decade could be met.

The evidence is clear on yet one more point: Teachers avoid high-poverty schools. One study, for example, showed that 70 percent of the seventh through 12th graders in high-poverty schools were being taught physical science by unqualified teachers.

What College and University Presidents Need to Do

While colleges and universities cannot solve all these problems, the education of the nation's teaching force will be improved dramatically if academic leaders move these matters closer to the center of the institutional mission and agenda. We

recommend that college and university presidents take these 10 action steps:

College and university presidents must take the lead in moving the education of teachers to the center of the institutional agenda. Presidential leadership is essential because of the very nature of the education of teachers. Ultimately, it is presidents who outline the agenda, define the issues, commission studies, recommend policies, set institutional priorities, call for action, and form alliances with groups beyond the campus. As a first step— and more important than any other action recommended in this report— we urge that college and university presidents put the education of teachers at the center of the institutional agenda and accept the challenge and responsibility to lead constructive change.

Presidents need to clarify and articulate the strategic connection of teacher education to the mission of the institution. Presidents and chief academic officers must lead their institutions in a reexamination of the strategic role of teacher education, determine precisely where the education of teachers fits in the overall institutional mission and agenda, and articulate the importance of the education of teachers to the campus community. Where teacher education programs operate at the periphery of an institution's strategic interests and directions, they should be moved to the center— or moved out.

Presidents should mandate a campus-wide review of the quality of their institutions' teacher education programs. The time has come for presidents to call for a comprehensive review of the character and quality of their institutions' programs for the education of teachers. A central issue in any such review is the extent to which prospective teachers receive a sound grounding in the academic content area in which they expect to teach. The campus-wide evaluation should include an analysis of the quality of students admitted to the program, how faculty quality is assessed, and how individuals or units are held accountable. If needed, the assessment should recommend steps to be taken by the institution to monitor and evaluate more closely the performance of teacher education graduates.

Presidents and governing boards should commission rigorous periodic, public, independent appraisals of the quality of their institutions' teacher education programs. In order to validate program quality and encourage public confidence, the Task Force strongly urges every institution of

higher education that offers an academic program of teacher education to secure some reliable form of periodic third-party assessment of the quality of its program. This appraisal may take the form of accreditation or the appointment of an independent visiting committee that is charged with assessing the quality of the teacher education program.

Presidents must require that education faculty and courses are coordinated with arts and sciences faculty and courses. The responsibility for preparing prospective teachers in the subject areas they will teach rests not only with school of education faculty, but also with faculty of the institution as a whole— especially the arts and sciences faculty. To achieve a common vision, a well-integrated curriculum, and an explicit point of accountability, presidents need to appoint an effective, collegial oversight committee of academic leaders from the arts and sciences and from education to craft and supervise the curriculum and academic standards for the teacher education program. The aim should be to move teacher education beyond the confines of a single department or college and raise it to the institutional level.

Presidents should ensure that their teacher education programs have the equipment, facilities, and personnel necessary to educate future teachers in the uses of technology. The nation must think beyond connecting schools to the Internet and toward keeping teachers on the cutting edge. Technology will fail to meet its educational promise if we neglect to equip teachers with the skills they need to understand and use it. Colleges and universities must provide education in technology that enhances the capacities of teachers. The federal government, too, should spend just as much on equipping teachers to use technology as it does to buy the hardware. To invest in one without the other is meaningless.

Presidents of graduate and research universities have a special responsibility to be advocates for graduate education, scholarship, and research in the education of teachers. It is difficult to identify an area of comparable importance to the society for which so little is invested in research and development as in the education and performance of teachers. Given the professed concern of politicians and the public for improving the quality of education in this country, appropriations for research in teaching and learning are indefensibly inadequate. Presidents can and should be vigorous advocates for dramatic increases in such funding.

College and university leaders should strengthen

interinstitutional transfer and recruitment processes. Most of today's college students attend more than one higher education institution before receiving a degree. Many students who become teachers begin their postsecondary education in a community college. Carefully crafted articulation agreements can strengthen the quality of academic programs, enable students to move smoothly from one academic setting to another, and, ultimately, improve the quality of teachers.

Presidents should ensure that graduates of their teacher education programs are supported, monitored, and mentored. Colleges and universities need to ensure continuing professional growth for teachers during their college years and early career through well- designed programs that support beginning teachers. Just as important, colleges and universities, working in partnership with the schools, should assist experienced teachers with strong, well-crafted professional development opportunities.

Presidents should speak out on issues associated with teachers and teaching and should join with other opinion leaders to shape public policy. Even as college and university presidents act to improve the teaching of teachers, a school environment that does not foster and reward excellence will not attract or retain the best teachers. College and university presidents must join with governors, business and opinion leaders, public policy makers, and teachers themselves to reform the system. It is crucial that presidents play a vigorous role in advocating for and supporting constructive change in the system. They need to be visibly engaged, vocal spokespersons and strong public leaders in the field of education.

When Christa McAuliffe was asked why she wanted to be the first teacher to fly into space, she replied "Don't you understand? I am a teacher. Every day, through my students, I touch the future." Every schoolchild in America needs and deserves teachers of the highest quality this nation is capable of producing. The two partners in achieving this goal are the school systems that employ teachers and the colleges and universities that educate them. Unless both partners change, our country will not prosper. Higher education must demand more of its students— future teachers— and more of itself. And school systems must do more to develop the talents of teachers and make the profession a more attractive career.

College and university presidents are the keepers of the covenant between the nation's institutions of higher learning

and its school children. This report calls for leadership from presidents. It is presidents who can serve as catalysts for change, as alliance builders, as visible and respected leaders in communities, as advocates for learning at all levels, and as influential framers of academic and public policy. Our call is for colleges and universities— their faculties, academic leaders, and governing boards— led by their presidents, to touch the future.

© Copyright 1999

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

| [Teacher Education Report](#) | [National Awards Program](#) |
| [Policy Analysis Home](#) | [ACE Home](#) |

Center for Policy Analysis
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW, Washington, DC 20036
phone: (202) 939-9551 • policy@ace.nche.edu

© American Council on Education, 1995-1999. **ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.**

One Dupont Circle NW, Washington, DC 20036
phone: (202) 939-9300 • fax: (202) 833-4760

Please send your questions, comments, and suggestions to:
web@ace.nche.edu

Last Modified: December 3, 1999

Stone, J. E. (2000). Aligning teacher training with public policy. *The State Education Standard*, 1(1), 35-38.

Aligning Teacher Training with Public Policy

by

J. E. Stone

The American Council on Education (ACE) recently issued a report calling for colleges and universities to either embrace independent assessment of the quality of their teacher education programs or to close them.^[1] The Council, which represents American colleges and universities, fears that the weak academic standards maintained by teacher education programs will damage the reputations of their host institutions. The report discusses the critical importance of well-trained teachers and calls on college presidents to lead campus-wide evaluations of entrance requirements, admission standards, and retention practices. What it fails to discuss is why teacher training programs have tolerated weak academic standards in the first place.

All teacher training programs are approved by state education agencies and almost all of the large ones are externally accredited. The ACE report suggests that “rigorous, periodic, independent appraisals” are needed, but, in fact, teacher training programs have undergone external appraisals for years.^[2] Why should campus-wide reviews be necessary in addition?

The following analysis asks why weak standards are tolerated, and it finds a surprising answer: They are tolerated because the teacher education community does not consider academic achievement—at least as the term is conventionally understood—to be the primary aim of education. It suggests that if campus reforms of teacher training are to affect learning in public schools, the presidents will need the help of policymakers in aligning teacher training with public policy.

Why Teacher Education Tolerates Weak Standards

Education’s consumers—parents, students, the lay public, and their representatives—presume that good teaching is teaching that brings about student achievement as measured by standardized tests. They value other outcomes too but improved test scores are a minimum. But as evidenced by Public Agenda’s *Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Public Education*, teacher educators take a view “that differs markedly from that of most parents and taxpayers.”^[3] They conceive of good teaching not as teaching that improves test scores, but as teaching that is correctly aligned with pedagogical theory. Among education professors nationwide, Public Agenda found the “teacher-as-facilitator” view to be predominant. In focus groups, “It was never questioned or challenged,” regardless of which group of teacher educators were involved.^[4]

The teacher-as-facilitator or “learner-centered”^[5] view of teaching is, within the teacher education community, the ideal against which all other forms of instruction are compared. It is an approach that encourages the teacher to coax and collaborate rather than instruct. It is an approach that requires the student to initiate and inquire rather than follow teacher direction. In short, it is an ideal form of teaching and one suited

to ideal students, i.e., students who are exceptionally mature, eager, and well prepared. As *Different Drummers* observed: “If there is a single question raised by this recent Public Agenda study, it is, ‘What price perfection?’ Or, to put it another way, has the professors’ strategy for education become a classic example of letting the perfect be the enemy of the good?”^[6]

A primary reason why learner-centered instruction is ineffective in producing achievement is that its outcomes are an accident of the choices made by the student. Although the degree of learner-centeredness differs among teachers, the learner-centered ideal encourages student choice in matters such as the form and degree of engagement in academic activities. Teachers are expected to be “a guide on the side,” not a “sage on the stage.” Students are encouraged to engage themselves thoroughly and well but they are free to choose the insubstantial. Engagement, not outcomes, is the uppermost priority. “Good teaching” by the learner-centered definition is not designed to produce preordained objectives. Rather, it presumes that intellectual growth is enhanced by activities that may have only the remotest relationship to the outcomes expected by the public.

What are the outcomes sought by the public? Parents and employers want students to have thinking skills, but they place equal or greater importance on academic fundamentals.^[7] As *Different Drummers* found, “Most typical Americans—along with most employers—are alarmed by the number of youngsters they see who lack even basic skills, particularly such fundamentals as spelling and grammar. But for education professors, training teachers who stress correct English usage is a distinctly low priority.”^[8] Education professors consider the public’s concerns to be “outmoded and mistaken.” In a word, professors are learner-centered but parents and employers are *learning*-centered.

All of this is to say that the teacher education community is comfortable with weak academic standards because they believe that education cannot be judged by whether it produces recognized forms of academic achievement. Instead, they hold that the important outcomes of education are the task-specific enhancements of intellectual ability that are presumed to result from learner-centered educational experiences. The knowledge and skills valued by parents and employers are considered secondary, incidental, and dispensable.

As college presidents talk with teacher educators’ about improving educational quality, they should bear these distinctions in mind. So should policymakers and the public. When teacher educators speak of good teaching, they do not necessarily mean actions intended to bring about the acquisition of basic knowledge and skills. In the learner-centered view, such recognized educational attainments are options, not requirements.

“Best Practice,” Learner-centered Teaching, and Progressive Education

Teachers are taught a variety of instructional methods but the approaches that are considered “best practice” are learner-centered. *Best Practice: New Standards for Teaching and Learning in America's Schools* by Steven Zemelman, Harvey Daniels, and Arthur Hyde examined recent reports of organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the Center for the Study of Reading, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Association for the Education of Young Children, as well as other major stakeholders in teacher education and from them developed a list of “state-of-the-art” educational practices for which there is a “strong consensus.”^[9] The authors characterized these practices as “student-centered, active, experimental, democratic, [and] collaborative,” which is to say they are the same practices herein termed “learner-centered.”

Best Practice argues that teachers *overemphasize* measured student achievement at the expense of “real” learning (i.e., the self-selected outcomes that result from learner-centered educational experiences). The authors believe that mandated achievement testing props up a “rigged meritocracy” and caters to “political demands for accountability,”^[10] and they recommend that schools place less emphasis on measurable outcomes as a means to producing better outcomes. What they fail to make clear, however, is that the “better” outcomes they have in mind, may or may not include the basic knowledge and skills sought by the public and most policymakers.^[11]

Best Practice also acknowledges a critical yet widely ignored aspect of its pedagogical recommendations: They are only the most recent manifestation of that which has been known historically as progressive education.^[12] It is a point that should be carefully considered by any policymaker or parent who accepts the education community’s guidance in matters of education reform.

Progressive education principles underpinned the “child-centered” schooling of the 1930s, the “open classrooms” of 1960s, and a long list of other innovations that have been tried and have failed repeatedly in the course of the twentieth century. Eighty years ago, progressive education was a welcome alternative to the harsh classroom methods of the nineteenth century. In that earlier day, students were required to memorize lengthy tracts as a form of “mental exercise.” Classroom life was highly regimented. The dunce’s cap and the hickory stick were accepted tools of classroom discipline. For students who were not assigned a wise and humane teacher, school could be an unhappy experience.

Progressive teaching methods were grounded in the revolutionary but complex ideas of John Dewey. Dewey reasoned that Darwinian evolution had equipped humans to learn from naturally occurring encounters with life’s daily experiences and that the optimal form of teaching was one that would approximate that process. Progressive educators believed that traditional schooling was both unpleasant and ineffectual because it artificially divided learning into subjects and forced students to learn without the benefit of natural context and natural motivation. They assumed that learning would virtually take care of itself if teachers would confront students with challenging and intriguing problems. To many, Dewey’s ideas seemed intuitively reasonable; and to many parents, teachers trained in progressive methods were far more appealing than the traditional teacher/taskmaster.

What was not widely understood then or now is that Dewey’s ideas were not merely an alternative means to the educational ends sought by traditional schooling. Instead, they embodied an entirely different concept of the nature and purpose of education. Traditional schooling was intended to teach children the knowledge, skills, and values substantiated by experience and recognized by adults. These included higher-order intellectual skills such as analysis and reasoning. In contrast, progressive education sought to promote what Dewey called “growth”—a kind of general enhancement of intellectual ability that was presumed to result from engagement with student-selected problems and projects. That the new and enlightened pedagogy largely abandoned the schooling outcomes most valued by parents and the public has never been clearly understood by educators or by the public.

Obstacles to Improved Achievement

It would be difficult to overstate the significance of the difference between the public’s educational aims and those embodied in the progressive/learner-centered viewpoint. Likewise, it would be difficult to overstate the relevance of this difference to the frustrations experienced by education policymakers over the years. In essence,

the pedagogical ideal in which virtually all teachers have been trained has ensured that their aspirations are at odds with both public policy and the public's educational priorities. A full discussion of this discrepancy is beyond the scope of this essay, but the following points may be useful to policymakers in understanding the obstacle they confront.

Mutual Misunderstanding

Not only are educators and policymakers using similar terms to refer to very different ideas about education, neither side seems to understand the inconsistency. Most policymakers want schooling that produces high minimum levels of conventionally measured knowledge and skills. Their expectations include the higher-order intellectual skills but the basics are seen as indispensable. They assume that educators respect those priorities and are using the best available means of producing the desired outcomes.

Teachers are given to understand that learner-centered practices are the latest and most pedagogically sound means of producing what policymakers want—or at least what they should want. Few have a clear understanding that these so-called state-of-the-art methodologies are recycled versions of a pedagogical concept that is marginally suited to academic achievement. Rather, teachers are taught that learner-centered pedagogy is grounded in a convincing body of research and experience, not some longstanding doctrine. For example, even though Zemelman et al. acknowledge the linkage between current “best practice” and progressive education, they characterize their recommendations as strongly backed by research. In truth, the vast majority of studies pertaining to learner-centered instruction are not the kind that can discern whether teaching Method A produces greater achievement than Method B. Instead, most of them are theoretical, anecdotal, and opinion-based.^[13] The few that do empirically assess achievement outcomes are only weakly supportive and contradicted by other findings. For example, the federally sponsored Follow Through research of the 1960s and 1970s found that the progressive/learner-centered pedagogical models not only failed to help disadvantaged students, they produced worse results than the teaching practices used in the study's control groups.^[14]

Developmental Limits

Another obstacle posed by the learner-centered vision is the belief that the findings of developmental psychology show that students may be harmed by teacher-directed instruction.^[15] Teachers are taught that their assignments and expectations may not agree with students' developmentally regulated proclivities, thereby putting students at risk for frustration and burnout. Moreover, teachers are given to understand that students who study and learn merely because teachers require them to do so gain only a superficial understanding. According to the learner-centered view, real learning can take place only when there is true interest in the subject at hand. Learner-centered educators disdain “teacher-centered” assignments as “drill and kill” and “rote memorization.” Schools that encourage standards and measurable outcomes are derided as teaching “mere facts” and employing a “one-size-fits-all” curriculum.

Despite widespread teacher belief in the dangers of teacher-directed instruction, there is virtually no credible evidence of it producing academic or psychological harm. To the contrary, the above-cited Follow Through project found a highly structured and scripted form of teaching called Direct Instruction to be more effective than any other tested model with regard to both basic skills improvement *and* enhancement of self-esteem.^[16] Given the prevailing opinion among teacher educators, however, this finding has been largely ignored.^[17]

As a matter of day-to-day classroom practice, teachers pay little attention to indicators of development per se. Instead they work with students who are similar in age, ability, knowledge, and skills, and they are guided by a curriculum that has proven suitable for a given group. While the pedagogical strategy of matching teaching styles to developmentally determined learning styles would seemingly enable teachers to fine-tune their efforts, researchers have not found it effective in improving achievement.^[18] In fact, the entire line of studies of which learning styles research is a part—so called attribute-treatment interaction research—is generally conceded to have been unsuccessful in improving instruction.^[19] Not incidentally, Public Agenda found that most parents reject the concept of tailoring schoolwork to student interests, preferences, and backgrounds.^[20]

What developmental research has contributed to classroom practice, however, is a set of theoretically inspired restrictions that rule out virtually all forms of pedagogy that are inconsistent with the learner-centered model. Learner-centered instruction solves the problem of fitting teaching to developmentally governed differences by allowing students to choose the nature and degree of their engagement with that which is being taught. Theoretically, good teachers can arrange classroom experiences that are so irresistibly engaging that students will choose to undertake virtually everything for which they are developmentally prepared. However, learning takes study, and study requires the time and effort of students who live in world of competing attractions. Interest alone is typically insufficient. In reality, children cannot reasonably be expected to appreciate the value of academic requirements that appear boring and unimportant because they have not had the opportunity to see either the long-term rewards of learning or the long-term consequences of failure. Experience has not yet taught them what adults know about lost opportunity and life's prospects.

Clearly, effective teachers must be sensitive to both learner comfort and learning outcome. As experienced teachers well understand, students can become frustrated by a succession of failed attempts to learn. However, the matter of that which a teacher believes about developmental limitations has important consequences. A teacher who assumes that failure to achieve means a developmental limit has been reached is likely to discontinue his or her effort. In contrast, a teacher who does not make such an assumption is likely to seek an improved means of teaching—especially if children of the same age are known to succeed with the same material. In other words, a belief in developmental limitations—especially a belief in difficult-to-assess cognitive limitations—encourages teachers to delay and reduce expectations for learning rather than question the effectiveness of their practices or their pedagogical principles.^[21]

Resistance to Accountability

Given the nature of their perspective, learner-centered educators tend to resist accountability for recognized forms of achievement. They believe that “good teaching” cannot be judged by gains in standardized achievement test scores. They believe standardized tests are capable of measuring only memorization skills and factual recall, not “higher-order” cognitive processes—a criticism rejected by most authorities in educational measurement. Such educators want schools to be accountable for “real” thinking in the “real world,” i.e., thinking demonstrated by “authentic” products and performances and collected into student “portfolios.” Essentially they want schools to be accountable for outcomes reminiscent of the “growth” envisioned by Dewey, not the knowledge and skills expected by most parents and policymakers.

Aligning Teacher Training and Public Policy

its first priority presents a very substantial obstacle to the kind of educational improvement sought by policymakers, parents, and the public. Most educators believe that laymen are simply ignorant of the pedagogical and developmental considerations on which sound teaching should be based. Moreover, they believe that they have a moral responsibility to protect children from what they see as politically inspired attempts to impose wrongheaded forms of accountability. Many of education's highest officials share this view. Not infrequently, they and staff members of state departments of education quietly work with accrediting bodies and professional organizations to diffuse what they see as a misguided insistence on objectively measured academic achievement.

In a sense, public schools are caught in the middle, and so are college presidents and policymakers. All are under pressure to improve achievement but all are dependent on a professional community that has been taught to think of high expectations for measured achievement as stressful, wrongheaded, and contrary to the best interests of students.

A New Tool for Measuring Teacher Effectiveness

If college presidents are to improve teacher training in ways that will impact elementary and secondary school achievement, they will need the help of policymakers. Teacher training is aligned with the learner-centered ideals of the teacher-education community, not the objectives of public policy. College presidents cannot address this issue because they cannot and should not stipulate the curricular details of academic programs.

A reasonable point of intervention for policymakers would be to rethink current policies on assessing teacher quality. States currently employ a variety of indicators that are assumed to be predictive of classroom effectiveness. In truth, indicators such as completion of an approved training program and success on licensure exams are more clearly an assurance of familiarity with learner-centered instruction. A better indicator—one more directly aligned with public policy—would be the measured effectiveness of novice teachers in improving the achievement of their K-12 students. Data on the classroom performance of novice teachers could be aggregated on a program-by-program basis and made available to the public. Over time, teacher-training programs producing effective teachers would attract enrollment, and those with less effective graduates would tend to lose enrollment. The quality problem would become an enrollment problem and college presidents would be able to effectively address it.

Measuring teacher effectiveness is not a simple matter, but policymakers do have a new tool at their disposal. Called value-added assessment, it is a type of statistical analysis that summarizes the student achievement gains produced by individual teachers. Student gains are computed by comparing each student's current performance with his or her previous record. Value-added assessment is field-tested, fair, and objective; and it permits not only teachers but schools and school districts to be fairly compared as well. It is currently used in several large districts and statewide in Tennessee.^[22]

Unless training in pedagogy is aligned with public policy goals, efforts to set higher academic standards for teachers will have little effect on learning and school reform will continue to be characterized by frustration, failure, and wasted resources. Teachers trained in learner-centered methodologies know little about producing achievement gains. Indeed, they have been taught to resist demands for a greater emphasis on achievement. If policymakers want improved achievement, they will either have to redirect the efforts of the nation's teacher

<http://education-consumers.com/aligning-training.htm>

training programs or take the drastic measures suggested by the ACE report. Instituting value-added assessment for novice teachers would be a sensible and fair-minded first step.

J.E. Stone is an educational psychologist and professor in the College of Education at East Tennessee State University. He also heads the Education Consumers ClearingHouse (www.education-consumers.com).

[1] American Council on Education, *To Touch the Future: Report of the ACE Presidents' Task Force on Teacher Education* (Washington, DC: Author, 1999).

[2] J. Stone, "The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education: Whose Standards?" in *Better Teachers, Better Schools*, ed. M. Kanstoroom and C. Finn (Washington, DC: Thomas Fordham Foundation, 1999).

[3] G. Farkas, J. Johnson, and A. Duffett, *Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Public Education* (New York, NY: Public Agenda, 1997).

[4] *Ibid.*, 11.

[5] As noted below, there are a large number of terms used to identify the pedagogical ideal embraced by the teacher training community. The term "learner-centered" instruction used in present essay is well known to leaders of the teacher-education policy community; see L. Darling-Hammond, G. Griffin, and A. Wise, *Excellence in Teacher Education: Helping Teachers Develop Learner-Centered Schools*, ed. R. McClure (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1992).

[6] Farkas, Johnson, and Duffett, *Different Drummers*, 28.

[7] J. Johnson and J. Immerwahr, *First Things First: What Americans Expect from the Public Schools* (New York, NY: Public Agenda, 1994).

[8] Farkas, Johnson, and Duffett, *Different Drummers*, 28.

[9] Steven Zemelman, Harvey Daniels, and Arthur Hyde, *Best Practice* (Portsmouth, NH: Heineman Publishers, 1998). See Preface and Chapter 1, especially pages 3-7.

[10] *Ibid.*, 247.

[11] For a contemporary example of parent reaction to best practice schooling, read D. Frantz and C. Collins, *Celebration USA*, an account of Walt Disney World's Celebration School (New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company, 1999).

[12] Zemelman, Daniels, and Hyde, *Best Practice*, 16-17.

[13] Appraisals of learner-centered research are typically focused on specific forms of instruction. For example, see P. George, "Arguing Integrated Curriculum," *Middle School Journal* 28 (September 1996): 12-19 for an assessment of the research underpinning "integrated curriculum." For a brief, critical assessment of "constructivism" and "whole-language" research, see T. Good and J. Brophy, *Looking in Classrooms* (8th ed.) (1999). Regarding constructivist teaching, Good and Brophy conclude: "...although there are exceptions (primarily some of the studies cited in this chapter), most research on constructivist teaching has been confined to statements of rationale coupled with classroom examples of the principles implemented in practice, without including systematic assessment of outcomes or comparison to other approaches. For an example of the type of study to which Good and Brophy refer, see T. Jennings, "Developmental Psychology and the Preparation of Teachers Who Affirm Diversity: Strategies Promoting Critical Social Consciousness in Teacher Preparation Programs," *Journal of Teacher Education* 46, no. 4 (1995).

[14] C. Watkins, "Project Follow Through: A Story of the Identification and Neglect of Effective Instruction," *Youth Policy* (July 1988): 7-11.

[15] J. Stone, "Developmentalism: An Obscure but Pervasive Restriction on Educational Improvement," *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 4, no. 8 (1996).

[16] Watkins, "Project Follow Through," 7-11.

[17] “For professors of education, perhaps the most egregious violations of their vision of learning occur when students are expected to memorize facts or take standardized exams” (Farkas, Johnson, and Duffett, *Different Drummers*, 13).

[18] R. Dunn, J. Beaudrey, and A. Klavas, “Survey of Research on Learning Styles,” *Educational Leadership* 46, no. 6 (1996): 50-58.

[19] R. Snow and J. Swanson, “Instructional Psychology: Aptitude, Adaptation, and Assessment,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 43 (1992): 583-626.

[20] “People also reject the notion that schoolwork should be tailored to suit the interests and preferences of young people. Only 20% think the idea of adapting teaching techniques to students’ backgrounds (such as using street language to teach inner-city students) would be effective in boosting academic performance. This approach does not enjoy much support from African-American parents, either: only 24% think this idea would improve learning” (Johnson and Immerwahr, *First Things First*, 21).

[21] Stone, “Developmentalism.”

[22] See J. Stone, “Value-Added Assessment: An Accountability Revolution,” in *Better Teachers, Better Schools*, ed. M. Kanstoroom and C. Finn (Washington, DC: Thomas Fordham Foundation, 1999).

“Diversity” and “Political Correctness”

These terms have come into great usage over the recent past. The difficulty with these terms is that over use has destroyed any ability to understand their meaning. They have taken on the nature of a fad. They are words that contribute nothing to an attempt at precision of language.

“Political Correctness” came into use in an attempt to soften the alleged hurt that some commentary may bring. The use of such devices may be laudable if they are used only in casual relationships, and are not intended as a substitute for truth. A mere “cleaning up” of the language, as was common in mid-Victorian usage – when a spade may have been called “a garden implement” – might be permitted. But when the truth, or fact, as revealed in a long train of scholarly research, is turned on its head, then we have gone too far. History, which is one of my disciplines, is being rewritten through applications of politically correct reinterpretations. I refer to something far more serious than the work by scholars in revisions. There are many incidents when the use of political correctness has become anti-intellectual.

The role of education is to make a positive contribution to understanding. Put another way, the task of educators is to engage in the quest for fact and truth. The feelings and sensitivities of students deserve such considerations as civility, courtesy, and decency. But in providing these attributes, it is essential to hold to the conclusions revealed in scholarly research.

The use of the term “diversity” has become quite pernicious. The academy at virtually all levels seems to be quite enamored with the notion of diversity. The word has become useful as a virtual mantra – which has no real meaning. Again, we struggle to understand what is implied in the use of this term. If we mean that it is good to bring together persons with varied ethnic roots in a setting that fosters a greater degree of tolerance and understanding among people, this motivation can be useful in a civic setting. If the implications to be derived from this term are that we must provide some sort of ethnic ratio or mix in the academy, then it may be that we are promoting an unlawful or undesirable quota system. Some jurisdictions have enacted law which specifically prohibits the use of quotas in employment and enrollment. To create a weighted mix of persons based upon artificially devised ethnic or racial considerations is poor public policy.

Ralph M. Tanner, Ph.D.

TITLE: Provisional Teacher Program

HISTORY: Adopted by the State Board of Education in Sept. 1984.

MOTIVATION: The Provisional Teacher Program is intended to enhance both the quantity and quality of teaching candidates.

"The point of the alternate route is to put stronger teachers in classrooms."

GRADE LEVELS AND/OR SUBJECT AREAS COVERED:

All, except special education, English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education.

WHO OPERATES: LEAs, in conjunction with colleges of education, with coordination provided by the State Department of Education.

REQUIREMENTS TO ENTER:

To be eligible for employment in the Provisional Teacher Program, applicants must present completion of the following:

1. Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution.
2. For secondary candidates: a major in the subject teaching field (e.g. English, mathematics). For elementary candidates: a major in the liberal arts or sciences.
3. Test requirement -- Applicants for certification in a subject teaching field must pass the appropriate Praxis II Subject Assessment/NTE Programs Specialty Area tests. Applicants for certification in elementary education must pass the NTE General Knowledge test of the Core Battery. Candidates in the following subject teaching fields available through the Alternate Route are exempt from the test requirement: foreign languages other than French, German, and Spanish; earth science; health education; psychology; and vocational education.

ALTERNATIVE TEACHER CERTIFICATION

A State-by-State Analysis 1998-99

C. EMILY FEISTRITZER
DAVID T. CHESTER

Upon completion of the three requirements, a candidate receives a Certificate of Eligibility, which provides the opportunity to seek employment through the Provisional Teacher Program.

When offered employment, applicants are advised of documents required before a provisional license can be issued. A provisional license is required to legalize employment during the 34-week Provisional Teacher Program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

Provisional teachers attend a program of formal instruction that takes place concurrently with employment during the first year. This instruction supplements a program of on-the-job mentoring, support, and evaluation, aimed at developing and documenting the teacher's instructional competency.

Formal instruction consists of approximately 200 hours of study in essential professional knowledge and skills. It is presented after school and/or on Saturdays at a district-operated or state-operated training center.

Mentoring is provided by a support team arranged by the local district and minimally comprised of the school principal, and an experienced mentor teacher. Other professionals, as determined by the district, may also participate.

After successful completion of the program, provisional teachers are eligible for standard license in the teaching area(s) listed in the Certificate of Eligibility. Certificates are issued in subject teaching fields (N-12), and elementary education (N-8).

NO. OF CREDIT HOURS TO COMPLETE:

Approximately 200 clock hours of instruction and 34 weeks of full-time classroom competency development.

WHO EVALUATES: Evaluations are conducted by the school principal or administrative designee. The teacher is evaluated on at least three occasions during the initial year. The first two evaluations are used to aid the teacher's development.

The third and final evaluation is conducted after the provisional teacher has completed 34 weeks of full-time teaching. This last evaluation will contain the principal's recommendation regarding licensure. Recommendations for standard licensure are made by the principal (on forms provided by the New Jersey Department of Education), in consultation with the support team and are submitted for final action to the State Board of Examiners.

LENGTH OF TIME: 34 weeks of full-time employment.

Teaching As The Opportunity: The Teacher Advancement Program

2000 National Education Conference President's Presentation

By Lowell Milken
Chairman
The Milken Family Foundation

Executive Summary

Every young person in America has the right to the kind of education provided by quality educators. From the Foundation's work, analysis of research and experience over the years, we know that quality teaching is the basic building block of better schools and the essential ingredient of student success and achievement. In fact, the single most important education element is *always* the educator.

There is, for the first time in many years, a growing national consensus about the critical issue of the quality of teachers. With education now ranking as American voters' top concern, there is no shortage of proposed solutions for improving the quality of the American teaching corps. Yet, none of these proposals has proved equal to the challenge of attracting, motivating and retaining high-caliber talent to the American teaching profession.

The problem resides in the *structure* of the American teaching profession. In its current form, this structure fails to attract and keep top talent in three critical ways. First, it does not offer teachers sustained opportunities for professional growth and career advancement. Second, it does not provide competitive compensation. Third, and in part, consequently, it does not command the respect of the society it upholds—or the young people it serves.

The problem is particularly urgent because in our fast-changing times, teaching quality isn't just an *education* issue; it's also an *economic* issue. Human capital, which is propelled by the education, training and skills that give people command over knowledge, is the engine of today's economy. Because they are in limited supply, there is fierce competition for highly skilled workers in virtually every industry, and companies are offering ever-larger compensation packages to attract talent.

At a time when the entire economy is competing for a limited pool of high quality human capital, how can the American education profession—which already faces an unprecedented teacher shortage—possibly attract, retain and motivate the high-caliber practitioners it needs?

The answer is, it can't—at least in its present form. Compensation is a major concern. Teachers' average starting salaries are lower than those of other college graduates, making it difficult to attract talented young undergraduates to the profession. This is evident in the fact that the young people who are attracted to teaching, compared to students considering careers in other fields, are those who largely score near the bottom of high-stakes exams. This pattern is reinforced by the hiring practices of many districts, which tend to undervalue important indicators of teacher quality, such as subject matter knowledge, strong academic records and cognitive ability.

But it will do little good to recruit talented young people to the teaching profession if we can't retain and motivate them—that is, if we don't create an environment in which they can thrive. Under the current structure, one out of five new teachers will leave the profession within three years—and most likely to leave will be those with stronger academic backgrounds. Part of the reason, again, is low compensation: Those in other professions with similar education and experience levels earn on average 75% more than teachers. And the minimal pay raises that do occur are based almost exclusively on years of service or academic seat time, not on performance or additional responsibility. Indeed, because of few opportunities for career advancement for those teachers who want more salary and responsibility, the current K-12 system is a one-way career path out of the classroom and into administration.

To address these problems, the Foundation has formulated the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), a systemic approach that builds upon five key principles:

First, establish multiple career paths. TAP provides all teachers with multiple career paths and opportunities to advance in the profession without having to leave the classroom. Teachers are able to progress along a continuum where increased responsibilities, qualifications, professional development and performance requirements are commensurate with compensation. Multiple career paths provide expanded roles for talented teachers as leaders, decision-makers and mentors, and give them opportunities to work in the broader community.

Second, establish a system of broad market-driven compensation. TAP provides market-driven compensation, which replaces lock-step salary structures and provides flexibility to establish salaries. This system provides increased pay for those who do more work and are judged to be the most effective.

Third, establish a system of performance-based accountability. TAP maintains high teacher standards by means of performance-based accountability, which systematically measures teacher competence in content knowledge, instruction, assessment and student learning gains. Hiring, advancement and pay decisions are based on performance reviews conducted by the principal and peer experts from both inside and outside the school. While the ultimate goal is for teachers to sign three-year renewable contracts, the tenure process, at a minimum, will be longer and more rigorous.

Fourth, establish the means for ongoing, applied professional growth. TAP provides professional growth at the school site throughout the year in order to improve teacher skills in the classroom. Professional Growth Blocks provide frequent opportunities for teachers and administrators to learn, plan, and grow collaboratively. A mandated induction year with salary and mentoring gives new teachers classroom responsibility with intensive support.

Fifth, expand the supply of high quality teachers. TAP expands the supply of high quality teachers in several ways: By making the initial academic degree and teaching certification attainable in four years in all states, by providing alternative certification to give beginning teachers as well as mid-career professionals the ability to enter teaching, and by allowing outstanding retired teachers to continue working part-time. Expanded teacher job mobility is achieved through multi-state credentialing; private pension plans that make benefits more portable; and the opportunity for all teachers to become nationally certified.

Last year, the Foundation unveiled an elementary school model designed to show how these five TAP principles could be put into practice. Since then, much of that strategy has taken hold in diverse settings around the country—from Massachusetts and Florida to Arkansas. And in Arizona five elementary schools will open next fall as the first TAP demonstration sites in the nation.

The Foundation has since developed a model specifically geared to secondary schools. All educators in this multi-tiered model—the associate teachers, senior teachers, mentor teachers, adjunct teachers, faculty fellows and master teacher elite—are motivated by and rewarded with increased salary flexibility, new career paths, and daily and ongoing professional growth opportunities.

Working over the past two decades in K-12 education and, in particular, with the Milken Educator Awards Program, gives us great hope about the possibilities for American education being vibrant and responsive. Our task now is to establish a *new* education structure that assures that good teachers are the norm, not the exception; a structure that will draw, nurture and reward more people of talent and commitment; and that will provide *all* children with the high quality teachers they need and deserve.





Home

Go

OK

LATEST NEWS

[Deputies face murder charge in lockup beating](#)

[Texas executes Graham](#)

[Gas prices fall for first time since June 1](#)

[License scandal moves Downstate](#)

[Justice official urges Gore campaign probe](#)

[Albright: U.S. forces not leaving S. Korea](#)

[Fire kills 15 at Australian youth hostel](#)

[More Latest News](#)

Markets

DOW:
+38.88
10415.0

NASDAQ:
-27.16
3909.68

S&P 500:
+1.87
1454.05

Find a quote:

Search

[Full market report](#)

REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHERS MAY INCREASE

REFORM PLAN SEEKS STRICTER STANDARDS

By Stephanie Banchemo
Tribune Staff Writer
June 16, 2000

Becoming a public school teacher in Illinois, which for years required little more than passing a high school-level basic skills exam and a fairly easy test in one field of study, will become more arduous under a sweeping package of reforms being considered by state education officials.

Under the proposal, aspiring teachers would have to pass a rigorous, college-level basic test of math, reading and writing skills before entering an accredited teaching program in Illinois. After graduation, they would receive a temporary teaching certificate after passing more strenuous tests in the subject areas they hope to teach, and another test to prove they know how to teach.

Finally, they would obtain a five-year license after undergoing an assessment of their classroom teaching skills.

The proposal also could require every school district to create a mentoring program for novice teachers.

The Illinois State Board of Education, which accredits teaching colleges, took the first step toward implementing those reforms Thursday when it approved

FEATURED ADVERTISERS

Check out the local companies at the 2nd annual Chicagoland Virtual Job Fair
From June 20-23

How does global warming affect me?

Search

alta vista:

Advertising information

WEB
SPECIALS

Tribune
investigation:
State of
execution

Jeff
MacNelly:
1947-2000

Multimedia
special:
Courthouse
weddings

Chicago's
Top 100
Companies

Jelly Roll
blues

Illinois
school report
card

More
specials

stringent "content-area standards," the body of knowledge a prospective teacher must master before receiving a diploma.

The state's teacher education programs are based mainly on the number of credit hours students must pass, not on the specific knowledge they must learn. For instance, French teachers need never prove they can speak French, only that they completed the required number of French classes.

The plan to drastically alter the state's teacher training programs is the latest move by the State Board of Education to ratchet up the demands on current and potential teachers, which educators acknowledge are embarrassingly low. For instance, on the current Test of Basic Skills, teachers need only post a three out of six on the writing exam. And those who fail the test can retake it unlimited times. Moreover, a middle school teacher who has a certificate to teach art, legally can teach math after completing 18 college credit hours in math.

"Right now, I would say Illinois is on the second tier when it comes to how we train and prepare teachers," said Mike Long, who oversees teacher preparation for the State Board of Education. "It's no secret that students' performance in the classroom can be directly attributed to the quality of teaching they receive. If we are going to toughen our standards for students, then we have to toughen our standards for teachers."

Illinois colleges and universities have until 2003 to align their curricula with the newly adopted content-area standards. The remainder of the teacher education reform proposals, such as tests and assessments, are under discussion and promise to be the most cantankerous aspects.

The state's teacher education reform efforts mirror a national move to rid classrooms of inept teachers and keep the

good ones, who often leave for better paying and less stressful jobs.

But it also comes at a time when a massive teacher shortage looms. Federal education officials estimate that shortage will reach 2 million during the next decade, with the recruitment of math and science teachers reaching crisis proportions.

That stark reality weighed heavily in the state's reform efforts.

The new proposal would have created a certification in the broad field of "science," where potential teachers would receive training in all the science fields. Then, a high school teacher with a science certificate could teach chemistry, physics or biology.

Currently, a high school physics teacher is supposed to have an endorsement to teach physics, and one who teaches chemistry needs a chemistry endorsement. But a critical shortage of science teachers has forced Illinois school districts to hire teachers who have no training to teach science classes, Long said.

The new designation would increase the pool of trained science teachers and mitigate Illinois' out-of-field teaching problem.

But the science standards were tabled after Board Chairman Ron Gidwitz complained about the broad nature.

"My concern is if we don't have a level of specificity [on the science certificates], children in this state will not benefit from a science curriculum that is second to none and is universally available," he said.

There are other critics. Some business leaders complain the reform efforts do not go far enough. And teachers union officials, while offering support for higher standards, express concern over the final assessment of classroom skills and the

possibility of making teachers pass a test in every subject they plan to teach.

Susan Shea, spokeswoman for the Illinois Education Association, the state's largest teachers union, said, "So far, we agree with most of what the state board has done, but I guarantee there will be some cussing and discussing when it comes down to assessments."

Carolyn Nordstrom, president of the Chicago United, a non-profit coalition of 75 business leaders, alleges that state officials are not being aggressive enough.

"Things are better than they used to be, but they are not where they need to be," Nordstrom said of the teacher education reform. "We feel they [state board officials] need to take a leadership role and not be afraid to ask teachers to reach higher standards. They almost have an apologetic attitude about it."

- [E-mail this story to a friend](#)
- [More articles on the Metro Du Page home page](#)

[RETURN TO TOP](#) | [HOME](#)

Home

ONLINE ORDERING IS HERE!

Start shopping . . . www.jewelosca.com



SECTIONS: [News](#) | [ChicagoSports.com](#) | [Business](#) | [Tech](#) | [Leisure](#) | [Health|Family](#) |

[Copyright and terms of service](#) | [Privacy policy](#)

STATE OF KANSAS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

KENNY A. WILK
715 Cottonwood Drive
Lansing, Kansas 66043
(913) 727-2453



*State Representative
42nd District
State Capitol, Room 514-S
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1504
(785) 296-7660*

CHAIRMAN
House Appropriations Committee

**Testimony by Representative Kenny Wilk
Thursday, February 15, 2001**

Good Morning Mr. Chairman and Madame Vice Chair,

It is an honor to be here this morning to support the idea of looking at alternative ways for teachers to get their certification.

We've all been hearing about the teachers shortage here in Kansas. As a matter of fact- we're short 500 teachers today and the school year is just about over. Substitute teachers are filling the gap but how many of us would like to know that our child is being taught essential life skills by someone different- at different skill levels- each day? What we need is people who **want** to teach our children and who **want** to make a difference.

If we looked at education like a business... we'd focus our attention on solving the shortage by looking at ways to recruit and retain our employees (a.k.a.. our teachers). We would also have to recognize our changing society. We are growing older and our workforce is growing older. As a business, we would have to find a way to be more flexible and more accommodating to get the qualified people we want. Unemployment is low right now and our industries are being forced to explore alternatives to attract the best. That's exactly what we have to do in **our** business of education.

Several states are now offering alternative programs to certify teachers. In New Jersey for example, their state board of education has been offering a provisional teaching program since 1984. And much closer to home, Wichita State University has started offering an alternative teacher certification program. We have got to get out of the box and find the qualified people who want to be a part of education. We need to do some brainstorming... why not offer older people a chance to get back in the classroom? The percentage of retirees is much higher than ever before... why not let a professional person with years of experience and knowledge have a chance to give back to Kansas by leading a classroom? I'm sure there are several who would love the chance but can not imagine having to go back to college for certification.

House Education Committee

Date: 2/15/01

Attachment # 4-1

I recognize and acknowledge that not everyone can be a teacher. But I believe there are hundreds of people who could and should be at the head of a class. We just have to find them to make the most important business in Kansas, the business of educating our children, the success we know it should and could be.

In closing: I am here today to challenge this committee, and all legislators to broaden our horizons. We all have different strong points, experiences, successes and failures... surely we can come up with a way to put great teachers in our classrooms. Remember, alternatives in certification should not be about letting less qualified people teach our children, it's about changing with the times, opening our eyes, and giving our children the best education- with the best possible teachers.

Thank you again for the opportunity to share my views in this. I share your passion about education.

I will be available for any questions.