AMERICA'S TEACHER COLLEGES: ARE THEY MAKING THE GRADE?

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MAY 20, 2003

Serial No. 108-16

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and the Workforce

87-985 pdf

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
FAX: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
PETER HOEKSTRA, Michigan
HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware
SAM JOHNSON, Texas
JAMES C. GREENWOOD, Pennsylvania
CHARLIE NORWOOD, Georgia
FRED UPTON, Michigan
VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan
JIM DeMINT, South Carolina
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
JUDY BIGGERT, Illinois
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
PATRICK J. TIBERI, Ohio
RIC KELLER, Florida
TOM OSBORNE, Nebraska
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JON C. PORTER, Nevada
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas
MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE, Colorado
MARSHA BLCAKBURN, Tennessee
PHIL GINGREY, Georgia
MAX BURNS, Georgia

GEORGE MILLER, California
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
RUBÉN HINOJOSA, Texas
CAROLYN McCARTHY, New York
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
RON KIND, Wisconsin
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
DAVID WU, Oregon
RUSH D. HOLT, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
ED CASE, Hawaii
RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, Arizona
DENISE L. MAJETTE, Georgia
CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Maryland
TIMOTHY J. RYAN, Ohio
TIMOTHY H. BISHOP, New York

Paula Nowakowski, *Chief of Staff*
John Lawrence, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21st CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS

HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California, *Chairman*

JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia, *Vice Chairman*
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware
SAM JOHNSON, Texas
FRED UPTON, Michigan
VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan
PATRICK J. TIBERI, Ohio
RIC KELLER, Florida
TOM OSBORNE, Nebraska
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JON C. PORTER, Nevada
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas
PHIL GONGREY, Georgia
MAX BURNS, Georgia

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
RON KIND, Wisconsin
DAVID WU, Oregon
RUSH D. HOLT, New Jersey
BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota
CAROLYN McCARTHY, New York
CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Maryland
TIMOTHY J. RYAN, Ohio
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
RUBÉN HINOJOSA, Texas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS iii

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, DC 1

OPENING STATEMENT OF RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, REPRESENTATIVE DALE KILDEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, DC 4

TESTIMONY OF MRS. LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, EDUCATION LEADERS COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C. 7

TESTIMONY OF MS. KATI HAYCOCK, DIRECTOR, THE EDUCATION TRUST, WASHINGTON, D.C. 9

TESTIMONY OF DR. ARTHUR E. WISE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C. 11

TESTIMONY OF DR. LOUANNE KENNEDY, PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE, NORTHRIDGE, CALIFORNIA 13

TESTIMONY OF DR. JERRY ROBBINS, DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, YPSILANTI, MICHIGAN 14

TESTIMONY OF DR. JOYCE R. COPPIN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE, DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES, NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 17

APPENDIX A -- WRITTEN OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, DC 37

APPENDIX B -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF MRS. LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, EDUCATION LEADERS COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C. 41

APPENDIX C -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF MS. KATI HAYCOCK, DIRECTOR, THE EDUCATION TRUST, WASHINGTON, D.C. 53

APPENDIX D -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. ARTHUR E. WISE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C. 65

APPENDIX E -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. LOUANNE KENNEDY, PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE, NORTHRIDGE, CALIFORNIA 87

APPENDIX F -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. JERRY ROBBINS, DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, YPSILANTI, MICHIGAN 97

APPENDIX G -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. JOYCE R. COPPIN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE, DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES, NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 131

APPENDIX H -- THE BROAD FOUNDATION AND THE FORDHAM FOUNDATION REPORT ON, "BETTER LEADERS FOR AMERICA'S SCHOOLS: A MANIFESTO", SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY MRS. LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN 139

APPENDIX I -- QUESTIONS TO WITNESSES SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY REPRESENTATIVE MAX BURNS AND RESPONSES FROM DR. JERRY ROBBINS, DR. ARTHUR E. WISE, DR. LOUANNE KENNEDY, AND MS. KATI HAYCOCK. 215

APPENDIX J -- WRITTEN STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY REPRESENTATIVE BETTY MCCOLLUM 229

APPENDIX K -- LETTER SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD FROM DR. DARYAO S. KHARTI AND DR. ANNE O. HUGHES 233

TABLE OF INDEXES 238

AMERICA'S TEACHER COLLEGES: ARE THEY MAKING THE GRADE?

TUESDAY, MAY 20, 2003

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY
COMPETITIVENESS,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2 p.m., in Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives McKeon, Petri, Castle, Ehlers, Tiberi, Cole, Carter, Gingrey, Burns, Kildee, Tierney, Wu, Holt, McCollum, McCarthy, Van Hollen, Ryan, Owens, and Payne.

Also Present: Representatives Bishop and Davis of California.

Staff Present: Kevin Frank, Professional Staff Member; Alexa Marrero, Press Secretary; Maria Miller, Coalitions Director for Education Policy; Susan Oglinsky, Coalitions Advisor; Deborah L. Samantar, Committee Clerk/Intern Coordinator; Kathleen Smith, Professional Staff Member; Rich Stombres, Professional Staff Member; Holli Traud, Legislative Assistant; Ellynne Bannon, Minority Legislative Associate/Education; Ricardo Martinez, Minority Legislative Associate/Education; Alex Nock, Minority Legislative Associate/Education; and Joe Novotny, Minority Staff Assistant/Education.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, DC

Chairman McKeon. A quorum being present, the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness will come to order.

We are meeting today to hear testimony on America's teachers colleges: Are they making the grade?

Under committee rule 12(b) opening statements are limited to the chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee. Therefore, if other members have statements, they may be included in the hearing record. With that, I ask unanimous consent for the hearing record to remain open 14 days to allow members' statements and other extraneous material referenced during the hearing to be submitted in the official hearing record. Without objection, so ordered.

Good afternoon. I would like to welcome each of you to the hearing today as the subcommittee continues its focus on reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Today we are holding our second hearing on teacher quality.

Last October the subcommittee held a hearing on Training Tomorrow's Teachers: Ensuring a Quality Postsecondary Education, to learn about the effects of amendments made in 1998 to Title II of the Higher Education Act on the quality of teacher education programs in the United States. At that hearing we discussed the effectiveness of the competitive grant programs authorized under Title II and examined accountability provisions for teaching preparation programs under the act. The purpose of today's hearing is to discuss whether teacher colleges and other teacher preparation programs are producing a competitive cadre of teachers.

The caliber of teacher education programs at institutions of higher education has come under increased scrutiny over the past several years. Among other things, teacher preparation programs have been criticized for providing prospective teachers with inadequate time to learn subject matter; for teaching a superficial curriculum; and for being unduly fragmented, with courses not linked to practice teaching and with education faculty isolated from their arts and sciences faculty colleagues.

In particular, there have been concerns about high rates of failure of recent teacher college graduates on initial licensing or certification exams. A recent Congressional Research Service report noted that one of the most publicly reported instances of high failure rates was in 1998 when 59 percent of prospective teachers in Massachusetts failed that State's new certification exam. These dismal results raised questions about the quality of the preparation and training prospective teachers had received from teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education across the State.

In June 2002, the Secretary of Education issued the first full annual report on teacher preparation as required under Title II of the Higher Education Act. The report, titled Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality, concluded that the teacher preparation system in this country has serious limitations. Not only does acceptable achievement on certification assessments differ markedly among the States, the Secretary's report found that most States, in setting the minimum score considered to be a passing score, set those scores well below the national averages. The data collected for this report suggest that schools of education and formal teacher training programs are failing to produce the types of highly qualified teachers that the No Child Left Behind Act demands.

There is widespread awareness that the subject matter knowledge and teaching skills of teachers play a central role in the success of elementary and secondary education reform. More than half of the 2.2 million teachers that America's schools will need to hire over the next 10 years will be first-time teachers, and they will need to be well prepared for the challenges of today's classrooms. For these reasons the nation's attention has increasingly focused on the role that institutions of higher education and States play in ensuring that new teachers have the content knowledge and teaching skills they need to ensure that all students are held to higher standards.

Approximately 1,200 institutions of higher education award undergraduate degrees in elementary and secondary education. In addition to earning a baccalaureate degree in education, other undergraduates get ready to teach by participating in a teacher education program while earning a degree in an academic subject area. Still other individuals enter teaching through post baccalaureate certificate programs or master's programs offered by institutions of higher education. Finally, alternative routes to teaching that target, for example, individuals changing careers may also involve higher education institutions.

Title II of the Higher Education Act includes programs and provisions intended to improve the overall quality of teacher preparation programs administered by institutions of higher education, hold these programs accountable for the quality of their graduates, and strengthen recruitment of highly qualified individuals to the teaching profession. Institutions of higher education have a great deal of responsibility in contributing to the preparation of our nation's teachers. We are here today to learn whether provisions under Title II of the Higher Education Act are working and whether our teacher preparation programs are making the grade.

We have a distinguished panel of witnesses today, and I would like to thank you for your appearance before the subcommittee today, and I look forward to your testimony and any recommendations you may have as we work to reauthorize the teacher provisions of the Higher Education Act.

WRITTEN OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN HOWARD P. “BUCK” MCKEON, SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, DC—SEE APPENDIX A

Chairman McKeon. I now yield to Mr. Kildee, Ranking Member of the committee, for his opening statement.

OPENING STATEMENT OF RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, REPRESENTATIVE DALE KILDEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. Kildee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased to join my respected friend Chairman McKeon at today's hearing on teacher quality and Title II of the Higher Education Act.

Having led efforts on this side of the aisle during the last higher education reauthorization, I am looking forward to strengthening our teacher preparation programs and increasing the supply of highly qualified teachers. Nothing is more critical to the education of a child than the quality of that child's teacher. I taught for 10 years and have been guided by that. I really gained from having taught with such great teachers at Flint Central High School, many of whom attended Eastern Michigan. This makes the work at our nation's schools of education and other programs that produce and certify our teachers extremely critical. Without top-notch schools of education, we simply can't produce the number of teachers that our children need to learn.

Title II of the Higher Education Act plays an important role in improving the quality of our teacher preparation programs. The research provided through its grant programs has improved teacher certification and reform initiatives at the State level and assured strong partnerships between institutions of higher education and high-need local educational agencies.

As we look to authorize or reauthorize these programs, we need to make several critical changes. First, the definition of high-need local educational agency should be set at a higher, more targeted threshold. This will lead to needier school districts being included in partnerships and an increased number of disadvantaged children benefiting from improved teaching.

In addition, we need to expand our efforts to include all of the high-quality universities in Title II programs. This includes expanding opportunities for historically black colleges, Hispanic-serving institutions and travel colleges to improve teacher preparation and to work with disadvantaged school districts.

We also need to examine the accountability provision of Title II to ensure that critical information on the performance of schools of education and other teacher preparation programs is reported and used to improve quality. The reporting and accountability system we established in 1998 with Mr. McKeon and I was a very good first start, and in this reauthorization we need to improve how States and institutions report data to ensure that we get an accurate picture of how many teacher candidates pass initial certification exams.

Lastly, I want to comment on the president's loan forgiveness proposal for math, science and special education teachers. Loan forgiveness is an important tool to ensure that highly qualified teachers can be recruited and retained, especially in our most disadvantaged schools. While the president's proposal improves the existing loan forgiveness program that Chairman McKeon and I created in the last reauthorization, more must be done. We should not limit

expanded loan forgiveness to just math, science and special education teachers. Instead we should increase loan forgiveness to 17,500 for all teachers teaching in Title I schools. In addition, we must provide some initial levels of forgiveness in the first five years of teaching in a Title I school.

The present loan forgiveness authority requires teachers to teach for five years prior to ever receiving any loan forgiveness. This 5-year waiting period reduces the attractiveness of loan forgiveness as a retention-based incentive. We should instead be providing an increasing portion of forgiveness in each of the first five years a teacher teaches in a Title I school. This change alone could make the existing loan forgiveness program a much more attractive retention tool for school districts seeking highly qualified teachers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close my remarks by thanking the witnesses for their testimony, and thank you for holding this hearing. There is no more important task than to assure that our teachers are well prepared to help our children learn, and I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McKeon. Thank you.

I will now introduce our witnesses. First is Lisa Graham Keegan. Ms. Graham Keegan is the chief executive officer and founding member of the Education Leaders Council in Washington, D.C. Prior to the Education Leaders Council, she served as the superintendent of public instruction in Arizona. I first met her when we went there and held a hearing on charter schools. She was elected to the Arizona House of Representatives for two terms. During her tenure she served as vice chair and chair of the house education committee.

Next we have Kati Haycock. Ms. Haycock is a director of The Education Trust in Washington, D.C., and previously served as executive vice president and chief operating officer of the Children's Defense Fund. Additionally, Ms. Haycock founded and served as the chief executive officer of the Achievement Council, a nonprofit organization that assists teachers and administrators in low performing, predominantly minority schools.

Then we have Dr. Arthur E. Wise. Dr. Wise is president of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in Washington, D.C., and is the coauthor of *A License to Teach*, which concerns professionalization of teaching. He also served as director of the Rand Corporation's Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession.

Then we have Dr. Louanne Kennedy. Dr. Kennedy is provost and vice president for academic affairs at California State University-Northridge in California; which used to be in my district. Prior to this she held the positions of vice president for academic affairs at Keen College of New Jersey and associate provost of Baruch College, the City University of New York, and was also acting president of the university, I know, for about a year. It is good to see you again.

I would like to introduce Mr. Kildee to introduce our next witness.

Mr. Kildee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is my great pleasure to introduce Dr. Jerry Robbins, dean of the College of Education at Eastern Michigan University. My daughter chose to attend Eastern Michigan, not in your school, but in the School of Psychology. Dr. Robbins has 23 years of experience as a dean of a college of education, the last 12 years at Eastern Michigan University. In addition, Dr. Robbins has 15 additional years in other higher educational roles and has served as a principal and a teacher.

Eastern Michigan University and the college Dr. Robbins have the distinction of being the largest producer of educational personnel in the country, in both quantity and quality. In addition, Eastern Michigan University is among the largest producers of new teachers. Eastern Michigan also has received the NCATE accreditation and represents one of the more innovative examples of schools of education.

What impresses me most about Dr. Robbins' and Eastern Michigan's focus on preparing high-quality teachers, and I stress high quality, is that all of EMU's prospective teachers complete an academic major and minor. Graduates from Eastern Michigan know the subject matters they are hired to teach. In addition, an EMU graduate must take the State exam prior to being recommended for the Michigan Department of Education for licensure. Dr. Robbins is a big reason this focus on quality remains a steadfast commitment at Eastern Michigan. This focus on quality is exactly what this committee is seeking as we look to reauthorize Title II of the Higher Education Act. We are fortunate to have Dr. Robbins before this committee today, and I welcome his insight and testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McKeon. Thank you.

I would now like to introduce Mr. Owens to introduce our next panelist.

Mr. Owens. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to introduce Joyce Coppin, who is the chief executive of Division of Human Resources, New York City Department of Education. I have a long biography here, but I will not bother to read it. I know Dr. Coppin is an activist and idealist, a person who has been on the frontlines in every aspect of education starting with teaching, superintendent of a local district and high school superintendent. She is presently part of the massive reorganization of the schools in New York City, and we are so glad to have her to help train those businessmen who are in charge and keep them focused on education.

Dr. Coppin was appointed as the Brooklyn High School superintendent more than 14 years ago. She served for 14 years in the position as Brooklyn High School superintendent, giving back. The magnitude of what that means, in Brooklyn there are 56,000 students, 4,500 staff members and a budget of almost $275 million.

In 2002, she was appointed to her present position as chief executive for the division of human resources. Her office provides service and support to the 130,000 staff members who are directly and indirectly responsible for education of children in the city of New York schools. In addition, she also oversees the department's teaching recruitment, preparation, professional

development, and retention programs.

The last time I saw Dr. Coppin, I think it was at a special reception in honor of her at Medgar Evers College, and it is a college where a large number of teachers are educated. They have had their problems with their teachers being able to pass examination and get certification, and they have made great improvements in that respect.

So, Dr. Coppin, it is great to see you here and know that you are close to the top decision-making processes as New York City Schools reorganize themselves.

Chairman McKeon. Thank you very much.

Before the witnesses begin, I would like to explain to you a little bit about those lights you see in front of you. I know your testimonies will probably be longer than five minutes. Your full testimony will be included in the record. When the light comes on green, it means you have five minutes. When the yellow comes on, it means you have a minute. When the red comes on, it means the world just ended.

And we will begin with Ms. Graham Keegan.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, EDUCATION LEADERS COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Ms. Keegan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members. I appreciate being here on behalf of the Education Leaders Council, which is an organization of State school chiefs, State board members, and governors' offices and other officials in education who are committed to standards and accountability, to choice in education, and to the quality of teaching in the nation. We are also partners with the National Council on Teacher Quality in a project that Secretary Paige initiated with us for the development of an American board for teacher certification, which will provide a new route for the country for teachers to come into teaching, for us to be able to guarantee that young teachers, at least prospective teachers, know their content, know the teaching instructional skills that they need to know to be a beginning teacher, and then we will heartily recommend to States and follow them through mentoring, mentoring that for us must include the quality of the instruction as evidenced in student achievement. So the American Board will follow all of our candidates and see how their standards perform.

The American Board was put together originally by grant from Secretary Paige, who, as you know, has been a strong advocate for bringing quality teachers into the classroom, for knowing whether the teachers we have in the classroom are producing quality in terms of students. We brought together some of the Nation's most thoughtful advocates of teacher quality, of content specialty, and created the standards on which these tests are based. These tests will be available for elementary education starting at the end of August of this year for States to adopt and use as one

route to certification.

The American Board will not require that the candidate must go through a college of education. We will require a bachelor's degree in content. We will require absolutely that the candidate has been trained and skilled and has the knowledge and instructional technique required to be in the classroom. However, we will not require the traditional route through a college of education.

We believe this is important because no preparation for teaching is easy or efficient or quick. It simply isn't possible. To know the content that one has to impart to students is difficult. Whether that be through a math preparation program, an English language arts preparation, or science preparation, all of those studies are extremely difficult at the university level.

It is also challenging to acquire the kind of skills that you must have to be able to manage a classroom, to understand how students learn, to respond to all groups of students, and primarily to have the high expectation which we believe is incumbent in this endeavor that all students in the classroom can and will learn the necessary skills.

We are in a new environment, thank goodness, of no child left behind, of accountability, of a belief in the Nation and an insistence that all children, no matter the way they look, how much money they have, or their ZIP code, all of them must be entitled to a certain amount of essential knowledge. In order to do that then, in order to teach that knowledge, one must understand that certain types of instruction are necessary.

There is no question that the predominant view in the preparation of teachers in America today is that discovery learning and that students sort of exploring and coming up with the things that they need to know has been the predominant view, in addition to the fact that we have far too much belief that there are certain students who cannot. At the Education Leaders Council we make a weekly event of pointing out a quote from somebody who shares with us the reasons that some school cannot succeed because of the nature of the students in the school. We simply must get beyond a moment in which we blame a lack of improvement on the students themselves. It is us, it is our responsibility. It is an adult responsibility that we think can be answered in the process for certification that States and the nation allow.

What we believe is that there ought not to be simply one method, one route to the classroom; that what we need to judge is whether or not the person who is coming to us as a prospective teacher has the skills that they need to be a beginning teacher. No teacher who walks into a classroom for the first time is prepared for what they will face, particularly in middle school, where my son is right now. It is a very trying, very expertise-laden job to manage 12-year-olds, 13-year-olds, 14-year-olds who come to us with these really big backpacks and believe we will fill it up with the knowledge that they need.

It is a difficult job, but it is also a job that must be learned in part based on what the teacher knows, and how they deliver that information. There must be unequivocal ability on the teacher's part of the content itself; they must know the subject material they are trying to impart to their student. We have spent far too long on process. It is not possible to teach what we do not know.

So that needs to once again come to the forefront of this endeavor.

In addition, we must change our emphasis so that we look at exactly how far students progress and not simply whether or not we have provided process, but whether we provided success.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF MRS. LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, EDUCATION LEADERS COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C.—SEE APPENDIX B

Chairman McKeon. Thank you.

Ms. Haycock.

TESTIMONY OF MS. KATI HAYCOCK, DIRECTOR, THE EDUCATION TRUST, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Ms. Haycock. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice Chairman and members of the committee, for the last 10 years we have been engaged in this nation in a war of competing claims about teacher preparation. On one side are those who argue that teachers need no special preparation in education skills. On the other side are those who argue that teachers, like other professionals, need special preparation, and to place anybody else in a classroom is criminal.

You just heard one side of that argument. When I am done, you will hear the other. In fact, I worried a little bit about my placement between these two. Like most matters, however, the truth is probably somewhere in between. But the very sad fact is that we do not actually know which parts of whose claims are accurate.

Fortunately, while that lack of good, solid information has limited what States can do to respond to the bold action you asked them to take in No Child Left Behind, the truth is that you could set in motion in Title II, the Higher Ed Act, a process that would actually answer these questions once and for all. But first a brief reminder of why that is so important.

As all of you know, we used to believe in this country that what kids learned was primarily a function of them and their families, and that kids who grew up in poverty or in difficult home or neighborhood circumstances would not learn no matter what we did. There was, of course, a lot of new research that turns those ideas upside down. It says unequivocally that some things that schools do matter hugely in whether kids learn or whether they don't, and the thing that unquestionably matters most is good teachers.

Now armed with that knowledge, you set into motion in No Child Left Behind a process for refocusing schools and districts and entire States, in fact, on improving teacher quality and in making sure that poor children got their fair share of our strongest teachers. The Higher Ed Act, of course, is your opportunity to refocus higher education on that objective as well. You started that work in 1998. Now is your opportunity to move a bit further.

What changes might you consider? The first thing that is important to understand is that whether teachers come through schools of education or whether they come through alternate routes and, therefore, from academic departments, whole universities are responsible for the preparation of teachers pre-K through high school. Yet in a 1998 act you held accountable only the education schools. So what could you do about that?

Number one, you could require States to ask arts and science faculty members to actually review the standards and assessments for teachers to make sure that they are up to the level of knowledge that is necessary to get children to State standards.

Number two, you could make sure that when candidates fail licensure examinations in mathematics, for example, that the mathematics department that did their education is actually held accountable as well, not just the education school.

Number three; you could target the dollars in your State and partnership grants to engage not just education schools, but academic departments as well in tackling two of the biggest problems that we face. Number one is both the quantity and the quality of mathematics teachers, and number two is both the quantity and the quality of our pre-K teachers.

Secondly, let me go back to those vexing questions about what really matters and what does not. There, in fact, is a way to answer those questions. It is called value-added assessment, and I would strongly urge you to make, as a condition of providing a State grant or a partnership grant, a requirement that districts or States install value-added systems or the rough equivalent of those in order, in other words, to understand what actually matters in raising student achievement and what does not.

Third and finally, the matter of who teaches whom. No matter how you measure teacher qualifications in field, out of field, certified, uncertified, major, non-major, or actual experience, poor and minority children nationally get way more than their fair share of our least well-qualified teachers. Again, you focused real attention on that on the K-12 side in No Child Left Behind. The question is how you come back around and reinforce that in the Higher Education Act.

There are two things in particular that would help. Number one, loan forgiveness helps, especially when it is highly targeted to the highest poverty schools, and when it is more generous earlier than it is now. The current amounts are not sufficient to provide an incentive to those who want to teach in our highest poverty schools.

Secondly, it would also help to focus higher education energies if, number one, States were asked to include in their accountability systems for higher education institutions not just the pass rate measures, but measures of improvement in a number of teachers they produce who actually go

to teach in high poverty schools; and secondly, to do what some States have already done, and that is include in the accountability measures targets just as you have for No Child Left Behind to make sure that every group of prospective teachers passes a licensure exam in adequate rates. Thank you.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF MS. KATI HAYCOCK, DIRECTOR, THE EDUCATION TRUST, WASHINGTON, D.C.—SEE APPENDIX C

Chairman McKeon. Thank you.

Dr. Wise.

TESTIMONY OF DR. ARTHUR E. WISE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Dr. Wise. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am honored to be here. NCATE is the accrediting agency for colleges that prepare the nation's teachers. NCATE and Congress, through Title II of the Higher Education Act, share the important goal of improving teacher preparation. I am here today to suggest that we can more effectively achieve the goal together. Rigorous teacher preparation is key to ensuring that no child is left behind.

Title II brought teacher testing out of the policy shadows and into the sunlight where it is now playing a forceful role in upgrading teacher quality and teacher preparation. Education schools are now required to report how many of their teacher candidates pass State licensing tests. In response, education schools and States have changed admissions and graduation requirements. They no longer graduate teachers who fail the test. This federal mandate has engaged NCATE to incorporate test score results into its accreditation decision.

The NCATE is voluntary. Its decisions currently apply to 665 institutions or 55 percent of the 1,200 teacher preparation institutions in the U.S. NCATE institutions prepare over two-thirds of all the new teacher education graduates. In the last decade 48 States have entered partnerships with NCATE.

NCATE now requires that education schools not only meet State-mandated pass rates, but also a high national pass rate; namely, that at least 80 percent of all candidates pass tests of academic content knowledge.

Since the enactment of Title II, NCATE has also been working with one national testing company to ensure that its teacher licensing tests are aligned with rigorous professional standards. NCATE has just reached an agreement with that company to establish a high national benchmark

on its teacher licensing tests. This unprecedented benchmark will provide a beacon to States that wish to upgrade standards.

As important as these steps are, content knowledge is only one indicator of readiness to teach. NCATE believes in a comprehensive approach to the development and assessment of teacher quality. In 2001, NCATE launched its new performance-based accreditation system, which requires multiple sources of evidence that candidates have not only content knowledge, but also the ability to teach it so that students learn.

In addition to meeting new test score requirements, education schools must take these steps: They must prepare new teachers to teach to today's higher standards. They must prepare new teachers to teach the great diversity of students who are now in America's classrooms. They must prepare new teachers to use technology effectively. They must offer more intensive supervised experiences in schools, and they must track progress of new teachers from admission to graduation and into the first years of teaching. These new requirements are strengthening the programs that education schools offer.

Based on what NCATE has learned from working with education schools, I have four recommendations. First, as I have described, NCATE carries out a comprehensive review of the institution, its programs and its candidates; therefore, Congress should revise section 207 of Public Law 105-244 to allow NCATE-accredited institutions and States to use NCATE accreditation as a substitute for all or some reporting requirements.

Second, Congress should amend section 202 to create incentives for States to implement comprehensive licensing assessment systems that include measures of content knowledge, teaching knowledge and skill, and the ability to teach so that all students learn.

Three, Congress should continue to encourage the development of alternate routes to licensing, but should tighten the definition of highly qualified teacher to preclude those who are still in training. The term "highly qualified" should be reserved for those individuals who have mastered a rigorous program of study and who have met all State licensing requirements.

Finally, Congress should amend section 203 to encourage professional development schools similar to teaching hospitals for medical education. These innovative institutions hold particular promise for preparing a new generation of teachers for urban schools. Thank you.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. ARTHUR E. WISE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.—SEE APPENDIX D

Chairman McKeon. Thank you.

Dr. Kennedy.

TESTIMONY OF DR. LOUANNE KENNEDY, PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE, NORTHRIDGE, CALIFORNIA

Dr. Kennedy. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice Chairman, members of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, ladies and gentlemen, we are pleased to be here as recipients of a Carnegie grant, which you had asked us specifically to speak about, as we look to moving further on our reform of teacher preparation.

Research has shown that the most important factor that impacts student achievement in the K-12 classroom is the quality of the teacher, even among disadvantaged children. And clearly, when students are not achieving, we need to look at the way we are preparing the teachers.

What this grant has made possible for us is to focus the attention of members of six different colleges, including the College of Education, as has been discussed earlier, to combine together to work together to look at the curriculum that is used in preparing the teacher rather than having them separated as they had been in the past.

We began this project actually with a Title II grant that developed and integrated teacher preparation program, integrated between arts and sciences and education, and aligned with the California standards.

The work under the grant takes as a dependent variable looking at every possible way in which we can evaluate pupil performance in the classroom and tie that back to the value added by graduates of our program. It has required us to look at evidence of what constitutes good teaching. It requires us to watch how that occurs not only in our own classrooms, but also in the K-12 classrooms. We are partnering now with teachers in the schools, principals, the Achievement Council, and the faculty that we have involved right now involves probably between 40 and 60 individuals, one group looking at evidence, one group looking at partnering with arts and sciences in education, and the third group looking at the measures that will be used as we make possible having teachers become a clinical practice profession. They are being and we are modeling this program on the way in which doctors have been prepared.

We follow the teachers through the first two years of their teaching and make possible the ability for them to identify the areas where they feel weakest and be able to produce the kind of learning, whether it is in pedagogy or in the content area or in what we now refer to as pedagogical content knowledge, because it does bring the two together, and it will be able to put together quickly the kind of programming they need in those first two years. We need teachers to teach well and students perform well, but we have to provide the support to make that possible.

This work also now has gone in two different directions as well. We are opening a high school in 2004 that will be a teaching academy. It is a joint venture with the Los Angeles Unified School District. You were there for the transfer of the land, as I recall. And this is a teacher academy that has two parts to it that I think are really very special. One is we are now hiring K-12 teachers with doctorates in content areas into the arts and sciences colleges, and we are hiring arts and sciences people as well as K-12 teachers into the college of education, and all of these combined together to work to develop our curriculum and to test the models that we are using to see whether it is really resulting in the child having a better performance at the end of the time with that teacher.

We are using standardized tests, normative tests, but our long-time objective is to establish an agreed-upon quality of student work that anyone can look at and say that is high-level performance in fourth grade math, writing, or English, or any subject whatsoever.

That high school opened in 2004. It will be a teaching academy, also focused on health sciences, and also focused on entertainment and communications. The three strands, the high school of 800, the three stands will be in these areas, and they are all geared toward careers so that we encourage students to learn the material, and the curriculum will be designed around learning that material as it applies to going on to higher education, but also to career, which is an important aspect, particularly getting kids to study mathematics and sciences.

We also have a full-inclusion elementary school, the CHIME school, in which we are able to demonstrate in K through 8 that full inclusion is possible, that every child can succeed. We are working with a number of different agencies, including the Achievement Council, the schools and our own six colleges. We think we have a model that will be, can be replicated. We started this with a Title II grant. We brought together the faculty there. Those kids are now graduating. They are out, able to show that a good teacher matters, it can be produced, and that results in high pupil performance. Thank you.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. LOUANNE KENNEDY, PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE, NORTHRIDGE, CALIFORNIA—SEE APPENDIX E

Chairman McKeon. Thank you.

Dr. Robbins.

TESTIMONY OF DR. JERRY ROBBINS, DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, YPSILANTI, MICHIGAN

Dr. Robbins. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Kildee, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, we appreciate this invitation very much. I am not here to speak for or against any particular

legislation, but instead to give you a case study of a teacher preparation program at which most of the criticisms that have been directed in recent times do not apply.

We are big. We are trying to be very good. We are very well connected with our constituencies.

As the vice chair has graciously recognized, we are indeed the nation's largest producer of educational personnel. That is about 2,000 people per year. That includes about 1,000 new teachers per year. This number will be increasing rapidly as our admissions have gone up approximately 44 percent in the past three years. We are committed to addressing the perceived teacher shortage problem.

We are working on being good. We are accredited by NCATE, approved by our State education agency, and officially recognized by 16 subject area organizations. We are rigorously reviewed by each of those every five years. All of our prospective teachers complete an academic major and minor that is at least as long and rigorous as that for anybody else. Every teacher must take and pass the State's required test in the subject fields before being recommended for licensure.

I want to dispel any concern that the teachers prepared at our place are not at least as well prepared in their discipline as anybody else at our institution. As a result, our graduates are highly recruited. They are very heavily recruited. Each can have his choice of three or four opportunities just from our annual job fair.

Our alumni have national recognition. One of them is former Congressman Carl Pursell from Michigan. We have 24 recipients of the 25,000 Milken Award, a national teacher of the year, national superintendent of the year, and many executives and presidents of national education organizations. I am most pleased to recognize today one of our recent alums who is in the audience.

Mr. Sergio Garcia came to EMU several years ago from south Texas. He completed his requirements this past December with a major in one of the sciences and a minor in bilingual studies. He is temporarily teaching science while he considers a number of highly attractive permanent job offers. After he was admitted to our institution, he had to complete the same set of general education requirements that anybody else did at our institution, and all of that course work is in arts and sciences. He became eligible for and was admitted to our initial teacher preparation program, which is not a trivial screening, because each year more than 200 students who make formal application are not admitted. Mr. Garcia was one of the successful ones.

He completed his major, a strong pattern of course work in the sciences, and his minor, and in his professional studies he took a sequence of courses that qualitatively met every requirement set by NCATE at the Michigan Department of Education and specialized agencies. In the professional studies everything that has been called for in the reform reports in recent years has been included. Teaching the technology, classroom management, assessment and evaluation, working with students with disabilities, special methods, reading in the content areas, and on and on and on, these are all part of our preparation program.

Along the way he had three structured pre-student teaching field experiences to apply these new skills, and then to culminate his program after further screening, he was placed with a highly qualified cooperating teacher for a full-time, full-semester student teaching experience.

This, along with the pre-student teaching field experiences, does provide extensive opportunity for our teachers-to-be to apply their knowledge and skills under careful supervision.

Because a large portion of our students work and commute to classes, we offer professional course work from 8:00 to 10:00 each weekday, on Saturday, on Sunday, online and in six locations in southeastern Michigan. In recent times we have admitted to our teacher preparation program about 500 career changers per year, and they now make up about one-third of our student body. These are people with at least a bachelor's degree, often a graduate or professional degree, who have decided to become teachers.

We are involved in numerous projects with urban teachers in Detroit and in Flint. We are well connected with our education community through consortia with other institutions, with involvement with schools in a wide variety of ways, special partnership schools, and special funding from State and federal agencies that permit us to engage ourselves in many ways.

We are very proud of our work as the university partner for the implementation of the Comer schools and Family Initiative in Detroit, where we have been working with 24 inner-city schools.

We are among a relatively small number of institutions in the country that collectively prepare most of the new teachers. We are committed to quality. Our new teachers are well prepared in general education, in the content areas they will teach, and in appropriate strategies for bringing about learning in all children. Our alums are highly successful and much recognized for their competence. Our new teachers are highly recruited. The feedback that we get is quite good. We have almost every type of external recognitional quality that is available. We intend to remain well connected.

We agree with the subcommittee that teacher-training programs are the key to improving effective K-12 education. Thank you for the opportunity.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. JERRY ROBBINS, DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, YPSILANTI, MICHIGAN—SEE APPENDIX F

Chairman McKeon. Thank you.

Dr. Coppin.

TESTIMONY OF DR. JOYCE R. COPPIN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE, DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES, NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

Dr. Coppin. Good afternoon, Chairman McKeon, Ranking Member Kildee, Congressman Owens, Congresswoman McCarthy and Congressman Bishop.

I oversee 80,000 teachers in 1,200 schools and administer the largest teacher recruitment and preparation program in the nation. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and our ongoing efforts to attract, prepare and retain high-quality teachers.

For the current school year, the New York City Department of Education set a goal of hiring only certified teachers for positions in elementary schools, social studies and English. We accomplished this objective and are now a step closer to satisfying a new State requirement that all teachers in our schools be certified by September 2003. We were also able to satisfy the NCLB standard of hiring only highly qualified teachers in our Title I schools. Last September, I attended a ceremony at the White House where President Bush highlighted our efforts to meet these requirements.

Securing high-quality teachers for all of our classrooms remains a challenge. We must hire 11,000 teachers by this September, knowing that as many as 4,000 current teachers may fail to meet the new State regulation. The supply of new teachers in New York State is not keeping up with the demand. Colleges and universities are not producing enough teaching candidates in math, science, bilingual and special education. For example, the city could hire every newly certified math teacher in New York State and still could not fill its 1,000 mathematics vacancies.

The department has worked aggressively to broaden the pool of qualified individuals who want to become teachers. Our efforts have increased the percentage of newly hired teachers with appropriate State certification from 43 percent in September 2000 to 86 percent today. This increase can be attributed to the following: The establishment of the Teaching Fellows Program, a closer working relationship with colleges and universities, an increase in teachers recruited both nationally and abroad, a new teachers' contract offering more competitive salaries, and a productive relationship with the UFT.

Teaching Fellows addresses the fact that traditional teacher preparation programs do not produce enough qualified teachers. The department, with partnering IHEs, tailored the program to prepare teachers to succeed in urban schools. It seeks highly qualified professionals who want to teach in our lowest-performing schools. For this September, this coming September, 3,000 candidates were selected from among 20,000 applications. Our current fellows include former doctors, lawyers, Wall Street financiers, judges, and advertising executives. Over the last three years, 3,300 fellows have entered the program, and 2,800 are still teaching in these schools,

including businessmen or Congressmen.

Because school districts are solely accountable for student performance, we must play a lead role in teacher preparation programs. Congress should recognize the importance of school districts in improving teacher quality and update how Title II allocates funds. First, allow 40 percent of Title II funds to be allocated to partnerships between high-need LEAs and IHEs, with LEAs as the lead applicant and fiscal agent. This capacity would support successful district-administrated programs such as Teaching Fellows.

Second, 40 percent of the Title II funds should be allocated to partnerships between a high-need LEA and IHEs to administer three service teacher preparation programs, with the IHE as the lead applicant.

Third, we recommend the remaining 20 percent be authorized for recruitment purposes. These revisions will miss their mark unless these funds are better targeted. For example, in New York State, the White Plains School District's per pupil expenditure is $16,000, yet it qualifies as a high-need LEA because exactly one of its schools meets the current definition. New York City also qualifies, with 900 of its 1,200 schools enrolling 50 percent or more children eligible for school lunch, and spends less than $9,000 per pupil.

We recommend defining a high-need LEA as a district that serves at least 10,000 children or 30 percent from below the poverty line.

Finally, many prospective teachers are questioning their entry into this profession as they see districts across the nation eliminating teaching positions to meet budget cuts. While our current budget situation is dire, we have not cut any teaching positions; however, other districts have not been as fortunate. Revising HEA in the ways I have suggested and increasing its authorization will increase the supply of highly qualified teachers. Congress should also make education funding a priority so that struggling schools have the resources needed to educate children during this time of State and local budget cuts.

I thank you.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. JOYCE R. COPPIN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE, DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES, NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK—SEE APPENDIX G

Chairman McKeon. Thank you very much.

I am going to hold my time until the end and at this time yield the time to Mr. Cole from Oklahoma.

Mr. Cole. You caught me unawares, Mr. Chairman. I was going to follow your lead.

If I may, I would like to ask a couple of questions. This whole issue of teacher quality interests me greatly. Let me ask you, each of you, to address in turn something maybe a little bit beyond what you testified to.

One of the great difficulties I have found in the structure we have in education now is simply rewarding quality when you find it. We have a significant resistance to any kind of concept of merit pay, significant resistance to looking at educators who are able to increase dramatically the scores of children that they are dealing with. So I would like to ask you if there are some reforms on the back end of this system so that after we actually found quality, we found a way to reward it, both to encourage other people to emulate it, and to encourage people that displayed exceptional teaching ability to stay in the profession longer and, frankly, to stay in the classroom as opposed to move into the administrative ranks where most of the upward mobility in education tends to be.

Ms. Keegan. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Cole, it is a perfect question, and I think that without any question whatsoever we have got to change the contractual arrangements that we have for teachers. In most professions what we do is not simply pay somebody more for a better job, we pay them more, and then we add more responsibilities. There is a very constrictive contract at play, as you know, in most school settings so that if you want to evolve a system wherein great teachers are not only teaching their students, but also mentoring other teachers, you cannot do that readily. You cannot pay that individual more for more of her time after school, et cetera, because the contract is prohibitive for that. We really are going to have to find new ways to do that.

We work with the Milken Family Foundation on something called the Teacher Advancement Program that attempts to get around this, but until we are open to those kinds of things, I don't think we will have the mentors present that are making enough money to make it worth their while to make this change because it is very difficult to do.

Ms. Haycock. Just a quick addition to that. I happen to share your bias. In my estimation at least, if you are going to transform an organization and make it more performance-oriented, you need to recognize employee performance when you do that. The great problem with our efforts to do that, however, is we have not had a fair way to do that. It has been kind of principals pick or department chairs pick. It has not been rooted in analysis of who actually is successfully raising student achievement and who is not.

So I bring you back to what we talked about earlier, and that is the importance of providing incentives for States and school districts to put value-added systems into place so that the things that you need to do to reinforce and reward performance are actually based in a fair and impartial measure of that rather than on, let us say, the principal selection.

Mr. Cole. Let me ask if I can get you to expand, anybody can pick on this in addition as you go on down, what would be your opinion of peer review in this process, and I mean literally from people that are recognized as accomplished educators, accomplished teachers, and not obviously drawn from the same school where they have any sort of personal ties with the individual, but some way to interject, because, again, I understand the concern if I'm a teacher about all of this process being in the hands of administrators and playing of favorites in rewarding and punishment. That is a legitimate point. But at the end of the day there has to be some way in which quality can be

recognized and rewarded, and so it can be encouraged.

Mr. Wise. If I may, I have actually studied that in my past life at the RAND Corporation, and we have found that peer evaluation systems can work; in fact, they can work especially well when it comes to working with teachers who are in difficulty. These peer evaluation systems can be used to strengthen the capacity of some teachers, but they can also be used as a means of encouraging individuals to leave the profession. And we can cite some examples of that if you would like.

I think the general idea of our system right now is highly inefficient in its use of human resources. I believe that we should have something like differentiated roles and responsibilities, career ladders, team teaching. Having one adult for every 25 children actually keeps us quite confined in terms of what we are able to do, both in terms of training and induction and in rewarding people who show superior competence on the job.

Ms. Kennedy. I think one of the issues in order to provide for this reward structure is to understand also that it is the school itself that creates the environment for the professional development to take place. The evaluation by a peer can be both an evaluation and a coaching of that person. To simply put some kind of a test or some other mechanism in without providing the opportunity for the teacher to be the best that they can be can be a problem as well. And again, the measures that the value added--where did the child start at the beginning of the year, what are the opportunities and the climate in the classroom with that teacher as well as the professional development in the school itself can make a real difference. And when those pieces are in place, the reward structures have to be there for all those who participate in the education of that child.

Mr. Robbins. Congressman Cole, the only thing that I would add to the many fine comments that have been made here, and I do agree with the fact that a peer review system can be made to work if it is established properly, I would just add on the reward side of it to keep in mind that many of the people who go into teaching are rewarded through psychological rewards as well as tangible rewards. This means that we probably should be establishing more kinds of recognition of people, improving their working conditions and a number of factors of that sort that may be important to many people.

Ms. Coppin. We have in the New York City Department of Education talked about merit pay, and it is still under discussion. The previous speakers talked about all of the issues that are involved. But can I say that we have utilized many different approaches for recognizing those teachers who are outstanding. They serve as mentors, coaches, and staff developers. Some run teacher centers. And in many programs we have outstanding teachers working with the colleges and universities as adjuncts.

In addition, the peer review system that we have allows teachers to observe each other and rate each other's lessons. We also have a peer intervention program where experienced teachers work with those who are weak and about to receive adverse ratings. Both of those programs work very well.

Mr. Cole. If I can ask one more question without abusing my time? If I am, that is fine. I can ask it later.

Chairman McKeon. Your time is used. The chair now recognizes Mr. Kildee for five minutes.

Mr. Kildee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just was thinking, looking around this room at the witnesses and the audience, that I am convinced that there is no meeting on Capitol Hill taking place right now that has more impact upon the future of our country than this meeting right here. The preparation of teachers is extremely important. Even before the time of Socrates. Right? We think of him. But it is really so important for our future. So this is an extremely important meeting, and all of you are involved in that and you can take certain pride in that and a certain deep sense of responsibility on that also.

I am going to direct this question primarily to Dr. Robbins, but any of you may join in. Dr. Robbins, I know you are doing some special work in Flint and in Detroit; Flint being my hometown. Certain school districts have high levels of children from low-income families, sometimes a high concentration. I think every school in Flint is a Title I school. And, also, certain areas have children from families who are struggling to be functional families. How can schools of education prepare teachers to provide instructions to children who may be from dysfunctional families or families just barely able to function? What can the schools of education do to prepare?

You know, if you teach in certain areas of Michigan, you have very functional families, all the things that can help a child. In other areas, much of that is lacking. How can you help prepare your teachers to deal with this?

Mr. Robbins. There is not an easy answer to your question, Congressman Kildee. And every State represented in the room has urban areas that are suffering from the kinds of problems that exist in Detroit and Flint and many other places.

Probably our most positive experience along this line has been 10 years of experience in Detroit with the generous funding of the Skillman Foundation of Detroit to serve as the university partner for an implementation of the Comer Schools and Families Initiative. We have learned from that, that school reform in an inner city setting is not something that occurs quickly or easily. It takes a lot of time to make it happen.

We have discovered that this works best when there is stability with the school building leadership. When there is stability with the teaching faculty so that you can set goals, you can address those goals over time, you can set out strategies to train teachers, train parents, train other school workers, and train the community in how to do things better for the children that happen to be involved in this poverty and other at-risk areas.

We have also found that nothing works universally. Things that work rather well in one setting are difficult to transfer somewhere else. That is an area that requires I think a great deal more study to find things that can be made to work in other settings. With a lot of effort and a lot of trial and error, and certainly the other States represented here can also give success stories using other models where they have been able to demonstrate great accomplishments under highly

adverse circumstances, it can be done.

There are some success stories. We are proud of what we have been able to accomplish in several Detroit schools. We are now working with Flint to try to bring some of those things that we have learned in Detroit to Flint as well. And we will keep you posted on how well we do on that.

Mr. Kildee. If you can provide us some information on this program in Detroit, that would be helpful to the committee. Anybody else, any comments?

Ms. Keegan. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Kildee, just at the risk of sounding like Katie, I think one of the best ways to take a look at who is really succeeding is to look at gain. Oftentimes you will have schools whose scores overall are not good at all, but the gain that they have made from where those students started is remarkable. Some of the best teachers in the country are in those urban settings. If you only look at flat, static scores, they don't look very impressive; but if you look how far those children traveled in one year, it is a phenomenal distance. The Education Trust keeps that data incredibly well.

I think young people or aspiring teachers need to be taught what is possible, taught high expectations, and given examples such as the ones we just heard of where it works. Too often they are convinced, somehow just sort of passively, that it is impossible, I am afraid. And we have so many fabulous examples; thousands of schools all over the country have just beaten the odds. And we need to hold those up as what is possible for these kids in difficult circumstances.

Mr. Wise. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Kildee, we have advocated something called "professional development schools" as a bridge between schools of education and particularly urban schools. Most teachers, as a statistical matter, come from strong families. We need people to go into the city to work with families that are not so strong. The best way to learn how to do that is on the job, in a situation, a highly structured situation, working with people who have figured out how to do it. And, hence, we believe in this model that will train people as they work in such communities.

Mr. Kildee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman McKeon. Thank you. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Ehlers for five minutes.

Ehlers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Wise, if I heard you correctly, you said that about two thirds of the teachers who graduate each year come from NCATE-accredited teacher colleges; is that correct?

Mr. Wise. That is correct, sir.

Mr. Ehlers. So that means one third of our teachers come from schools that are not accredited. Is that something that this school that is hiring them is taking into account when they hire them? Or has NCATE accreditation come to not mean very much to the schools that hire these teachers?

Mr. Wise. NCATE accreditation varies substantially from State to State; from some States which require it of all their institutions, to other States which leave it pretty much up to the institutions whether or not they wish to seek NCATE accreditation.

The evidence is clear that NCATE adds value to those who attend those institutions. We can cite statistics that reveal that, without question, individuals who graduate from NCATE institutions have a higher probability of passing State licensing exams, for example.

As to whether or not school districts choose to favor or disfavor graduates from NCATE institutions, that does vary some at local option.

Mr. Ehlers. And are there States that simply require that all teachers should graduate from those?

Mr. Wise. Well, they don't necessarily require that all teachers graduate from them, but they do require that all institutions be accredited. So, for example, we cite as an instance the States of North Carolina, Arkansas, and West Virginia mandated that all of their colleges be NCATE accredited. They did that in the late 1980s. Interestingly, by the mid-1990s, scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, which is a test of school children, climbed disproportionately in those States when compared to other States in the Nation. That is just one fact.

Mr. Ehlers. I guess I was naive. I thought virtually all teaching institutions were NCATE certified.

Mr. Wise. No, sir. It is the one professional school on campus that has a choice about whether or not it wishes to be professionally accredited. All other professional schools on campus are required to be accredited.

Mr. Ehlers. That is very strange.

Let me ask you another question. As part of the NCATE accreditation, what are you finding out with regard to science education in the various colleges and universities that produce teachers? Are the requirements changing? Are you asking that they be changed? How do you set your standards on that score?

Mr. Wise. Well, we have a regular process of setting standards on a regular cycle. We have upgraded our standards recently across the board. We work closely with the National Science Teachers Association, which in turn works with most of the other major scientific organizations, so that our standards for science education do reflect contemporary thinking in science and effective science instruction.

Mr. Ehlers. Can a school receive your accreditation if it does not have adequate instruction for teachers in both the content and the pedagogical methods of teaching science?

Mr. Wise. Well, we consider as we accredit. We accredit the whole college of education, and in so doing we look across the curriculum and generally expect to see strength across all offerings as

we make our accreditation decisions.

Mr. Ehlers. So if a school is good in everything but not in science, will they get accredited?

Mr. Wise. It is conceivable that they could be, if that were the only area of weakness. But I have not seen an actual example of something like that, but it is theoretically possible.

Mr. Ehlers. If a college or university were delinquent in the teaching of reading but were good in everything else, would they get accredited?

Mr. Wise. Well, that would be a more fundamental problem that would result in quite pervasive.

Mr. Ehlers. But that is my point. My point is that they are equally fundamental, particularly in today's world, because the jobs of the future do require mathematics and science.

Mr. Wise. Well, I couldn't agree more, sir. And of course as we look at elementary education, we do look very carefully at every component in the preparation of teachers.

Mr. Ehlers. No. My point is simply that that is today the greatest problem in teaching of all the subjects that are normally taught. And it is a subject that has to be addressed.

Chairman McKeon. Mr. Ehlers, your time has expired based on the questions that I responded to Mr. Cole.

Mr. Ehlers. Okay.

Chairman McKeon. Okay.

Mr. Ehlers. May I just make a statement to conclude, then?

Chairman McKeon. And you may also submit questions for the record that I am sure they would be happy to answer.

Mr. Ehlers. This would be a quickie.

In addition to the merit pay issue, I think you ought to establish a practice in academic salaries of meeting the market. We live in a free market society. In every instance, employers try to match the salaries that teachers could get elsewhere. We are losing the best science and math teachers because they can make twice the money elsewhere. They don't expect to get that much from the schools, but there has to be a differential in order to keep the good teachers in the schools.

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McKeon. Thank you. The Chair now yields five minutes to Ms. McCarthy.

Mrs. McCarthy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for having this hearing. I have to tell you, it has been fascinating listening to everyone.

You know, I kind of look at teaching like nursing. I was a nurse for over 30 years before I even came here. And one of the first bills I introduced had to do with teaching and mentoring, because I think when I was a nurse we had mentors for over a year before we were allowed to be on our own, shall I say. And that bill, you know, was accepted and I have been working on those programs ever since.

The second part, as far as what we pay our teachers and actually what we pay our nurses, again correlate. You know as well as I do that most of your teachers that work in New York City are constantly applying for positions out on Long Island only because we pay a heck of a lot more out there.

The third point, when we talk about urban schools, I live in a suburban area; I have urban schools, and I have school districts that will pay $21,000 for each student versus someone else in my district that will be paying 9,000, 10,000 per student. So the difference there. But here we go back on to teaching.

With our universities, especially with the teaching programs, do they test any of those that are going into the teaching field to see if they are actually qualified psychologically to go into that particular field and have the aptitude to be good teachers? That would be one part of my question, because I know they still do that for nursing. You might say it is different, but it is not, because we are dealing with, whether it is young people or sick people, you still have to have an aptitude to go into it.

The other thing with nursing schools also, if nurses fail their State boards, and there is a certain percentage each year that repeatedly do not pass their State boards, then that school loses its accreditation to become a nurse or teaching nursing course. Do we do that for our teaching programs?

And I guess what I am trying to get at is, I probably agree that we should be looking for really highly qualified people to even go into the profession, and that is going to open up a whole round robin. I will agree with Dr. Robbins, I would feel insulted as a nurse if someone gave me a merit pay because I am doing my job that I loved. And I think most teachers hopefully are in teaching because they love what they do. Other awards, fine. I agree with that.

How are you going to single out? How is a teacher in Great Neck that is getting 70,000, $80,000, and has highly qualified students to even start with, versus my Roosevelt School which is probably one of the worst schools in New York State, been taken over by the State, and you have a great teacher in there and the student has come up a lot but not to the standard of maybe a school right down the block that is in a richer district. So I don't know whether giving somebody a pay is the answer to that.

But if you could answer the questions on how do you get in to become a teacher? Are there qualifications to even come in? I mean, I hear constantly, I can't get in to architectural school, I

can't get in to premed, I can't get in to so many other classes. Get in to the teaching school; there are no qualifications, just about, and then go on to what you want to really do.

Mr. Robbins. There are approximately 1,300 institutions in the country that are preparing teachers, and there are probably nearly 1,300 answers to your question there, because the requirements for admission are institution-specific. There may be floors that are set by the State education agency, but institutions are at liberty to go above that or not go above that as they wish.

However, I do believe that you will find that the quality teacher preparations in this country perhaps do not use psychological examinations, but they are concerned about the issue and they use proxies for that. Some of the proxies that are used for this in the admissions process are the use of oral application processes. You must appear before a panel of people to present yourself and you are asked questions and you are examined in terms of your interest in and fitness for teaching through that sort of thing. Many other institutions have checklists. As people move through the program, certain kinds of behaviors are watched for. And if inappropriate behaviors emerge, then either remediation or removal from the program occurs. There are many attempts to get at the sort of thing, the qualitative issues that you are mentioning. This is fraught with legal difficulties, and people are very cautious about what they do. But good places are making attempts to address those sorts of approaches.

Ms. Coppin. Ms. McCarthy, you may be interested in knowing when I made reference in my testimony about having 20,000 individuals apply for positions as teaching fellows and we reduced it down to 3,000, it was done by just some of the things that you asked. There is rigorous examination, quote, unquote, that involves writing, teaching, and demonstration lesson. I mean, you know, some oral interaction. And the individuals must come before a panel of current teachers, some of whom have been outstanding teachers for years and years and years. So in a way, the screening process to come into the alternative certification program in the city of New York has, I would say, almost higher standards to get into that program. And we constantly monitor them as they go through the 2 or 3 years that they take to meet the certification requirements.

Mrs. McCarthy. And I think that is what I am looking for, because obviously we are going to be dealing on the Federal level, which obviously means we are going to be dealing with every State in this country. And I do know New York State has already put higher standards in, and yet how are we going to compare that to other States that might not have the money or the will to do that? And that is hopefully something that we request to do here on the Federal level.

Chairman McKeon. The lady's time has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Gingrey for five minutes.

Mr. Gingrey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In a way, as a follow-up or continuation to Mrs. McCarthy's line of questioning, in my State of Georgia we have what the teachers like to refer to as property rights and others sometimes refer to as tenure. And the way it works in Georgia is the teachers are hired, and their contract is a provisional contract for three years, during which time supposedly they are very carefully

mentored. And then a decision has to be made by the local school board and superintendent as to whether or not to offer that teacher a fourth contract. And if that contract is offered and accepted, then that teacher has so-called property rights or tenure. She or he is no longer an employee at will.

And I have always felt that maybe because of this very short provisional period, during which time maybe they are not mentored very well, or maybe for the first year or two nobody has really paid that much attention to how they are performing in the classroom, and then all of a sudden you get close to the spring of that third year and it is time to offer that fourth contract, and nobody really knows. And what happens is some bad teachers are offered that contract and then the system is sort of stuck with them.

And then some good teachers, who maybe were sort of maybe like Michael Jordan. I think Michael Jordan was a junior in high school before he made his high school basketball team. I think he got cut his freshman and sophomore year. Then I think many good teachers possibly are not offered that contract, and we are losing them. And God knows we can't really afford to lose teachers.

We want everybody ideally to go through a regular teacher preparation program. But because of the demand, there are all these alternative methods of getting into the system.

I want to ask each of you what your opinion is in regard to property rights and tenure. And is a provisional period too short? Should we lengthen that a little bit? Maybe instead of three years it should be five years so that we don't miss the good ones and get stuck with the bad ones? Not that there are very many bad ones, believe me. I honor the teaching profession and most are doing an outstanding job.

I would like you to comment on that, if you will.

Ms. Keegan. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Gingrey, I would say that the best way to evaluate the quality of any teacher is to look at the progress of their students. And I believe that more and more in this country that is possible, certainly in Georgia where there are assessments going on and there is that induction period.

I think it is important, however, not to simply say or fall prey to the idea that any standardized program or any barrier exam that sort of sounds professional is the one that we want to apply to teachers. We have the majority of our nation's teachers right now taking a test to determine whether or not they will be certified teachers that literally teaches them that whole language is a preferred instruction to phonetic instruction. That is part of our system at this point. That is an easy one to pick on. It also suggests that direct instruction is not as favorable as discovery learning.

I think it is very important to back up and look at the content of these barrier moments as in at the end of three years, let us look at how the students performed for that teacher; not which classes she completed and does she have certifications that look good. What was the result with the students? And I think once we do that, we will start insisting on a different quality of preparation

in the first place.

Ms. Haycock. I may be incorrect about this, but I actually thought Georgia was the one place that moved to eliminate tenure.

Mr. Gingrey. It was put back in this year under a Republican administration, a Republican general assembly.

Ms. Haycock. I mean, let me tell you what I think after a lot of work in schools. We spend most of our time in schools around the country working with teachers, and in that experience we sometimes see absolutely terrific teaching. Even in the lowest-performing schools we are always finding at least some terrific teachers. But we are also finding an awful lot of teachers who have just given up on the kids.

I actually think, as a fundamental principle, we have to agree that in teaching, like in most other work; you don't have a right to a job. It is a right that you earn through producing student learning.

So I would agree, in fact, that we have to revisit our old ideas about security of employment. I think that is true at the higher education level as well. Because if we are about producing student learning, then we have to be about evaluating whether employees are contributing to that or not.

And that is why, again, I think it is so terribly important that we take the opportunity provided by No Child Left Behind to put fair measurement systems into place that actually look at whether young people are learning; where they now provide teachers that aren't producing that learning with the help that they need to grow, but act when they are not producing those gains.

Mr. Wise. I think there are many, many contributing factors to the problems that you describe. One of them is the weakness of our licensing assessment process. And we would urge that States be much more careful in looking at an individual's ability to teach, their content knowledge, their professional dispositions, and really whether they can take what they know and communicate it to children, and that that should be a much more serious part of the process for controlling access to teaching.

Chairman McKeon. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Owens for five minutes.

Mr. Owens. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one question with two parts. Part one is and I think Dr. Robbins said you had either 500 people who went into teaching as a result of career changes this year or last year? And Dr. Coppin was mentioning the fact that the teacher fellow program had a lot of people from outside the teaching profession, including Wall Street financiers, whose backgrounds you should have checked carefully before we put them in the classroom. Don't take anybody from Enron or WorldCom.

In times of recession, you have this kind of movement. During the Vietnam War, anybody who went into teaching received a draft exemption. We have had experience with people for various reasons go into teaching. Can anybody speak definitively at this point about whether it is worth encouraging those programs, whether as we pursue a higher education reauthorization we should bother wasting resources on those kinds of programs? Have they paid off, or do they really just produce a temporary jump in the number of people available for teaching; and quickly, as soon as conditions change, these people flee the profession for better paying jobs, and it is just not worth neglecting or using limited resources that can go somewhere else in terms of recruiting people who really want to teach, and finding ways to encourage and identify people whose aptitudes and outlook on life are such that they are going to stay in the profession?

Yes.

Ms. Coppin. Congressman Owens, we have found it to be very successful in the city of New York. We currently have, as I said, 3,300 teaching fellows. The rate of retention among the fellows is very similar to the rate of retention for individuals coming through traditional programs. Additionally, the teaching fellows have accepted some positions in our more challenging schools. They bring a different kind of background experiences to the youngsters, and it has enriched schools where we were unable to attract teachers, particularly in our schools that are considered the lowest performing.

Mr. Owens. That program is about how old, three years old?

Ms. Coppin. That is right, three years old.

Mr. Owens. Does anybody else have a longer-term experience with alternative teacher recruitment?

Ms. Coppin. Actually, that program. But we have had different alternative certification programs, Peace Corps returnees program.

Mr. Owens. With high retention rates?

Ms. Coppin. Yes.

Mr. Robbins. And I would add to that, that of the 500 or so that we have been admitting per year for some years now, those people have made a very serious choice to change away from being a physician or a lawyer or an accountant or an engineer or a whatever to come into teaching. They make that decision, they go through the appropriate preparation program, they go into teaching, they stay there, and they are good teachers.

Mr. Owens. My next question; I am sorry.

Ms. Kennedy. I just wanted to add that we have considered multiple pathways to the degree and the opportunities for students to enter in different parts of their lives rather than the traditional age. And we find that the students are retained and retain themselves as teachers, and do well. I don't

have exact numbers on it, but I think it is making certain that there are alternate ways for them to do it or maintaining the high exit standards for letting them into the profession.

Mr. Owens. My next question is closely related but it is a little more difficult. The percentage of African American college graduates entering teaching has gone down over the last 10 years. When I graduated, at least 60 percent of the graduates were going into teaching. Opportunities have opened up. There are various reasons for this. But put aside civil rights considerations, affirmative action, anything that is not related to teaching. Just in terms of the scientific approach to teaching, pedagogically, psychologically, is it highly desirable to have these large numbers of youngsters in our urban schools who happen to be mostly Hispanic or African American go into a school which has a diversified staff, which has a greater percentage, not a lesser percentage, a decreasing percentage of minority on the staff but decreasing? Is that going to hurt the efforts to improve education? To what degree does that have an impact? And is it great enough for us to make a special effort in our higher education reauthorization to try to make certain we encourage more minorities to go into teaching?

Ms. Coppin. There is no question about the fact that we do need role models for our youngsters. As a matter of fact, in New York City we established the Center for Recruitment and Professional Development, and one of our goals was to increase the percentage of teachers of African American ancestry and Hispanic. As a matter of fact, New York City is such an international school, so we are looking for teachers who know Farsi and everything else.

Yes. The first and most important thing is that the teacher has to be a high-quality teacher who knows his or her subject. Secondly, the teacher has to be caring and empathetic. And, thirdly, the teacher has to respond to and know the community and be willing to participate in the community and work with the youngsters. And we find many minority teachers who do meet those qualifications.

The qualifications, I just want to say, Mr. Owens, is very, very important, because I don't want an unqualified minority teacher either. But I do think it is absolutely essential that we diversify our staff so that our youngsters have role models and have standards to which they can aspire.

Chairman McKeon. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair now recognizes Mr. Carter.

Mr. Carter. My question may be way off the wall; I was not here to hear what everybody had to say. However, as I hear us talking about teachers, and I happen to have a teacher in my family; my son, and I am certain I live in a different part of the world than you do, some of you. I don't live in an inner city area. But we do see mobility in teachers. And what we see a lot of teachers moving for is the better environment school. The good teacher wants to go to the school that has given him the best environment to be a teacher. And so the inner-city schools in Austin doesn’t have a large inner-city population, but the inner-city schools in Austin are moving around in record numbers, those teachers because it is a safer environment within which they may operate than in the school district that they are in. And it is a pretty good school district down there.

The Dallas School District, there would probably be car races down I-35 if we recruited up in the Dallas School District.

Now, would you like to comment on the, if you will, the discipline and safety problems that exist in schools and how that has an effect on recruiting teachers to go into the teaching profession and staying in the teaching profession?

Ms. Keegan. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Carter, in our experience you are exactly right when you are speaking about an environment that is favorable to the teacher. But we don't see a huge difference. The assumption is that in wealthy areas, that is a friendlier environment to teach in. What most really fantastic teachers are looking for is the ability to be honored in their decision-making, their determination to get these kids to learn. And even in the inner city, so long as the teacher is given the ability and the backup to control the classroom and control the environment that is a fabulous learning environment.

I am afraid what we have done is created a situation where in too many instances we have given up on those urban schools in terms of discipline, and the teacher has a disciplinary exercise, the child acts out, the teacher acts upon it appropriately, and for whatever reason the child is thrown back into the classroom. The lesson was learned by all the kids right there. That is a horrible teaching environment.

So it isn't so much the atmosphere as much as it is the leadership in these schools. And, yes, I think we have a huge problem. We think it is answered by leadership in the teaching corps itself, by allowing them to determine how those things are handled, and by strong principal leadership as well. That creates a great environment for them.

Ms. Coppin. This past year we conducted an exit survey among teachers who left in their first year of teaching to try to determine why they left. You are quite correct when you were talking about an environment. But the environment is not just do you have security guards or is it in a nice neighborhood. What they talked about and stressed was do they have support? Are there resources to help them? Do they get assistance with youngsters? Is there some follow-up programs? Are there some support programs and parent engagement programs?

So that the presence of security and uprights and things of that nature wasn't what they were looking for. They were looking for a well-organized, well-run school where they were respected, and that the leadership of the school knew what he or she was doing.

Mr. Carter. I am not advocating metal detectors on any school. I don't think there ought to be a behavior quality in any school where a metal detector should even be desirable. And, of course, I come from a background of 20 years in the judiciary and 19 years as chairman of the juvenile board for our county, and I have seen lots of juvenile justice issues. And what I am really talking about is discipline within the schools, and a school board and principals and others who will back up teachers on those issues.

I find there is a shortage of that, and it has nothing to do with dollars. It has nothing to do with the rich schools or the poor schools. It has to do with the schools that kind of go back to old-

fashioned you are going to behave or you are out of here. And I don't know whether you all approve of that or not, but that is where I come from, because I don't tolerate misbehavior and I don't think schools, I don't think teachers, should have to tolerate misbehavior. And I think if we are not teaching that the administrators need to back up our teachers, then schools need to be teaching administrators they need to back up our teachers, and that is where I was coming from.

Thank you.

Chairman McKeon. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair now recognizes Mr. Tierney for five minutes.

Mr. Tierney. I thank the chairman.

I thank the people on the podium for speaking to us and testifying.

Let me ask four questions, if I can. So the first one quickly. Would you tell me in your opinion if it is very important, somewhat important, neutral, not very important, or not at all important? All right, one through five, how important do you believe it to be that teacher preparation programs ensure prospective teachers can use technology as part of their instructional technique in the classroom?

Very? Very? Very? Very? Very all the way across. Thank you.

Is there a role for teacher preparation programs post-graduation? In other words, I would be thinking of some responsibility for the teacher programs in mentoring the professional development for the first year to three to five years. And how would we do that? Maybe starting off to my left to right, if you would.

Mrs. Keegan. And I think that is also critically important are those mentoring programs. And we are actually working on programs that would create within the school itself the flexibility to have as

Mr. Tierney. But you think the institutions themselves who are preparing our teachers to teach could take on that role out in the community?

Ms. Keegan. I think it would be the most beneficial because they are working with the kids right there.

Mr. Tierney. Thank you.

Ms. Haycock.

Ms. Haycock. I am equally clear for the need for mentoring, less clear that it has got to come from higher education. I think sometimes the best support for teachers comes from expert peers, just as long as they are released a substantial part of the day to actually do that as opposed to just adding

that on.

Mr. Tierney. Therein lays the problem. And I was thinking maybe we could do something.

Sir.

Mr. Wise. Mentoring is very, very important. And like Ms. Haycock, I believe it is probably best done by school personnel. However, we have required now as part of our accreditation standards that our colleges follow the graduates during their first several years of teaching in order that they can inform us about how well their graduates are doing.

Mr. Tierney. Is that working well?

Mr. Wise. It is just being implemented now.

Mr. Tierney. Dr. Kennedy.

Ms. Kennedy. Yeah. I agree. One of the things that do need to happen, I think, from the institution, from the higher education institution, is to follow the first two years. And the mentoring that is done in those first two years by the higher education is in collaboration with mentor teachers. I think the same thing with the CSU, which is 23 campuses, we survey all of our entering teachers and the principals who hire them to evaluate how they are doing and, based on that, determine the program for them.

Mr. Tierney. Thank you.

Dr. Robbins.

Mr. Robbins. Higher education should have some role in the early years of teaching. It is very difficult to make that happen.

Mr. Tierney. Dr. Coppin.

Ms. Coppin. I believe that the mentoring should be done by school personnel. However, now, alternative programs, there is a collaborative mentoring program.

Mr. Tierney. Thank you.

Would you speak just very briefly to the benefit that we have or the value that we would have in expanding the loan forgiveness programs that we have or the ones that are proposed to include a loan forgiveness program for prekindergarten programs, particularly those within a school district, but Early Head Start and Head Start? Do you think that would be beneficial?

Ms. Haycock. You bet. We are having a terrifically difficult time attracting high-quality people into the profession of preschool education, yet the search says we need high quality folks. It is unquestionably clear, given the low salaries in that field, the loan forgiveness program would help big time.

Mr. Tierney. Is that generally agreeable?

Thank you.

And lastly let me ask this: What is the impact of the quality of principals on teachers' performance, and ought our teacher preparation institutions also be looking at some principal preparation aspects?

Ms. Coppin. Absolutely. New York State is in the preparation of new regulations to strengthen programs for leadership.

Ms. Keegan. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Tierney, today, this morning, the Broad Foundation and the Fordham Foundation actually put a report out on educational leadership, specifically principals. It was very interesting recommendations, so you might want to get those.

Mr. Tierney. Mr. Chairman, might we ask that that be placed on the record, the report?

Chairman McKeon. Without objection, so ordered.

THE BROAD FOUNDATION AND THE FORDHAM FOUNDATION REPORT ON, "BETTER LEADERS FOR AMERICA'S SCHOOLS: A MANIFESTO", SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY MRS. LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN— SEE APPENDIX H

Mr. Tierney. Thank you. Thank you all very much.

Chairman McKeon. Thank you. The gentleman's time has expired.

Those bells that you heard going off, we are called to a vote, and we will be there for over a half hour, so we are not going to ask the panel to stay. We really appreciate your time.

Mr. Payne has asked if he could have 1 minute.

Mr. Payne. Maybe Tierney should have asked four questions.

Let me just say that, what about the fact that if we had a program to also give forgiveness for Title I schools, what would you think about that? I see President Bush is proposing for math and science, et cetera. Do you think that would help?

Ms. Haycock. I would strongly encourage. But actually if you did for all Title I schools, you would include schools even that have a poverty norm of maybe 10 percent. We would strongly encourage you to focus it much more tightly on high-poverty schools so it really helps make the difference.

Mr. Payne. And would you know about the New Jersey program? What was the experience of bringing in professional people into teaching? Governor Kean did that during his time as Governor of New Jersey.

Ms. Haycock. And that continues. Like many alternate route programs, it has brought in a terrific set of talented people. And by the way, one of the things that is important to remember about alternate route programs, they are providing us proportionately more teachers of color than our traditional route program. So it is a terrific way both to bring in people who actually know the answer to the question, why should I learn this, but also to bring in a set of teachers who look more like the kids that they teach.

Mr. Payne. Thank you.

Chairman McKeon. In the interest of your other colleagues, Mr. Van Hollen would like to make one comment.

Mr. Van Hollen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know we all have to vote.

I want to thank all the witnesses for your testimony, and I have been reading over it as well. A special welcome to Dr. Wise, my constituent, and thank you for being here.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McKeon. Thank you very much. Thank you for being here. And this is just the start. We appreciate if those who didn't get the opportunity to ask questions could submit those in writing. If you could get those to us, we would appreciate that. And if you will keep in touch with us as we go through this process, we would like to continue to be able to call on you and ask for your advice and help.

With that, this hearing stands adjourned. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 3:47 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX A -- WRITTEN OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, DC

Opening Statement of Howard P. "Buck" McKeon
Chairman
Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness

Hearing on "America's Teacher Colleges: Are They Making the Grade?"
May 20, 2003

Good afternoon. I would like to welcome each of you to the hearing today as the Subcommittee continues its focus on reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Today, we are holding our second hearing on teacher quality.

Last October, the Subcommittee held a hearing on "Training Tomorrow's Teachers: Ensuring a Quality Postsecondary Education" to learn about the affects of amendments made in 1998 to Title II of the Higher Education Act on the quality of teacher education programs in the United States. At that hearing, we discussed the effectiveness of the competitive grant programs authorized under Title II and examined accountability provisions for teaching preparation programs under the Act. The purpose of today's hearing is to discuss whether teacher colleges and other teacher preparation programs are producing a competent cadre of teachers.

The caliber of teacher education programs at institutions of higher education has come under increased scrutiny over the past several years. Among other things, teacher preparation programs have been criticized for providing prospective teachers with inadequate time to learn subject matter; for teaching a superficial curriculum; and for being unduly fragmented, with courses not linked to practice teaching and with education faculty isolated from their arts and sciences faculty colleagues. In particular, there have been concerns about high rates of failure of recent teacher college graduates on initial licensing or certification exams. A recent Congressional Research Service report noted that one of the most publicly reported instances of high failure rates was in 1998 when 59 percent of prospective teachers in Massachusetts failed that State's new certification exam. These dismal results raised questions about the quality of the preparation and training prospective teachers had received from teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education across the State.

In June 2002, the Secretary of Education issued the first full annual report on teacher preparation as required under Title II of the Higher Education Act. The report – *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality* – concluded that the teacher preparation system in this country has serious limitations. Not only does acceptable achievement on certification assessments differ markedly among the States, the Secretary's report found that most States, in setting the minimum score considered to be a passing score, set those scores well below national averages. The data collected for this report suggest that schools of education and formal teacher training programs are failing to produce the types of highly qualified teachers that the No Child Left Behind Act demands.

There is widespread awareness that the subject matter knowledge and teaching skills of teachers play a central role in the success of elementary and secondary education reform. More than half of the 2.2 million teachers that America's schools will need to hire over the next 10 years will be first-time teachers, and they will need to be well-prepared for the challenges of

today's classrooms. For these reasons, the nation's attention has increasingly focused on the role that institutions of higher education and States play in ensuring that new teachers have the content knowledge and teaching skills they need to ensure that all students are held to higher standards.

Approximately 1,200 institutions of higher education award undergraduate degrees in elementary and secondary education. In addition to earning baccalaureate degrees in education, other undergraduates get ready to teach by participating in a teacher education program while earning a degree in an academic subject area. Still other individuals enter teaching through post-baccalaureate certificate programs or master's programs offered by institutions of higher education. Finally, alternative routes to teaching that target, for example, individuals changing careers, may also involve higher education institutions.

Title II of the Higher Education Act includes programs and provisions intended to improve the overall quality of teacher preparation programs administered by institutions of higher education, hold these programs accountable for the quality of their graduates, and strengthen recruitment of highly qualified individuals to the teaching profession. Institutions of higher education have a great deal of responsibility in contributing to the preparation of our nation's teachers. We are here today to learn whether provisions under Title II of the Higher Education Act are working and whether our teacher preparation programs are making the grade.

We have a distinguished panel of witnesses today. I would like to thank you for your appearance before the Subcommittee today and I look forward to your testimony and any recommendations you may have as we work to reauthorize teacher provisions of the Higher Education Act.

APPENDIX B -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF MRS. LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, EDUCATION LEADERS COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

TESTIMONY OF LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
EDUCATION LEADERS COUNCIL

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE WORKFORCE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS

MAY 20, 2003
2:00 PM
2175 RAYBURN HOB

TESTIMONY OF LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, EDUCATION LEADERS COUNCIL

MAY 20, 2003

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, thank you so much for the opportunity to appear before you today. My name is Lisa Graham Keegan, and I am the Chief Executive Officer of Education Leaders Council, an education reform "action tank" comprised of like-minded teachers, school chiefs, school board members, and policymakers. At ELC, we believe in high academic standards, rigorous assessments, and equal access to an outstanding education not only for all students, but for all prospective teachers as well. This will require new approaches that will require breaking with some tradition. At ELC, we know this, and we're not afraid to do this work. That's one reason why we've been at the forefront of the effort to develop a teacher certification route that relies on evidence on what we know matters in a classroom – knowledge of content and instructional methodology. The country cannot afford to require all of its prospective teachers to be subjected to so-called progressive pedagogies and certification based more on seat time and process than on actual proficiency.

Since September 2001, ELC has been working closely with Secretary of Education Rod Paige, who has made teacher excellence and alternate certification one of his priorities. And with $5 million in startup funding from the U.S. Department of Education, ELC worked with the National Council on Teacher Quality – under the watchful eye of some of the nation's most thoughtful advocates for teacher quality – to create the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence. American Board provides a nationally recognized, high quality credential to attract the best and the brightest new and advanced teachers into our classrooms. This certification has also been recognized by the Congress – in Section 2151(c)(2) of the *No Child Left Behind Act* – as one of the nationally recognized doorways into the teaching profession. We're very proud of this certification, and we think you'll be impressed with it, too. Secretary Paige has called this certification radical – "radically better than the system we have now, a system that drives thousands of talented people away from our classrooms.

But before I tell you more about American Board, let me speak briefly about why this alternative route is so important. You're asking a very important question with this hearing: Are colleges of education getting the job done? It's an appropriate question, and you're right to be concerned about it. The answer is a simple one: No, they're not. And it's largely because they have lost sight of what it is that teacher's need to know. Colleges spend their time focusing on pedagogy – some of it bordering on the downright bizarre – and not on the kind of content in which I think most of us assume our teachers are being instructed.

Pedagogy, Instead of Content

For the most part, teacher competency in subject area is determined by the Praxis exam. When it was announced that the Praxis exam was being revised to better reflect content

demands, there was considerable agreement that the test needed to be updated – but also considerable skepticism about the ability to actually do it. This is because the organizations that are traditionally chosen to revamp its test – organizations with great sounding named like National Council of Teachers of English and National Council for the Social Studies -- have already shown that they have more interest in feel-good pedagogy than actual content.

Writing about the English standards that the National Council of Teachers of English developed, example, Diane Ravitch, in *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms* said that they "buzzed with fashionable pedagogical concepts but lacked any concrete reference to the importance of accurate language usage, correct spelling and grammar, great contemporary literature, or what students at any grade level should actually know and be able to do." What they did do, however, was advise teachers to stop getting in the way of a child's natural tendencies by trying impose the burden of phonics on children who are learning to read.

We all know that the whole language approach to reading has failed an entire generation of children, but don't tell that to the colleges of education – they're still working hard to ensure not that no child is left behind, but that no child's inner psyche goes unnurtured. Because teaching colleges had not adequately prepared teachers for the task of teaching phonics, the teachers who came out of these colleges didn't teach their students how to read. Congress, in its wisdom, finally declared that it had had enough, and now requires that all federally-supported reading initiatives be based in sound, scientifically-based methodologies. That at least ensures that phonics gets taught in elementary schools. It doesn't ensure that it gets taught in teaching schools. Perhaps it's time to require the same of teaching colleges.

Let's look at math standards next. Imagine what a career changer from a investment banking firm with a degree in math might think if we went back to a teaching college – as some would like to require – only to discover that math teachers aren't told to teach multiplication tables, and that there aren't really any incorrect approaches to long division, so long as children come up with their own methods of calculating. And the fallback position of the math standards? Use a calculator.

How about history? Surely, we could expect the National Council on the Social Studies to come up with some specific examples of what history teachers should be teaching. Even if it were impossible to compress all of the important events in history into less than 200 pages, you would at least expect something akin to "Great Moments in History" to show up in history standards. And you'd be wrong. There's not a single mention of a specific person, place or event that should be taught.

And portfolios! We're so intrigued with these portfolios. Teachers don't have to demonstrate proficiency, they just have to demonstrate they can put together elaborate portfolios. Teaching colleges have done such a good job of teaching teachers about the value of portfolios that they're even teaching students that they shouldn't be expected to pass a contents-based exam, either – they should just be asked to put together a portfolio.

We have English standards that don't talk about specific writers; history standards that don't talk about specific events, and math standards that don't talk about multiplication tables. But all of them talk about the need to let students determine what should be taught in the classroom.

This, then, is what our colleges of education are teaching. Nothing. Nothing is important. Nothing matters, except we make sure we allow everyone to explore their own approach to just about anything. Is it any wonder that we have 12th graders in Florida who still can't pass a 10th grade equivalency test after five tries? These are the kinds of educators that our colleges of education are producing.

And what happens when the students these teachers are teaching fail? They blame the student. They blame the test the student has to take. They blame the legislature for lack of funding. They blame the Congress. They blame everything but the failure of adults to adequately take the responsibility of teaching these students. And they can't teach, because they haven't been taught how to teach, only how to empathize.

I want to make clear that this isn't teacher bashing. There are plenty of great educators who came out of teaching colleges and have succeeded in spite of it. Just as we so often say that students can't be expected to learn what they were never taught, so too can we say that teachers can't teach what they haven't been taught to teach. And that, for too long, has been the job of teaching colleges.

No Silk Purses

Now, NCATE may argue that there's nothing wrong with teaching colleges that a good dose of updated NCATE standards won't fix. If NCATE is in the process of updating and improving their standards – and I mean truly improving them, not just changing around all the lingo to say the same things differently – then I applaud their effort. But that's not enough. Colleges are too far gone and entrenched in leadership that doesn't believe content matters, and always believes it knows best. Until you change the leadership, you're not going to see any changes, period.

Lynne Cheney recently warned that we should never underestimate the ability of special interests to co-opt education reform and continue to advance their own initiatives under the banner of change. I am fully confident that colleges of education will embrace whatever changes NCATE recommends, issue glowing press releases declaring that we'll now be seeing a new and improved system of teaching colleges. But only the jargon will have changed, the colleges will remain exactly the same. This is a sow's ear you have here, Mr. Chairman. There will be no silk purse, no matter how much gold thread you string it together with. It's no longer possible.

American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence

Despite this, NCATE and colleges of education remain convinced that teaching colleges are still the only reliable route to teacher certification. We disagree. And so does the President, the Secretary of Education, and the Congress. That's why they tasked ELC – and our partner in this endeavor, the National Center for Teacher Quality – with the challenge of creating a new alternative to teacher certification that was based on proficiency, not the ability to navigate one particular process – a process which has always been determined by colleges of education.

American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence is a rigorous way to open the doors for highly qualified candidates – including professionals who may want to enter teaching from other fields. Because the rigor of the exam its candidates are required to take, American Board certified teachers have proven that they not only have a mastery of their subject matter, but also the professional knowledge to begin teaching students right now. That's teacher excellence – and that's "highly qualified."

American Board will offer two types of certification: a Passport to Teaching, which will be available for career changers and prospective new teachers – including, I might add, anyone who may have come through a college of education – and Master Certification, which is targeted toward extraordinary educators who are already in the teaching profession and have a demonstrated record of accomplishment in improving student achievement. Passport certification is exactly that – a passport to teaching that is accepted in any state that chooses to accept it. Pennsylvania was the first state to accept the Passport to Teaching, and we anticipate a number of others will accept the American Board by the end of the summer.

The American Board was not created as a shortcut to the classroom, and I want to be very clear about that. The American Board was specifically created to address the "highly qualified" requirement of NCLB; that does not mean "speedily certified." And while it was created as an alternative to the teacher college route to certification, it does not pretend to be the *only* route to certification. This is a certification based on excellence. If you've got a bachelor's degree, you can apply for American Board certification, regardless of whether you came from a college of education or a college of engineering.

And it's not easy. American Board exams are tough – but that's how we know that those who pass them are highly qualified. When an applicant passes the American Board's exams, you know they're highly qualified. And that means that administrators and recruiters can hire American Board certified teachers with the confidence that they're getting a knowledgeable teacher.

Testing for Subject Mastery, Professional Knowledge and Classroom Experience

The American Board benefited from the expertise of more than 80 content specialists to help define and refine the domains and sub-areas for all of the standards on its content exams. The American Board contracted with StandardsWork, Inc. to facilitate the development of the standards for the tests for Professional Teaching Knowledge, English,

Mathematics, and Elementary Education. Our content standards are some of the most rigorous ever developed, and we're very proud of them.

But we understand that there's a real difference between having a mastery of a subject area and being able to teach it to a classroom of excited sixth graders. Therefore, the American Board assesses not only an applicant's knowledge of subject area, but also their ability to work in a classroom. Because the exam is administered using computers that can generate multimedia presentations, applicants can, for example, watch and listen to real children reading, and then assess the child's error patterns and select appropriate interventions. This isn't your typical test – but then, we like to think our applicants aren't the typical applicants. We ask that they demonstrate their knowledge in innovative ways, just as they will in the classroom.

One of the really exciting things about American Board's Passport to Teaching is that, broadly speaking, anyone can take it. That means we can finally tap into the vast pool of potential teachers who are presently in other occupations, but who would become teachers if they knew they didn't have to go back through a teaching college for a number of years. Other American Board Passport applicants have professional and life experiences as educators, but haven't necessarily obtained the credentials necessary to teach in public schools. We believe that one becomes a great teacher by teaching – and if an applicant doesn't have instructional experience, the American Board provides a clinical experience checklist that can be completed by those seeking to fulfill this requirement or we work with local initiatives to help individuals meet this objective.

All of these exams measure the same skills that we insist our teaching colleges instill in educators, and they do it in a much more meaningful way. Most important, with the American Board, teacher preparation is finally about content and subject mastery, not empathy. Our colleagues in the colleges of education may continue to assert to you that they all do a terrific job, and that they're the only ones who can do it. The American Board simply begs to differ. And by the end of the summer, the American Board will offer its certification tests for elementary education, with math and English available for middle and high school teachers by year's end. We appreciate your confidence in this project, and we're pleased to report to you that American Board certification is still right on schedule.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted the committee has chosen to discuss this issue. As you continue to turn the sow's ear over and over in your hands and wonder whether you really can make that silk purse – and Mr. Chairman, if there's anyone made of the stern stuff needed to do that, it's you – please also keep in mind that prospective teachers now have other options. Because of the leadership of this committee, the Congress, and the Administration have shown in establishing and funding the American Board, teacher quality finally has a fighting chance.

As you move forward with your consideration of the Higher Education Act, we at ELC look forward to working with you to encourage states and districts to expand the options their new and potential teachers have for certification to include other alternatives like the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence. Again, quality deserves a chance. Thank you for the pleasure of allowing me to speak with you today. I look forward to any questions you may have.

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: **Lisa Graham Keegan**

1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity?

   No.

2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 2000:

   None received by individual testifying (see question 6)

3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?

   Yes.

4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing.

   Education Leaders Council, Washington, DC

5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4:

   Chief Executive Officer, Education Leaders Council *(2001-present)*
   Arizona State Superintendent of Public Instruction *(1994-2001)*

6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 2000, including the source and the amount of each grant or contract:

   April 2003: $10 million, Fund for the Improvement of Education for *Following the Leaders: A Project for the Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act in the States* (Congressional line-item)

   February 2003: $68,038 contract from NAGB, for literature review and issues paper for development of 2007 NAEP Reading Test

   July 2002: $3.5 million, Fund for the Improvement of Education for *Following the Leaders: A Project for the Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act in the States* (startup funding)

<u>July 2002</u>: $62,000 contract from Westat to provide content for the U.S. Department of Education's Supplemental Services conference.

<u>March 2002</u>: $15,000 contract for assistance with the Charter School Awareness, Outreach, and Literacy Program. Part of a grant from the U.S. Department of Education to America's Charter School Finance Corporation.

<u>February 2002</u>: $150,000 contract for development and hosting of a national testing summit. Part of $1.7 million grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Education to the Education Commission of the States for creation of the State Education Policy Network.

<u>January 2002</u>: $3,800 contract to provide services for the Secretary of Education's Value-Added meeting.

<u>September 2001</u>: $460,000 over two years for marketing and state outreach services in support of the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence. Part of a two-year, $5 million grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Education to the National Council on Teacher Quality and Education Leaders Council for development of a new alternative teacher certification.

7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:

<u>National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ)</u>: a partner organization with ELC in the area of teacher quality and certification

<u>American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence</u>: a subsidiary organization created by ELC and NCTQ to develop a new alternate teacher certification for new and master teachers

Signature:

Lisa Graham Keegan
CEO, Education Leaders Council

Date: May 16, 2003

APPENDIX C -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF MS. KATI HAYCOCK, DIRECTOR, THE EDUCATION TRUST, WASHINGTON, D.C.

TESTIMONY OF KATI HAYCOCK, *DIRECTOR*, THE EDUCATION TRUST

BEFORE THE

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS

May 20, 2003

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to testify before you today on the number one ingredient of high achievement: quality teachers. This Committee has already exhibited great leadership in the effort to improve teacher quality by including important new teacher-related provisions in the Higher Education Act of 1998 and, more recently, by including expansive teacher-related provisions in No Child Left Behind. These were very important first steps.

My purpose here this afternoon is to remind you why this subject should remain high on your agenda as you reauthorize the Higher Education Act and to suggest some ways in which you might build on the momentum you created in the earlier laws.

First some context.

Getting Students to Meet Standards: The Importance of Schools, Teachers

For many years, most Americans believed that what children learned was largely determined by their family background. They believed that, no matter what schools did, children who came from low-income families with low levels of parental education wouldn't learn very much, while those who came from more affluent and better educated families would excel.

Research undoubtedly fed this view. Studies like the so-called "Coleman Report" issued in 1966 indicated that schools accounted for very little in the equation of academic achievement.

More recent research has, however, turned these understandings upside down. It turns out that some things that schools do matter hugely in whether students learn, or whether they don't. And the thing that matters most is good teaching.

Teacher impact on individual children

---

[1] Coleman, James et al. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC, Government Printing Office. 1966

The impact of teachers on children is clearest in the research of statisticians and economists who are studying the relationship between individual teachers and the growth students achieve in their classrooms during the school year. This approach is called "value-added" measurement.

William L. Sanders, who founded the Value-Added Research and Assessment Center at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, has studied the teacher and student data extensively. In examining data in the state of Tennessee, he found that low achieving students gain about 14 points each year on the state test when taught by the least effective teachers, but gain more than 53 points when taught by the most effective teachers. Teachers make a difference for middle- and high-achieving students, as well. On average, high achieving Tennessee students gain only about 2 points a year when taught by low-effectiveness teachers, but more than 25 points a year when under the guidance of top teachers.

In summarizing available research, Eric Hanushek, an economist at Stanford University, estimated "the difference in annual achievement growth between having a good and having a bad teacher can be more than one grade level equivalent in test performance."

Moreover, these teacher effects appear to be cumulative. For example, Tennessee students who had three highly effective teachers in a row scored more than 50 percentile points above their counterparts who had three ineffective teachers in a row, *even when they initially had similar scores*. An analysis in Dallas found essentially the same pattern there: initially similar students were separated by about 50 percentile points after three consecutive years with high- or low-effectiveness teachers.

As in the case of annual impact, the cumulative impact of teacher quality is biggest for initially low-achieving students. A recent study in Tennessee suggested that students who fail the state's 4th grade examination are six times more likely to pass the graduation examination if they have a sequence of highly effective teachers than if they have a sequence of low-effectiveness teachers.

In other words, students whose initial achievement levels are comparable have "vastly different academic outcomes as a result of the sequence of teachers to

---

[2] Sanders and Rivers, "Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Students Academic Achievement," 1998, p. 9.
[3] Hanushek, Eric "The Trade Off Between Child Quantity and Quality," *Journal of Political Economy,* 1992, p. 107.
[4] Sanders and Rivers, 1998.
[5] Jordan, Mendro and Weerasinghe, "Teacher Effects on Longitudinal Student Achievement," Dallas, TX, 1997, p. 3.
[6] Rivers, June "The Impact of Teacher Effect on Student Math Competency Achievement," University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, 1999.

which they are assigned." Differences of this magnitude—50 percentile points—are stunning. They can represent the difference between a "remedial" label and placement in the accelerated or even gifted track. And the difference between entry into a selective college and a lifetime working at McDonald's.

The View from America's Classrooms

My colleagues at the Education Trust and I spend a lot of time in classrooms. Over the past ten years, we have spent thousands of hours working with teachers around the country.

In that work, we sometimes see absolutely wonderful teaching—in all kinds of schools. In fact, even the lowest performing schools always have at least some quite terrific teachers. But, especially in the highest poverty schools, we often see teaching that is quite dreadful.

These tendencies are clear in the data, as well. No matter which measure of teacher qualifications you use—certified vs. uncertified, in-field vs. out-of-field, experienced vs. inexperienced, high scoring on licensure exams vs. low-scoring, effective vs. ineffective—poor children end up with less-qualified teachers.

This pattern should have been unacceptable even when we didn't know how much difference teachers make. Now that we are certain of the difference, it is unthinkable that we allow poor children to continue to be taught by more than their share of our least well qualified teachers.

To give you some idea of why it is so important that we find the courage and creativity to turn this pattern around, consider these findings from a recent study of Texas schools:

> *"By our estimates from Texas schools, having an above average teacher for five years running can completely close the average gap between low-income students and others." (Rivkin, Kain and Hanushek, 2002.)*

---

[7] Sanders and Rivers, 1998. p. 9.
[8] Ingersoll, 2002. Special analysis of SASS data prepared for the Education Trust.
[9] *Monitoring Quality: An Indicators Report.* National Center for Education Statistics; December, 2000.
[10] Ingersoll, 2002. Special analysis of SASS data prepared for the Education Trust.
[11] Kain and Singleton, "Equality of Educational Opportunity Revisited," *New England Economic Review, May/June 1996, p. 109.*
[12] Rossi et al, *Chicago Sun-Times, September, 2001.*
[13] Kain and Singleton, "Equality of Educational Opportunity Revisited," *New England Economic Review, May/June 1996, p. 109.*
[14] National Center for Education Statistics, *Monitoring Quality: An Indicators Report,* Dece

Six Core Problems

Looked at as a whole, there are at least six central problems in this arena that Title II of the Higher Education Act can affect:

- We don't have enough high-quality teachers in the categories and jurisdictions we need them in (e.g. math, physical science, special education)—even as we continue to produce more teachers in categories we don't need;

- The teachers we have are unequally distributed across different kinds of schools and students;

- Fears about supply, distribution and diversity have prevented most states from raising standards for teachers to align with recent increases in standards for students. Academic departments outside schools of education have not been adequately engaged in setting standards for teachers or ensuring that teacher candidates get a strong college-level education in the subjects they will teach;

- Current patterns of transfer and resignation result in our losing disproportionately large numbers of the teachers we most want to keep (including high-end teachers, and teachers in high-poverty schools);

- Because of the ways in which the current Title II accountability provisions were crafted, too many institutions that prepare teachers have been able to avoid real accountability and, even within institutions where there is new-found accountability, those who do the academic side of teacher preparation are off the hook; and,

- Woefully inadequate data systems interfere with both reporting and action on these issues, and hamper the efforts of those who insist that teacher quality should be judged not on proxy measures of their qualifications but on what matters most: their ability to grow student knowledge and skills.

No Child Left Behind and HEA: The Need to Align

In general, the Higher Education Act needs to be more aligned with No Child Left Behind's focus on raising student achievement and closing gaps. The Higher Education Act should reinforce the priorities of NCLB and enlist higher education in a more aggressive effort to address both teacher quality and distribution.

Following are some of the options you may want to consider as you seek to realign the Higher Education Act with the goals and priorities of NCLB. We've organized those options according to the six critical problems listed above.

Problems 1 and 2: Inadequate supply of high quality teachers in some categories, jurisdictions—and uneven distribution of those we have.

A. Funding streams in Title II should be much more highly targeted to categories and jurisdictions in which there are genuine shortages of quality candidates. We would suggest, in particular:

- A massive focus on the biggest problem of all: the inadequate production of secondary mathematics teachers (and, for that matter, of the mathematics majors from which those teachers are drawn).

- Dedicated funds to make much-needed improvements in programs that prepare early childhood educators to ensure they get high quality preparation in both content and pedagogy.

- Better targeting of resources toward helping produce teachers for the schools and districts most in need. Grants should be targeted to the districts having the most difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers and the districts educating the most students living in poverty.

Moreover, grant applications that seek to address teacher recruitment/retention should be required to refer to the applicable state's report, required pursuant to NCLB, on the disproportionate assignment of inexperienced, out-of-field, and unqualified teachers to teach poor and minority students.

B. These funding streams should be accompanied by much tougher evaluation of results and by strengthened accountability systems, as described below.

C. Congress should expand loan forgiveness to teachers in high-need academic subjects, in schools with the greatest shortages of highly qualified teachers, and to individuals working in pre-kindergarten programs. To maximize the impact on attracting teachers to high-need subjects and high-need schools, loan forgiveness should begin immediately upon entering the profession and increase over time.

Problem 3: Standards for teachers that are not always well matched with standards for students.

In the rush to put their accountability systems into place after the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, most states did not pause to reexamine the extent to which existing certification requirements align with current standards for students. While Congress recognized the need to focus on the subject-matter knowledge of secondary teachers in particular, there is still inadequate involvement of departments outside of education schools in

preparing teachers. In addition, teachers are not adequately prepared to use challenging State academic standards and assessments to improve teaching. In the new Higher Education Act, Congress should:

A. Ask each state to examine current certification requirements, eliminating those that are unnecessary to classroom effectiveness and strengthening those that are necessary. This reexamination should be informed by an analysis of data on the characteristics and qualifications of teachers who are effective in producing student learning, as contrasted with those who are less effective.

B. Require state officials submitting the required annual reports to the Secretary to attest that their standards for teachers are fully aligned with what it takes to get students to state standards and to summarize the evidence behind that conclusion.

C. Because most coursework completed by future teachers takes place outside schools of education, whole universities and colleges need to be involved in improving teacher preparation.
   1. Faculties outside of education schools should participate in setting standards for the subject-matter knowledge needed to enter teaching.
   2. Faculties in and out of education schools should collaborate on limiting barriers to students in other academic disciplines earning teaching credentials.
   3. Special emphasis should be placed on improving programs that train early childhood educators.

D. Direct the Department of Education to prioritize grants that reform teacher preparation programs to ensure that teachers:
   1. Integrate challenging state academic standards into development of curriculum, assignments, and instructional practice;
   2. Align classroom-based assessments with challenging State academic standards; and
   3. Regularly analyze assessment data to improve teaching and instruction.

Problem 4: How to hold on to our strongest teachers

No Child Left Behind asks state and local education officials to make certain that low-income and minority children are no longer taught by disproportionate numbers of underqualified teachers. As they confront this challenge, however, most education leaders have very little to base their plans on—other than their own hunches.

Although Title II authorizes grants to address these issues, research on the effectiveness of available options (for instance, increased pay, reduced student load, or extra support) is sorely needed. State and local grant monies should be directed to this purpose. Grantees should be required to report consistent and comparable data in order to compare the effectiveness of various approaches. Grant applications should be required to include a detailed description of evaluation plans, including the identification of an appropriate control group, and hard data on outcomes by which to measure the success of grant activities.

Problem 5: Strengthening our accountability systems for higher education.

Accountability for what matters most will only be possible when Congress insists that institutions of higher education conduct value-added analyses that truly account for teachers' abilities to impact student learning. Until then, we are left with the best available proxies for what we really care about – raising student achievement.

The Committee might want to consider the following amendments to existing reporting requirements under Title II:

1. State reports should be signed by the Governor or the state official responsible for teacher certification, who would attest to the accuracy of the data.
2. The submitting official should not sign just for accuracy of the data, but should be asked to attest that state standards for teacher certification are adequate to ensure that teachers have the knowledge and skills to teach students up to state standards.
3. Pass rates for licensure exams should be reported for all test takers who have been enrolled in a teacher preparation program for at least two semesters, not just program completers. Reporting pass rates only for "program completers" has enabled institutions to withhold the label "completer" from students who have not passed the exam(s) and has undermined the value of this data for evaluating the quality of teacher preparation programs. Pass rates should also be reported for participants in alternative certification programs.
4. Institutions that use licensure examinations of some sort for entry should also be required to administer exit examinations that enable judgments to be made about institutional value-added;
5. Licensure exam pass rate data should be disaggregated by race/ethnicity and states should be asked to set institutional pass rate goals by group;

6. Accountability systems should include consequences not only for education schools, but for the academic departments that co-produce teachers. (For example, if secondary mathematics teachers fail the mathematics portion of the exam, but have had all or most of their mathematics instruction in the math department, there must be consequences for that department—rather than just the education school. Similarly, if the numbers of mathematics teachers produced by a campus goes down, rather than up, the mathematics department must also be held to account.)
7. Institutions should also be held accountable for producing increased numbers of teachers in shortage fields and for increasing the number of their graduates who teach in hard-to-staff schools;
8. Reporting of teachers on waivers/emergency credentials should be based on a consistent definition so the data is comparable across states and the definition should be aligned with NCLB's definition of highly qualified teachers. Teachers who are participating in an alternative route to certification should be separately identified and reported by number of years teaching.

Problem 6: Inadequate data systems.

Discussions of teacher quality are inadequately informed by data regarding what makes the biggest difference in student learning. As the U.S. General Accounting Office has reported, the U.S. Department of Education has granted almost half a billion dollars ($460 million) in HEA Title II funds but there is no consistent, reliable way to evaluate the effect of these grants on raising student achievement.

A. State Grants should be limited to states that are willing to establish data systems to evaluate the efficacy of teacher training programs and professional development activities on improving teacher effectiveness. Ultimately, states should be in a position to evaluate their success in terms of hard data indicating whether various activities helped raise student achievement. Effects on student achievement should be measured by state assessment data (and if that data would be insufficient for programs focused on high schools, then graduation rates and entry/success in college).

B. If they don't already have the capacity, Congress should allow states to apply for grants to connect data systems that provide analysis of individual teacher effectiveness based on student gains on academic assessments.

Indeed, this latter matter—putting systems in place that will finally allow for the evaluation of teachers and the institutions that produce them at least in part upon ability to produce student learning gains—lays at the very heart of the needed changes in our education reform strategy. Without good, solid data, virtually all of our efforts—to know what matters, to analyze distribution, to evaluate either individuals or the institutions that produced them—are seriously handicapped. Rather than being informed by hard evidence, we make decisions based on proxies and hunches. If we have one highest priority in this reauthorization, it has to be to tackle that problem head on.

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: Kati Haycock		
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the committee).	Yes	(No)
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 2000: NONE		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	(Yes)	No
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing: The Education Trust		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: Director		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 2000, including the source and amount of each grant or contract: None		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:	Yes	(No)

Signature: _____ Date: 19 May 03

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.

APPENDIX D -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. ARTHUR E. WISE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Testimony of Arthur E. Wise, President National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

to

Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness Committee on Education and the Workforce U.S. House of Representatives

May 20, 2003

Summary

NCATE and Congress (through Title II of the Higher Education Act) share the important goal of improving teacher preparation.

I am here today to suggest that we can **more effectively** achieve the goal **together**. Rigorous teacher preparation is key to ensuring that no child is left behind.

Title II brought teacher testing out of the policy shadows and into the sunlight where it is now playing a forceful role in upgrading teacher quality and teacher preparation. Education schools are now required to report how many of their teacher candidates pass state licensing tests. In response, education schools quickly changed admissions and graduation requirements. They no longer graduate teachers who fail the test.

This federal mandate has enabled NCATE to incorporate test score results into its accreditation decisions. Though NCATE is voluntary, its decisions currently apply to

665 institutions or 55 percent of the 1,200 teacher preparation institutions in the U.S. NCATE institutions prepare over two-thirds of all new teacher education graduates. In the last decade, **48 states have entered partnerships with NCATE.**

NCATE now requires that education schools

a. meet state-mandated pass rates

b. have at least 80% of all candidates pass tests of academic content knowledge

Since the enactment of Title II, NCATE has also been working with one national testing company to ensure that its teacher licensing tests are aligned with rigorous professional standards. NCATE just reached an agreement with that company to establish a **high national benchmark** on its teacher licensing tests. This unprecedented benchmark will provide a beacon to states that wish to upgrade standards.

Important as these steps are, content knowledge is only one indicator of readiness to teach. NCATE believes in a **comprehensive** approach to the development and assessment of teacher quality. In 2001, NCATE launched its new performance-based accreditation system, which requires multiple sources of evidence that candidates have acquired or developed not only content knowledge but also the ability to teach it so that students learn.

In addition to meeting new test score requirements, education schools must take other steps:

a) They must prepare new teachers to teach to today's higher standards

b) They must prepare new teachers to teach the great diversity of students who are in America's classrooms today.

c) They must prepare new teachers to use technology effectively

d) They must offer more intensive supervised experiences in schools.

e) They must track the progress of new teachers from admission to graduation and into the first years of teaching.

These new requirements are strengthening the programs which education schools offer.

Based on what NCATE has learned from working with education schools, I have four recommendations to offer:

1. As I have described, NCATE carries out a comprehensive review of the institution, its programs and candidates. Therefore, Congress should revise Section 207 of P.L. 105-244 to allow NCATE accredited institutions and states to use NCATE accreditation as a substitute for all or some Title II reporting requirements.

2. Congress should amend Section 202 to create incentives for states to implement comprehensive
licensing assessment systems that include measures of content knowledge, teaching knowledge, and skill, and the ability to teach so that all students learn.

3. Congress should continue to encourage the development of alternate routes to licensing but should tighten the definition of "highly qualified teacher" to preclude those who are still in training. The term "highly qualified" should be reserved for those individuals who have mastered a rigorous program of study and who have met ***all*** state licensing requirements.

4. Congress should amend Section 203 to encourage professional development schools, similar to teaching hospitals for medical education. These innovative institutions hold particular promise for preparing a new generation of teachers for urban schools. *(* See *Education Week* Commentary, February 27, 2002)

In closing, Congress and NCATE should work together to improve teacher preparation so that every child will have a highly qualified teacher. This will be a major step **toward fulfilling the promise that no child will be left behind.**

An Accountability System for Teacher Quality

Current teacher licensing, or teacher certification, as it is commonly called, does not do what it is intended to do. It does not differentiate clearly between those who are qualified to teach and those who are not. The victims are the children. With many children being left behind, especially in our largest urban districts, it is no wonder that there are many end runs around the system.

"Certification" is literally the grant by the state of a "certificate" that attests to the fact that the state has determined that an individual is qualified and thus authorized to teach. This process is similar to the process states employ to determine that doctors, lawyers, psychologists, and physical therapists should be licensed to practice their respective professions. (For reasons now obscure, the term "certification" entered the lexicon of teaching rather than the conventional term "licensing.")

Before a state licenses a person to practice a profession, it establishes the requirements for that license. These requirements typically include educational prerequisites and assessments of the knowledge and skill expected of a beginning professional. Then, if a candidate satisfies the educational prerequisites and demonstrates adequate knowledge and skill through tests and performance assessments, a state grants the candidate a license.

In most professions, the process works well enough that policymakers and the public generally accept the fact that an individual who is granted a license is fit to practice as a beginning professional.

In most professions, candidates complete a course of study that typically includes four years of liberal arts education, two to four years in a professional school, and substantial internship experience. Professional study *must* be in a school that has been accredited by a national professional accrediting agency. In some professions, internships must also be professionally accredited. These educational and internship requirements, carried out according to rigorous standards, begin to build the foundation for public confidence in the quality of beginning professionals.

A visitor to a university can be confident that every professional school on campus is professionally accredited, with one notable exception. Coincidence or not, that professional school spends less per student than any other professional school on campus, yet its students generally pay the same tuition as other students.

Though candidates in the established professions have high-quality educational and internship experiences, the states properly insist upon external validation that candidates are, in fact, ready to begin to practice. That external validation is the licensing process. The process assesses candidate knowledge, skills, dispositions, and performance.

Assessment is not limited to fixed-response, multiple-choice tests; it includes multiple measures of the above-named attributes. A record is built, with evidence accumulated from the beginning of professional study to the final assessment required by the state. It is

this aggregation of information that assures the public that a beginning professional is fit to practice, and that provides the basis for public confidence in the quality of beginning professionals.

Teacher preparation and teacher certification clearly do not conform to the mainstream model of professional preparation and certification. In some cases, less is required for teacher certification than for occupational licensing. How is it, for example, that a substantial period of apprenticeship is required for those who trim our nails, our curls, or even the limbs of our trees, but is not required for those who are to help shape the minds of the next generation?

Even today, the vast majority of new teacher graduates begin to teach with only four years of preparation. "New teacher graduates" are candidates who major in education (elementary teachers) and those who major in a discipline and minor in teacher preparation (secondary teachers). In these four years, education candidates (elementary and secondary) must acquire a liberal arts education, content knowledge, teaching knowledge and skill, and clinical experience. Thus, new teacher graduates begin with less overall preparation than do peers entering other professions. They have had to accomplish in four years what other professionals accomplish in six to nine years. In addition, professional accreditation of education schools is voluntary. Thus, teacher preparation may be delivered according to rigorous standards ... or not. Because of the unevenness of teacher preparation, the preparation experience provides an uncertain basis for public confidence in the quality of beginning teachers.

The certification process is weak in comparison to the licensing process in most professions. The public should expect the certification process to provide independent validation of teaching candidates' liberal arts education, content knowledge, teaching knowledge and skill, and teaching performance. Most state certification processes fall short of that expectation. The public should expect new teacher graduates to have a foundation in general and liberal arts studies. Yet no state assesses more than basic skills and only 40 states do that. Despite the outcry that new teachers should have content knowledge, only 34 states require a content test, and many of those states do not test in all content areas. Moreover, there is widespread agreement that state cutoff scores are too low. Only 23 states check to see whether new teachers have mastered subject-specific pedagogy, despite research that such knowledge is essential.

What the public wants to know—and what the certification process should reveal—is whether new teachers can put to work what they have learned, so that their students will learn. Unbelievably, only seven states assess teaching performance. Today's certification processes are very uneven and collectively do not provide a basis for public confidence in the quality of new teachers. In the face of this reality, what is being done?

What are education schools doing? Long maligned, many of these schools now deserve kudos. Accredited education schools and those seeking accreditation are engaged in strengthening their programs and providing more information about the performance of their candidates and graduates. First, they are becoming explicit about the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and teaching performance that they expect candidates to develop.

Second, they are designing and implementing systems to assess whether their candidates are developing consistently with these expectations.

The real challenge for them is to determine how to assess the impact of their candidates on student achievement. Education schools know that they must gather evidence on candidates while they are still candidates, but they also know that the most persuasive evidence will come from studies of recent graduates.

Accredited education schools are developing strong partnerships with schools that enable candidates to have high-quality practical experiences. They are figuring out ways to prepare teachers to work with today's diverse student population. University faculty members are changing the ways they teach, including integrating technology into their instruction. Universities are investing in the preparation of teachers at accredited education schools. Six hundred and sixty education schools are on the move. We do not know about the half (about 600) which operate without the benefit of professional scrutiny. Not only would this situation not be tolerated in other professions, it would be illegal.

Nowhere is change more evident than in the approach of accredited education schools to teaching content. These institutions have placed content front and center for teacher-candidates. The largest and most comprehensive study to date of new teachers reveals that accredited education schools are very effective in preparing candidates to meet today's teaching-content testing requirements. Graduates of accredited schools passed state licensing tests at a much higher rate than liberal arts graduates and graduates of unaccredited schools.

In 1998, Congress, through Title II of the Higher Education Act, effectively challenged education schools not to graduate candidates who could not pass state licensing tests. These schools rose to the challenge and immediately imposed more-rigorous entrance and exit requirements, producing very high pass rates on today's licensing tests. Critics incorrectly alleged that colleges have manipulated the data. Instead, they have responded to the mandate of Congress and to today's state requirements. That is the good news.

The bad news is that today's teacher-certification procedures provide far too little information about whether new teachers are ready to teach.

Most accredited education schools have also opened alternate routes to teaching for nontraditional candidates. Indeed, most accredited education schools provide options like five-year programs, fifth-year programs, and internship programs to meet the variety of needs presented by traditional students, recent college graduates, and more mature candidates. Partnerships between education schools and school districts are also resulting in a variety of high-quality alternate routes to certification.

Some responses to the teacher shortage, however, contradict the mounting evidence that teacher preparation matters. Administrators, especially those in the largest urban areas, routinely hire individuals with no preparation. They do not want to do this, but the conditions in some schools make it difficult to attract and retain qualified teachers.

Meanwhile, recent research suggests that one- fourth of those who enter the teaching field without preparation quit by the end of their first year. Yet, those who have the knowledge

and skill provided by teacher preparation have a first-year attrition rate that is half that of those who have no preparation.

Alternative certification (including temporary and emergency certification) and alternatives to certification (let anyone teach) will not do the job. In a misleading use of language, these certificates literally mean that the state is certifying that these certificate holders are not yet certifiable under the state's own laws and regulations. Dissembling is not a strategy for enhancing public confidence.

Instead, we should revolutionize teacher-certification procedures so that they achieve the purpose for which they are intended. We should devise and implement a "professional beginning-teacher licensing process." These would be its requirements:

General Knowledge -- Basic-skills testing should be replaced with tests that measure the outcomes of liberal arts and general studies, including high-level literacy and numeracy and writing and speaking skills. Teachers need to be—and be seen as—well-educated.

Subject Matter -- Rigorous content tests, aligned with professional standards for teachers and students, should be required of all, and professional cut scores should be set.

Teaching Knowledge -- New teaching-knowledge tests should be developed. These should be based on the idea that teachers should be able to understand and critique educational research and various schools of thought about teaching and learning. Educational knowledge and practice, like medical knowledge and practice, undergo continuous development. Teachers need to be given the intellectual tools for evaluating new information and using it to guide their practice.

Assessments of Performance – Assessments of teaching performance, including the impact of a teacher on student achievement, must be a prerequisite for a professional teaching license. Assessments should begin during preservice teacher preparation and continue at least until the end of the first year of teaching. Every first-year teacher must have a real mentor, not just another teacher with full-time responsibilities who drops by when time permits. Every first-year teacher must be mentored as part of a systematic induction program which provides instruction and support.

No one should receive a professional teaching license until he or she meets all of these requirements. Some states have already created a tiered licensing system, with the first-year teacher on a provisional license.

If a school cannot hire enough prepared and licensed teachers, then it should be restructured so that master teachers are responsible for all children and supervise the work of all unlicensed personnel. ("The 10- Step Solution," Commentary, Feb. 27, 2002.)

If the licensing process were as rigorous as what is outlined here, it would end the call for end runs. If the process had sufficient integrity, it would reveal those few unusual individuals who do not need much preparation to teach. However, most who enter teaching need and want high-quality preparation. We must devise and implement a professional beginning-teacher licensing process so that schools, including those in our largest urban districts, will leave no child behind.

Citations/Research

- NCATE has been cited by the National Conference of State Legislatures as a "cost-effective means to upgrade teacher preparation" in the states.

- The National Alliance of Business with the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, and the National Association of Manufacturers cited NCATE's high standards as having a positive effect on teacher preparation programs in their report, *Investing in Teaching* (2001).

- An ETS study on 270,000 test takers indicate that graduates of NCATE accredited institutions pass subject matter examinations for teacher licensing at a higher rate than do graduates of unaccredited colleges or those who never enter a teacher preparation program.

- Research indicates that P-12 students who have fully prepared and licensed teachers outperform students whose teachers are not fully licensed (Fuller, E. 1999). Other data and the weight of research support this finding. (Darling-Hammond, L., 1992, 2001).

- The National Research Council, an arm of the National Academy of Sciences, published a report in 1999 that indicates teachers must be highly skilled to help students develop higher levels of understanding and learning. The level of skill takes time to develop. It does not happen overnight or with a quick-fix approach (National Research Council, 1999).

- The National Research Council noted in 2001, that when initial teacher licensure tests are used, they should be a part of a coherent system of preparation, assessment, and support. (*Testing Teacher Candidates,* 2001).

- The National Research Council in the same study, also reports that a test "cannot measure all of the components of competent beginning teaching;" tests provide only some of the information needed. The Council says "it is crucial that states use multiple forms of evidence in making decisions about teacher candidates (2001).

References

Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). "Research and rhetoric on teacher certification: A response to 'Teacher certification reconsidered.'" *Education Policy Analysis Archives.* http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html

Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). "Teaching and knowledge: Policy issues posed by alternate certification of teachers." in *The Alternative Certification of Teachers*, W.D. Hawley, Ed. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. A review of 100 studies.

Educational Testing Service. (1999). Gitomer, D. and Latham, A. *The Academic Quality of Prospective Teachers: The impact of Admissions and Licensure Testing.* Princeton, NJ. http://www.ets.org/teachingandlearning/researchrpt.html

Fuller, E. (1999). Does teacher certification matter? A comparison of elementary TAAS performance in 1997 between schools with high and low percentages of certified teachers. Unpublished report. Charles A. Dana Center, Austin: University of Texas.

National Research Council. *Testing Teacher Candidates.* (2001). National Academy Press. Washington, D.C.

National Research Council.(1999). Donovan, M.S., Bransford, J.D., and Pellegrino, JW., Eds. *How People Learn: Bridging Research and Practice.* National Academy Press. Washington, D.C.

Wise, A.E. "The 10-Step Solution: Helping Urban Districts Boost Achievement in Low-Performing Schools." *Education Week*, February 27, 2002.

Wise, A.E. "What's Wrong with Teacher Certification?" *Education Week*, April 9, 2003.

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: Arthur E. Wise		
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the committee).	Yes	No X
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 2000: None		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	Yes X	No
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing: The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: President (CEO)		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 2000, including the source and amount of each grant or contract: None		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:	Yes	No X

Signature: AEWise Date: May 19, 2003

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.

Oral Comments

Testimony of Arthur E. Wise, President, NCATE

to

Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness Committee on Education and the Workforce U.S. House of Representatives

May 20, 2003

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am Arthur Wise, President of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE is the accrediting agency for colleges that prepare the nation's teachers. I am honored to be here.

NCATE and Congress (through Title II of the Higher Education Act) share the important goal of improving teacher preparation.

I am here today to suggest that we can **more effectively** achieve the goal **together**. Rigorous teacher preparation is key to ensuring that no child is left behind.

Title II brought teacher testing out of the policy shadows and into the sunlight where it is now playing a forceful role in upgrading teacher quality and teacher preparation. Education schools are now required to report how many of their teacher candidates pass state licensing tests. In response, education schools quickly changed admissions and graduation requirements. They no longer graduate teachers who fail the test.

This federal mandate has enabled NCATE to incorporate test score results into its accreditation decisions. Though NCATE is voluntary, its decisions currently apply to 665 institutions or 55 percent of the 1,200 teacher preparation institutions in the U.S. NCATE institutions prepare over

two-thirds of all new teacher education graduates. In the last decade, **48 states have entered partnerships with NCATE.**

NCATE now requires that education schools

a. meet state-mandated pass rates

b. have at least 80% of all candidates pass tests of academic content knowledge

Since the enactment of Title II, NCATE has also been working with one national testing company to ensure that its teacher licensing tests are aligned with rigorous professional standards. NCATE just reached an agreement with that company to establish a **high national benchmark** on its teacher licensing tests. This unprecedented benchmark will provide a beacon to states that wish to upgrade standards.

Important as these steps are, content knowledge is only one indicator of readiness to teach. NCATE believes in a **comprehensive** approach to the development and assessment of teacher quality. In 2001, NCATE launched its new performance-based accreditation system, which requires multiple sources of evidence that candidates have acquired or developed not only content knowledge but also the ability to teach it so that students learn.

In addition to meeting new test score requirements, education schools must take other steps:

a) They must prepare new teachers to teach to today's higher standards

b) They must prepare new teachers to teach the great diversity of students who are in America's classrooms today.

c) They must prepare new teachers to use technology effectively

d) They must offer more intensive supervised experiences in schools.

e) They must track the progress of new teachers from admission to graduation and into the first years of teaching.

These new requirements are strengthening the programs which education schools offer.

Based on what NCATE has learned from working with education schools, I have four recommendations to offer:

1. As I have described, NCATE carries out a comprehensive review of the institution, its programs and candidates. Therefore, Congress should revise Section 207 of P.L. 105-244 to allow NCATE accredited institutions and states to use NCATE accreditation as a substitute for all or some Title II reporting requirements.

2. Congress should amend Section 202 to create incentives for states to implement comprehensive licensing assessment systems that include measures of content knowledge, teaching knowledge, and skill, and the ability to teach so that all students learn.

3. Congress should continue to encourage the development of alternate routes to licensing but should tighten the definition of "highly qualified teacher" to preclude those who are still in training. The term "highly qualified" should be reserved for those individuals who have mastered a rigorous program of study and who have met ***all*** state licensing requirements.

4. Congress should amend Section 203 to encourage professional development schools, similar to teaching hospitals for medical education. These innovative institutions hold particular promise for preparing a new generation of teachers for urban schools. *(* See *Education Week* Commentary, February 27, 2002)

In closing, Congress and NCATE should work together to improve teacher preparation so that every child will have a highly qualified teacher. This will be a major step **toward fulfilling the promise that no child will be left behind.**

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: Arthur E. Wise		
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the committee).	Yes	No X
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 2000: None		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	Yes X	No
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing: The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: President (CEO)		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 2000, including the source and amount of each grant or contract: None		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:	Yes	No X

Signature: AEWise Date: May 19, 2003

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.

APPENDIX E -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. LOUANNE KENNEDY, PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE, NORTHRIDGE, CALIFORNIA

California State University
Northridge

Creating a More Effective Model of Teacher Education for the Future: The Teachers for a New Era Initiative

U.S. House of Representatives

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness

Presented by:

Dr. Louanne Kennedy
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
California State University, Northridge

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Dr. Louanne Kennedy. I am provost and vice president for academic affairs at California State University, Northridge.

This Congress has expressed serious concerns about K-12 student learning and the nature of teacher preparation programs at our nation's colleges and universities. I am here today because I too share those same concerns. We at CSUN are working to find answers and would like to share with you some of our current work and future plans for addressing teacher preparation.

Research has shown that the most important factor impacting student achievement in our K-12 classrooms is the quality of the teacher, even among disadvantaged children. Clearly, if students are not achieving, we need to look at the way they are being taught. If teachers are not facilitating learning at a high level, we need to take a hard look at how we, as universities -- charged with the preparation of our nation's K-12 teachers -- are framing, presenting and assessing our curriculum.

California State University, Northridge is proud to be partnering with the Carnegie Corporation of New York and its funding partners -- the Ford Foundation and the Annenberg Foundation -- in a national initiative that will provide models for restructuring teacher education. These new models will allow colleges and universities to be more effective in preparing teachers who can successfully impact achievement for all learners.

It is important to note that the Carnegie Corporation of New York was instrumental in the 1920's in restructuring the model of preparing our nation's physicians into the clinical model that still exists today. Carnegie now is replicating that approach and marshalling its resources, along with the resources of other major philanthropic organizations in this nation, to forever change the face of teacher education.

The concept of the "Teachers for a New Era Initiative" began several years ago when Carnegie began reviewing the

characteristics and attributes that are identified with the "high quality" teacher. Based on this report, the Rand Corporation undertook a national study of colleges and universities in this nation that had the capacity to work with them in creating a new model of teacher education.

California State University, Northridge was one of the four universities selected to participate this first year. We were selected for a variety of reasons, but probably most important in the selection process was that our faculty and administration had already made a commitment to begin aligning our teacher education programs with research on effective practice -- including work supported through a Title II Grant that enabled us to develop an integrated four-year elementary education program as well as mathematics and English four-year programs at the secondary level.

Our participation in the Teachers for a New Era Initiative provides us with the intellectual and basic fiscal resources necessary to take what by most criteria is a very good program of teacher education, and transform it into a stronger model of preparing high quality teachers, one that has components that can be replicated at colleges and universities throughout the nation.

The Carnegie Corporation conducted extensive research and identified three primary principles of a strong teacher education program, along with a series of issues to be addressed within those principles.

First, a successful teacher preparation program must be guided by evidence. Research and "best practice" are important, but most critical is evidence that the teacher is impacting student achievement. If not, the teacher must be knowledgeable in self-assessment and how to adjust his or her teaching style to best meet the learning needs of all students. Also, evidence must guide the way that we, as universities, frame our teacher education curriculum, and how we use assessment data to change our curricula. The CSU has undertaken the only systemwide evaluation of teacher preparation graduates in the nation.

Second, our new generation of teachers needs to be highly knowledgeable in subject matter, but also well versed in how to teach that subject matter. The successful integration of pedagogy with subject matter will require a new approach to teacher education that will oblige faculty from the arts and sciences colleges to be full partners with college of education faculty in designing and delivering the curriculum for aspiring teachers.

The third principle asserts that aspiring teachers need to be educated in strong clinical settings, with real world, hands-on experiences being a key to the preparation of a high quality teacher. Universities and school districts work closely together to ensure that teaching is an academically taught clinical practice, much as is done now in medical education.

Finally, issues to be addressed throughout the teacher education model include literacy, quantitative reasoning, technology, cultural considerations in teaching and learning, recruitment of under-represented groups into teaching, and developing programs to encourage "late deciders" to enter the profession of teaching.

At California State University, Northridge, teacher preparation is a university-wide priority. CSUN produces more teachers each year than any other public institution in the State of California -- we produce more teachers than all of the nine University of California campuses combined. Our teacher education programs have received national recognition for their excellence. We also recognize that we can be better. We strongly support accreditation and we are pleased recently to have achieved full accreditation by NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education).

We are thankful for the investment of others, such as Michael Eisner, who like Carnegie are enabling California State University, Northridge to develop successful teacher education models that focus on the success of all kinds of learners. Mr. Eisner and his family have provided the resources necessary for our faculty to study and then embed new approaches to preparing teachers who are able to fully support the learning needs of all children.

Our faculty believe, as is articulated in the "No Child Left Behind" legislation, that *all* teachers must be prepared to support *all* types of students - including students with disabilities and students with learning differences. We believe in the work of such organizations as the Council of Great City Schools, which is looking at closing the achievement gap in schools and the necessary professional development needed for urban teachers.

CSUN has collaborated with the Los Angeles Unified School District and a group of parents to establish the CHIME Charter Elementary School, which is a resource to demonstrate full inclusion methods for teachers to successfully support children with learning disabilities within the typical classroom. We are pleased that the Annenberg Foundation has provided the initial funding for a materials resource center at the CHIME School where we can train our aspiring teachers to use emerging technology to support student-learning needs.

In Fall 2004, a new Los Angeles Unified School District High School will open on our campus. This teaching academy will engage the interests of students who are thinking about careers in teaching, the health professions, and the arts and communications fields, all of which are particular strengths of the University. CSUN faculty, including newly hired "Teachers for a New Era" faculty, will teach in the high school. CSUN has been invited to participate in the selection of the principal as well as the first group of teachers. In addition to the high school being built on our campus, they will

make use of CSUN facilities, and the school will be available as a clinical site for the University's teacher education program.

We believe that our job as teachers is to help remove the barriers to learning, to help open the door to success to every student, especially our most vulnerable children in our inner city schools. Our model of teacher education incorporates this philosophy.

In summary, we at CSUN are willing to be accountable for the quality of our teacher education programs, the quality of our teachers, and the quality of the learning that happens in our graduates' classrooms. We know that the "Teachers for a New Era Initiative" and our progress in re-envisioning the teacher education for the future will assist you and other policy makers at all levels in creating classrooms in which all children learn.

I thank you for allowing me to speak before you.

APPENDIX F -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. JERRY ROBBINS, DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, YPSILANTI, MICHIGAN

TESTIMONY

108th Congress
United States House of Representatives
Committee on Education and the Workforce
Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness

May 20, 2003

Jerry H. Robbins, Ed.D.
Dean, College of Education
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Chairman McKeon, Congressman Kildee, Congressmen Ehlers and Upton, Members of the Subcommittee, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am Jerry Robbins, Dean of the College of Education at Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti, Michigan, where I have served for 12 years. In addition, I have been dean of a college of education at two other institutions, for a total of 23 years in the deanship. I have 15 additional years in other higher education teaching and administrative roles. In addition, I've been a teacher and a principal.

The invitation to testify today is much appreciated. I would like to offer Eastern Michigan University as an example of a teacher preparation program at which most of the criticisms leveled in recent times do not apply. We are not unique; hundreds of such examples from around the country could be presented just as well.

Permit me to make three points: (1) EMU is big; (2) EMU represents quality; and (3) EMU is well connected to schools and other educational entities.

1. EMU is big.

At the time that Michigan State Normal School was founded in1849, we were the sixth such institution for the preparation of teachers in the country and the first west of the Allegheny Mountains.[1] Since that time, through several name changes, we have grown into a comprehensive metropolitan university of more than 24,000 students. We remain best known, however, for the size and quality of our programming in professional education. Part of our reputation stems from the fact that we were among the first institutions in the country to prepare teachers of physical education, among the first to prepare teachers in special education, and so on, and we have been doing those things, and many others, with quality for decades.

Eastern Michigan University is the nation's largest producer of educational personnel and among the largest producers of new teachers.[2] At any given time, we have about 4,000 students involved in professional education preparation. We prepare about 2,000 professional educators

---

[1]Egbert R. Isbell, *A History of Eastern Michigan University 1849-1965*, Eastern Michigan University Press, 1971, p. xi.

[2]Source: annual *Directory* of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). "Total productivity" is the sum of new teachers prepared + teachers prepared for an advanced level of licensing + school administrators prepared + school counselors prepared + "other" school personnel (school psychologists, school librarians, etc.) prepared. This data source does not include institutions that are not members of the AACTE, but it is unlikely that any non-AACTE member approaches EMU's statistics. Over the past dozen years or so, EMU's total has not been the largest every year, but the sum over time for EMU is appreciably larger than the sum for any other institution.

per year, including about a thousand new, first-time teachers. We are the nation's largest producer of special education personnel[3] and among the largest producers of school administrators,[4] teachers of mathematics[5], and teachers of science.[6]

Our initial teacher preparation program, always large, is growing rapidly. For example, the number of persons formally admitted to our initial teacher preparation program has grown from 1,000 in 1998-1999 to 1,438 for last year, a 44% increase in three years. During the same period of time, we increased from 40 to 56 (40%) the number of persons going into secondary mathematics teaching, from 56 to 88 (57%) the number of persons going into secondary science teaching, and from 146 to 150 (3%) the number of persons going into special education.

• I mention these statistics to illustrate our institutional commitment to addressing the perceived teacher and administrator shortage problem.

We are comprehensive. In professional education we offer programming that ranges from the bachelor's degree through a certificate program for career changers, through extensive master's degree programs, and culminating in programming at the specialist and doctoral levels. We prepare teachers in early childhood education, elementary education, middle grades

---

[3]Council on Exceptional Children (CEC)/National Clearinghouse for Professions in Special Education/Institutions of Higher Education Database for Special Educator Preparation Programs.

[4]AACTE *Directory*, 1998, p. 35.

[5]AACTE *Directory*, 1995, p. 35.

[6]AACTE *Directory*, 1995, p. 35.

education, secondary education (25 teaching fields), K-12 teaching fields (five teaching fields), and special education (eight teaching fields). In addition, we prepare school administrators and school counselors.

2. EMU represents quality.

External recognitions. EMU is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and has been ever since NCATE was created.[7] We are approved by the Michigan Department of Education for the preparation of educational personnel.[8]

In addition, we meet all requirements of and have been officially recognized by 16 subject-area specialized professional organizations.[9] Every five years, we undergo rigorous review by the Michigan Department of Education, subject field by subject field, against demanding criteria.[10] We are in good standing in all instances.

---

[7]See *http://ncate.org/standard/unit-stds.htm* for NCATE standards that must be met.

[8]See Appendix A for excerpts from the Entry Level Standards for Michigan teachers that must be met.

[9]American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; American Speech-Hearing-Language Association; Association for Childhood Education International; Council for Accreditation of Counseling Related Educational Programs; Council for Exceptional Children; Council on Education for the Deaf; International Reading Association; International Society for Technology in Education; International Technology Education Association/Council on Technology Education; National Association for the Education of Young Children; National Association of Schools of Music; National Council for the Social Studies; National Council of Teachers of English; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics; National Middle School Association; National Science Teachers Association. Applications for additional such recognitions are pending.

For the requirements of many of these organizations, see *http://ncate.org/standard/programstds.htm*

[10]See *http://www.michigan.gov/mde/1,1607,7-140-5234_5683_6368---,00.html* for Michigan Department of Education "unit" and program standards.

Subject-matter requirements. All of EMU's prospective teachers, irrespective of grade level or teaching field,[11] complete an academic major[12] and an academic minor.[13] The academic majors and minors for teachers require at least as many (often more) courses in the subject field as is the case for liberal arts students in the same field, are at least as rigorous, and often require related course work from another field(s) that is not required for liberal arts majors.[14]

A prospective teacher in any field at EMU must take and pass the State's required test in the field before being recommended to the Michigan Department of Education for licensure.

• I mention these points to dispel any concern that the teachers prepared by Eastern Michigan University are not at least as well prepared in subject matter–quantitatively and qualitatively--as any other undergraduate student at our institution.

---

[11]Prospective elementary teachers may complete three minors instead of a major and a minor. In a few instances, the State prescribes a "broad field" major with no minor required.

[12]A major consists of at least 30 semester hours of credit, 10 or more courses in the subject field.

[13]A minor consists of at least 20 semester hours of credit, typically 6-9 courses in the subject field.

[14]For example, the prospective teacher of history at EMU must minor in another social science area, must take more course work in U.S. history, and must take course work in geography, none of which are requirements for the liberal arts major in history. Otherwise, the course requirements are very similar. As another example, prospective teachers of English must take more course work in the teaching of writing than would be the case for a liberal arts student.

External awards. Professional education programs at EMU have received nine national awards from five major professional organizations in relatively recent years.[15]

Distinguished students. Our students distinguish themselves in a variety of ways. Typically, about half of each year's incoming group of EMU Presidential Scholars[16] intend to become teachers. Hundreds of teacher preparation program students participate each year in the EMU Honors Program. It is a rare year that an EMU student is not the winner or a finalist in the state "student teacher of the year" competition.

Our new teachers are heavily recruited. Each year, our teacher job fair attracts many hundreds of school district recruiters from all over the country, especially including Sunbelt states. Many of these recruiters come with contracts in their pockets, willing to sign on the scene. Others come prepared to pay signing bonuses, moving expenses, several months of apartment rent, and the like, especially for new teachers in high-demand fields, new teachers of color, new men teachers, etc. Each of our program completers could easily have her/his choice of three or four jobs.

---

[15]Exemplary Science Program award from National Science Teachers Association (NSTA); Christa McAuliffe Showcase for Excellence Award from American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) (four times); Exemplary Staff Development Program award from the American Association of School Administrators (AASA); Distinguished Program in Teacher Education from the Association of Teacher Educatiors (ATE) (two times); Distinguished Achievement Award in Teacher Education from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE); Silver Award (for structured field experiences) from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

[16]A four-year, all-expenses-paid Scholarship, based on extremely high academic ability.

Distinguished alumni. We are especially proud of our tens of thousands of alumni. I pay special tribute to the thousands of them who spent a career in the classroom, unsung heros except to their students. But many of our alums have achieved national recognition.

These include former Congressman Carl Purcell, who was a teacher and principal before he entered political life; 24 recipients of the Milken Family Foundation National Educator Award;[17] 1992 National Teacher of the Year Thomas Fleming; 1989 National Superintendent of the Year James Wilsford; executives of Washington-based educational organizations,[18] presidents of national professional organizations,[19] a *USA Today* All-USA Teacher Team winner,[20] and a very large number of state-level recognitions, including "_____ of the year"[21] not only in Michigan but several other states, chief state school officer, executive or elected leader of state-level professional organizations, and many others.[22]

---

[17]The Milken National Educator Award includes a $25,000 cash prize and extensive professional development opportunities. We know of no other institution with as many as 24 alums among the Milken awardees.

[18]Examples include Don Cameron, former executive director, National Education Association and Timothy Dyer, former executive director, National Association of Secondary School Principals.

[19]Examples include Bill Morris, former president of the American Association of School Adminsitrators; Lynn Babcock, former president of the National Association of Elementary School Principals; Sue Safranski, former president of the National Association of School Psychologists; Wilbert J. McKeachie, former president, American Psychological Association, former president, American Association for Higher Education; Jack Price, former president, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics; and Jack Minzey, former president of the National Community Education Association.

[20]Diane Bencik, 1998.

[21]Fill in the blank with teacher of the year, administrator of the year, first-year teacher of the year, _(subject field)__ teacher of the year, etc.

[22]EMU COE alums also include presidents of several colleges/universities, national award winners for mathematics and/or science teaching, a four-star general in the U.S. Army, a Pulitzer Prize winner, Olympic medalists, several recipients of the "Miss Michigan" award, several state legislators, a distinguished actor, and a number of CEO's of major corporations and foundations.

A recent alumnus. I am extremely pleased to recognize today one of our very recent alums who is in the audience. Mr. Sergio GarcΞa, who grew up in extreme south Texas, came to EMU several years ago to study to become a teacher. He completed his requirements this past December with a major in one of the sciences and a minor in bilingual studies. He is currently teaching science in a middle school in Ann Arbor, Michigan, completing the year for a teacher who is seriously ill, while he considers which of a number of highly attractive job offers that he will accept for a permanent teaching assignment. I invite members of the Subcommittee to question Mr. GarcΞa about his preparation program following this session.

Mr. GarcΞa represents so many aspects of our programming that we consider of importance–the need for more teachers of color,[23] more male teachers,[24] and more teachers in high-needs fields, such as his choices of science and bilingual education.

Admission requirements. But Mr. GarcΞa and his fellow students had to go through a rigorous process. First, he had to be admitted to Eastern Michigan University. EMU is not, under our mission, a highly selective institution. Nevertheless, EMU admissions requirements screen out those who do not show sufficient academic promise.

---

[23]In 1997-98, 64 minority students (8.4% of the annual admissions cohort) were admitted to the EMU teacher education program. The number has steadily increased each year since. By June 30, we expect to admit 176 minority students during 2002-2003, 13.2% of the annual admissions cohort.

[24]In 1999-2000, 252 men (22.7% of the annual admissions cohort) were admitted to the EMU teacher education program. This number had steadily increased each year since. By June 30, we expect to admit 375 male students during 2002-2003, 27.3% of the annual admissions cohort.

Along with all our prospective teachers, Mr. GarcΞa was required to take the same set of general education requirements–the equivalent of a year and a half of full-time study–as any other EMU student. These include required course work in English composition, speech, mathematics, the sciences, computer literacy, psychology, U.S. government, history, other social science areas, in cross-cultural or international studies, literature, the arts, and wellness/fitness.

When Mr. GarcΞa completed 56 semester hours of course work (about 40% of the total degree requirements), he became eligible to make formal application for admission to the EMU initial teacher preparation program. Up to this point, he and others similarly situated had been taking general education course work (along with EMU students in all fields), and some introductory course work in the major and minor teaching fields. All of this course work is provided by EMU's College of Arts and Sciences; none of it is in the College of Education.

Mr. GarcΞa had to demonstrate a number of items as part of his application process: (1) completion of 56 semester hours of course work, (2) a grade point average of at least a 2.75,[25] (3) demonstrated competence in speech,[26] (4) sufficient ability in reading,[27] (5) sufficient ability in

---

[25]Grade point average is computed on a four-point scale, C = 2.00, B = 3.00, A = 4.00.

[26]Successful completion of the required course(s) in speech.

[27]Several measures, including successful completion of the reading portion of the State's Basic Skills Test for prospective teachers.

writing,[28] (6) sufficient ability in mathematical computation,[29] (7) successful completion of tuberculosis and speech/hearing screenings, (8) being free of any University conduct violation, and (9) being free of any University probation standing.

Each year, more than 200 students who make formal application to the EMU initial teacher preparation program are not admitted. They are advised to complete necessary remediation and to reapply or, often, to go into some career other than teaching and to take an appropriate major/minor for that direction.

Mr. GarcΞa was successful in his application for admission. He was now free to pursue his major and his minor and a sequence of course work in professional/pedagogical studies.

Academic major/academic minor. In his major, Mr. GarcΞa completed a well-structured sequence of course work that was designed to meet the requirements of the National Science Teachers Association and the requirements in that field of the Michigan Department of Education. Subject-area requirements of the Michigan Department of Education for each teaching field are aligned with the Michigan Curriculum Frameworks. That is, teachers in any field are expected to master the advanced and expanded study of the material that their P-12 students are expected to learn. The same structure exists for the various teaching minors, as well.

---

[28]Several measures, including an autobiographical writing sample and successful completion of the writing portion of the State's Basic Skills Test for prospective teachers.

[29]Several measures, including successful completion of the mathematics portion of the State's Basic Skills Test for prospective teachers.

Professional/pedagogical studies. In his professional studies, Mr. GarcΞa entered into a sequence of courses designed to meet the requirements of NCATE, of the Michigan Department of Education (through the Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers, given in Appendix A), and of importance to the faculty at EMU.

First, he had to complete a cluster of courses that included human development, learning, the education of exceptional children, and a field experience that helped to tie together the university classroom instruction.[30]

Phase I. Once he had successfully completed this cluster of courses, Mr. GarcΞa was permitted to move to Phase I of the initial teacher preparation program. This cluster includes our course "Schools in a Multicultural Society,"[31] a course in curriculum and general teaching

---

[30]Human development is the study of how people, especially children and youth, grow and change over time in a variety of ways–intellectually, physically, socially, etc. In this course, the prospective teacher learns much about what 1st graders can and can't do ordinarily, what 7th graders can/can't do ordinarily, what 12th graders can/can't do ordinarily, and so on. The learning component addresses how people, especially children and youth, ordinarily learn certain kinds of matters and at what rates and in what order, different learning styles, and the like. It is important for the prospective teachers to realize that the act of "teaching" is pointless unless "learning" occurs as a result.

The prospective teacher also learns in this cluster about different types of disabilities that she/he is likely to encounter in the classroom and how to make appropriate adaptions of the teaching/learning process for such students. In the (very) structured field experience associated with this cluster of courses, the prospective teacher observes and assists in a classroom/building that is culturally diverse, often representing a culture very different from that of the prospective teacher.

[31]This course includes information about the school as a social institution; how schools differ because of their location and clientele; the need for teachers to address multiple cultures among the students to enhance learning; issues of equity; and the like.

methods that generally apply to any teaching field, a course in assessment and evaluation,[32] and a second structured field experience.[33]

Phase II. Upon completion of the requirements of Phase I, Mr. GarcΞa was permitted to move to Phase II. This phase includes a course for all secondary teachers (two courses for elementary teachers) in the teaching of reading.[34] This phase also includes special course work in the applications of technology and multimedia to the prospective teacher's field.[35] There is also a "special methods" course[36] and a third pre-student teaching field experience.[37]

---

[32]This is a course about which we have strong feelings. We consider it essential that teachers know how to determine when learning has occurred, how to measure it, how others (standardized tests, for example) are measuring it, and what to do if insufficient learning has occurred as a result of the teaching that has taken place.

[33]The field experience associated with this cluster focuses on evaluation and assessment of learning in a classroom.

[34]The State of Michigan requires, and we support, that all teachers, irrespective of grade level or teaching field, must be teachers of reading.

[35]The appropriate use of technology in teaching is carefully modeled by university faculty members throughout the professional education sequence. We are fortunate to have a relatively new building for Education that was designed to be technologically intensive for this purpose. Prospective teachers also have earlier experiences in courses and in field experiences with the use of technology. However, this is the "advanced" course, dealing with sophistical software, use of the Internet as a teaching tool, creation of multi-media "products" to use in teaching, and the like.

The EMU College of Education is currently a member of several consortia of institutions to accomplish several technology-related projects to improve our use of technology in teaching, many of them funded under PT3 grants. We also have worked closely with Sen. Carl Levin (D-MI) as he has been instrumental in creating the COATT (Consortium for Outstanding Achievement in Teaching with Technology) credential in Michigan.

[36]"Special methods" courses are those that are "The Teaching of [Subject Field]", *e.g.*, The Teaching of Mathematics, The Teaching of English.

[37]This field experience provides actual experience, under supervision, in how to teach reading.

Connections: Arts and Sciences and Education. At EMU, we believe that "the preparation of teachers is a campus-wide responsibility."[38] Under our organizational structure, the responsibility for the delivery of general education for prospective teachers is almost entirely the responsibility of the College of Arts and Sciences. The responsibility for the delivery of the academic content of the major and the minor is also that of the College of Arts and Sciences.[39] With one key exception, the responsibility for the professional studies/pedagogy sequence is that of the College of Education. The exception is that of the "special methods" courses, which are housed in and taught by faculty members of the College of Arts and Sciences.[40]

The "special methods" courses and the faculty members who teach them are special links between "content" and "pedagogy" and thus between the liberal arts faculty and the Education faculty. It is a linkage that is accomplished primarily through committees with membership from academic units all over the campus.

Student teaching. Upon completion of the course work and requirements in Phase II, Mr. GarcΞa and his fellow future teachers became eligible to apply for the capstone experience of student teaching.

---

[38]This is the First Principle of The Renaissance Group, an organization of approximately 36 institutions similar to EMU, of which EMU is a long-time member.

[39]A few relatively small teaching majors and minors are offered in the EMU College of Technology.

[40]Part of the professional studies/pedagogy sequence is taught in the department of the major in such fields as art, music, and the programs of the College of Technology.

There is a screening of students on a variety of criteria at the time of application to student teaching and not all applicants are accepted. Once accepted, students are placed with a highly-qualified cooperating teacher, with regular visits from and other communications with a university supervisor. Student teaching is a full-time, full-semester experience in a K-12 classroom.[41]

- **The full-time, full-semester student teaching experience, coupled with three previous structured field experiences and experiences in the schools often associated with courses in the sequence, provides extensive opportunity for the teachers-to-be to try their skills under careful supervision.**

Subject-field examinations. Between the time of substantial completion of the course work in the academic major and the academic minor and the time of application for recommendation for licensure, each student must take and pass the State's subject-field examination in each field.

Alternative delivery systems. A large portion of our students at EMU, including in our teacher preparation program, must work to support themselves and their families. A large portion of our students commute for their education, rather than live on campus. To accommodate these students, we offer professional education course work on campus, not only

[41] Some students, such as those in early childhood and those in special education, have multiple student teaching experiences. Those in K-12 teaching fields have student teaching experience at both the elementary and the secondary level.

from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. each weekday, but we have extensive Saturday and even Sunday course offerings. It is possible for many students to complete a portion of their program of studies on line. In addition, we offer course work in professional education at six locations other than Ypsilanti, all in southeastern Michigan.

Alternative audience. A special subset of our student body for initial teacher preparation is that of our "career changers." This group has grown rapidly in recent years. Last year, we admitted 534 such people to our initial teacher preparation program and they now make up about 1/3 of the student body for initial teacher preparation. These are persons with at least a bachelor's degree and often a graduate or professional degree as well who have been in some other line of work and who have decided to become a teacher.

I am constantly amazed at the number and variety of these people. We have just admitted a physician to our program for next fall, and that is not the first physician we've had. In our program for preparing teachers, we have appreciable numbers of lawyers, social workers, accountants, retired military personnel, corporate executives, engineers, clergy, and numerous other occupational groups. At any given time, we have several students in our program who have Ph.D.'s in liberal arts areas.

EMU's numbers from this alternative audience are much larger than for any other institution around, at least in Michigan, so EMU is clearly the institution of choice for these people and we are delighted to have the experience and maturity that they bring to our program.

Urban Teacher Program. A very special subset of the "career changers" audience comes to us through our Urban Teacher Program in Detroit and Flint. These two troubled districts, not unlike many other urban districts in the country, are forced to staff classrooms with persons who do not hold credentials as fully-qualified teachers. We are working, 25-50 at a time in each location, with these "long-term permanent substitutes," many of whom are minority persons and deeply committed to helping urban schools, such to provide the course work and other services to help them become fully-qualified teachers.

3. We are well connected with the education community!

International, national, and state. Time and space do not permit me to mention our educational connections around the globe.[42] At the national level, as has been mentioned, we are accredited by NCATE[43] and our subject-area programs have been formally reviewed and approved by a large number of educational organizations.[44]

Our College of Education meets the membership criteria for and holds membership in national organizations that are committed to quality in professional educator preparation. These

---

[42]In brief, these include having a former Fulbright scholar on our faculty; having several faculty members who were born/educated in other countries; hosting, almost every year, a Fulbright scholar from another country in our College of Education; faculty study and research in other countries; faculty presentations at international meetings; agreements of cooperation with institutions in other countries; membership in the Sino-American Education Consortium; a small number of international students in our student body; student teaching experiences in other countries, and a number of others.

[43]National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

[44]See note #9.

include AACTE,[45] TECSCU,[46] and The Renaissance Group. Our faculty members and administrators hold individual memberships in hundreds of additional national organizations. We are similarly connected through organizations at the state level.

We are connected with other colleges of education through collaborative projects. Several of these relate to the use of technology in preparing professional educators.[47] However, we are part of an 11-institution consortium that is working on "Teacher Quality"–particularly the relationship between the elements of a teacher preparation program and the later learning outcomes of the K-12 students they teach. We are the prominent player in a consortium of six Michigan institutions that is providing on-line instruction to prepare teachers for children with autism. There are other state collaborative projects as well.

Local-area schools. However, our greatest and most important connections are with our local-area schools. Our faculty members are in dozens of school districts and hundreds of classrooms each year as they supervise pre-student teaching field experiences and the student teaching experience. They bring back what they see and hear to their classrooms and to our prospective teachers. We have a series of advisory committees, made up primarily of K-12 personnel.

---

[45]American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

[46]Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities.

[47]Examples: "The CATALISE Project–Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology," "In Time: Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology," "Developing an Ecology for Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers for Technology," and "Media Literacy in the Information Age."

C-SIP. For more than 20 years, the College of Education's award-winning Collaborative School Improvement Program (C -SIP) structure has linked numerous EMU faculty members (from three colleges, not just Education) with dozens of local-area schools in three-year partnerships to help solve problems that the school has identified.[48]

"Consociate" schools. We maintain a special partnership arrangement with an elementary school and a middle school in Ypsilanti, Michigan, and a similar special partnership with a senior high school in Farmington, Michigan. These highly successful partnerships are built around the concept of "finding all that we can do for each other but that doesn't cost much money."[49]

Funded projects. External funding is permitting us to provide special services to Latina girls in the Detroit area such as to encourage and assist them in courses in mathematics and science (and eventually into careers in related areas). Another project permits us to provide extraordinary support for new teachers of mathematics and science in several districts such as to encourage them to stay with teaching as a career. Yet another permits us to assist a very troubled inner city middle school in Hamtramck, Michigan. Many other projects have occurred in recent years for as long as the funding lasted.

---

[48]For information on this activity, see *http://www.emich.edu/public/collab_ed/csip.html*

[49]For information on these "consociate" schools, see *http://www.emich.edu/coe/collab_ed/consociate/consociate.html*

Comer Project. We have many other partnership arrangements with schools, the most dramatic of which has been our ten years of experience with approximately 24 schools in Detroit as the "university partner" in the implementation of the Comer Schools and Families Initiative.[50] Over the past decade, dozens of EMU faculty members (including from such fields as Nursing and Social Work, as well as from Education) and many hundreds of EMU prospective teachers have had an opportunity to participate in the improvement of inner-city educational opportunities. While dramatic success has eluded us in some of these schools, the decade of work has been very successful in other instances.[51]

Summary

EMU is big, among a few hundred institutions in the country that, collectively, prepare most of the new teachers and other professional educators. EMU stands for quality. Our preparation program ensures that new teachers are well prepared in general education, in the content areas they will teach, and in the appropriate strategies for bringing about learning in all children. Our alums are highly successful and recognized for their competence. Our new teachers are highly recruited. The feedback that we get from employers and supervisors is quite good and, in any instance where it isn't, we fix the matter. We hold virtually every external

---

[50]For information, see *http://www.emich.edu/coe/collab_ed/comer.html*. We are extremely grateful for the generous financial support of this project by the Skillman Foundation of Detroit, MI.

[51]For example, Samuel Gompers Elementary School serves a 98 per cent poverty population. In 1999, 80 per cent of the students passed the fourth-grade Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) test in reading and science, and 100 per cent passed in mathematics. In 2000, they achieved the highest MEAP test scores among elementary schools in the state of their size category.

recognition of quality that is available. We always have been and intend always to be "well-connected" with our constituencies, especially the K-12 schools of Michigan.

We agree fully with this subcommittee that "ensuring the quality and effectiveness of teacher training programs is key to improving K-12 education in America." We feel that we at EMU are on the way to accomplishing this. We offer our support to this subcommittee and to the remainder of the Congress of the United States, as well as to the executive branch, as these important mutual goals are addressed.

Thank you.

APPENDIX A

EXCERPTS FROM ENTRY-LEVEL STANDARDS FOR MICHIGAN TEACHERS

FOREWORD

In 1988, the State Board of Education appointed a fifteen-member Professional Standards Commission for Teachers. Among its charges, the Commission is responsible for:

1. Investigating and recommending standards of professional practice to improve the quality of the teaching profession; and

2. Developing and recommending standards for the implementation of teacher internships, student teaching programs, or other clinical teaching experience for persons preparing to become teachers.

In response to these charges, the Commission directed its attention to the development of standards for beginning teachers, including those in the final or practice phase of the teacher preparation program.

The standards are drawn from an accumulation of research on best practices for teaching and are enhanced by input from a variety of professional educators, including teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and school board members. Each standard articulates basic or general knowledge and skills, interest and attitudes, and other attributes or dispositions expected of all beginning teachers, regardless of their subject area major or minor. Originally, six standards

were developed for use as a guide to those involved in the preparation of teachers and may be used as a reference in the review and approval of teacher preparation programs.

In 1997, a referent committee, exploring the preparation needs of preservice teachers in technology, drafted a seventh entry-level standard, which focuses on technology. This proposed standard was distributed for public comment during spring 1997, and the feedback received was supportive of both the standard and of including it in the entry-level standards document. On November 13, 1997, the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers reviewed the work of the referent committee and recommended that the State Board of Education amend the existing *Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers* to include a seventh standard on preservice technology. This recommendation was approved by the State Board of Education on July 1, 1998.

In an effort to increase understanding, the following seven standards of teacher performance have been identified and proficiencies are listed under each one. The proficiencies are not exhaustive, and may be conceptualized in different ways. The seven standards are:

1. An understanding and appreciation of the liberal arts, (humanities, the social sciences, the mathematical and natural sciences, and the arts);

2. An understanding of and commitment to student learning and achievement;

3. *A knowledge of the assigned subject areas and how to teach those subjects;*

4. *An ability to manage and monitor student learning;*

5. *An ability to systematically organize teaching practices and to learn from experience;*

6. *A commitment to participation in learning communities; and*

7. *An ability to use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.*

The standards presented are undergirded by the belief that the success of education depends largely on the performance of practicing teachers, and the quality of a teacher's professional performance depends heavily on the substance, scope, and quality of his/her initial preparation. It is also assumed that all teachers are responsible for their own professional growth and development, and that their outcome performance is the result of collaborative efforts among teacher training institutions, local school districts, and professional organizations.

Finally, the standards listed are the culmination of the initial phase of teacher preparation and the beginning phase of a career in which continuous growth and development are essential.

RATIONALE

This document describes entry-level standards for beginning teachers in Michigan. Each sets the foundation for and complements subject area proficiencies. These standards were developed because:

1. Prospective teachers need to be aware of the knowledge and skills they are expected to gain and develop during their teacher preparation program;

2. Institutions of higher education approved to prepare teachers need to know Michigan's expectations for competent entry-level performance;

3. Local school boards and school administrators need to know what skills they can expect to be demonstrated by student teachers and those new to the profession;

4. Local school districts, parents, professional organizations, and public and private agencies need to know what is expected of beginning teachers in order to determine what programs or services to develop or offer for assistance and support; and

5. The general public needs to know that agencies and institutions responsible for the administration and implementation of teacher preparation programs are preparing candidates with the basic proficiencies to teach.

These standards are written in an effort to give direction to all who are involved in the preparation and support of beginning teachers. This document should not be considered an endpoint or a checklist, but as a beginning source of dialogue for the continuous improvement of the teaching profession.

STANDARDS AND RELATED PROFICIENCIES

FOR ENTRY-LEVEL MICHIGAN TEACHERS

Upon completion of an approved teacher preparation program in Michigan, a person recommended for the Michigan Provisional Certificate should have:

1. An understanding and appreciation of the liberal arts (the humanities, the social sciences, the mathematical and natural sciences, and the arts):

a. The abilities and skills necessary for effective communication (listening, speaking, writing, and reading);

b. A knowledge and appreciation of free inquiry in the humanities, the social sciences, the mathematical and natural sciences, and the arts;

c. A knowledge of the interdependence of the liberal arts and the ability to integrate knowledge from the liberal arts to analyze and synthesize ideas, information, and data;

d. The ability to discuss and debate the value of education in a free and pluralistic society, particularly the role of intellectual and ethical values;

e. An understanding of global and international perspectives;

f. An understanding of and respect for individual differences, including those of culture, race, gender, religion, and ethnicity, as well as humankind's shared heritage and environment;

g. An ability to understand and respect varying points of view and the influence of one's own and others' ethics and values;

h. An understanding of the impact of technology and its use for gathering and communicating ideas and information;

i. An understanding of the Constitutions and histories of the United States and Michigan;

j. An understanding of the market system for allocating resources;

k. An understanding of and respect for the role of the individual in a free society, including the importance of individual responsibility and respect for individual rights and values; and

l. An understanding of the similarities within our culture and their importance to the fabric of American society.

2. A commitment to student learning and achievement, including the understanding and ability to:

a. Apply knowledge of human growth, development, and learning theory;

b. Expand cognitive, affective, physical, and social capacities of students for the development of the "whole person";

c. Discern the extent to which personal belief systems and values may affect the instructional process, e.g., love of learning; the belief that all students can learn; the belief that all students should be treated equitably; the role of expectations in affecting achievement;

d. Demonstrate appropriate classroom management and disciplinary techniques to ensure a safe and orderly environment which is conducive to learning;

e. Plan instruction to accommodate diversity, e.g., cultural, racial, and social diversity;

f. Plan instruction to accommodate various backgrounds of students;

g. Use multiple approaches to appropriately assess student abilities and needs to plan instruction;

h. Create inclusionary environments for students with exceptional needs and abilities; and

i. Use various kinds of literacy to promote access to knowledge, e.g., numeracy, graphics, printed text, computers, and electronic media.

3. Knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy, including the understanding and ability to:

a. Create learning environments that promote critical and higher order thinking;

b. Help students access and use information, technology, and other resources to become independent learners and problem solvers;

c. Use high expectations for optimal achievement to foster excellence in all students;

d. Practice teaching as both an art and a science;

e. Integrate and transfer knowledge across subject areas and encourage the same among students;

f. Engage students in practical activities that demonstrate the relevance, purpose, and function of subject matter; and

g. Access and use updated information and procedures.

4. The ability to manage and monitor student learning, including the understanding and ability to:

a. Plan and use different cognitive, affective, and psychomotor strategies to maximize learning and to accommodate differences in the backgrounds, learning styles, aptitudes, interests, levels of maturity and achievement of students;

b. Use a variety of teaching methodologies and techniques, e.g., lectures, demonstrations, group discussions, cooperative learning, small-group activities, and how to assess one's effectiveness in utilizing them;

c. Involve and work effectively with all support personnel to maximize opportunities for student achievement and success;

d. Involve and work effectively with parents and/or guardians to maximize opportunities for student achievement and success;

e. Differentiate between assessment and evaluation procedures and use appropriate procedures; and

f. Define and accept the legal and ethical responsibilities of teaching, e.g., student retention, corporal punishment, truancy, child abuse, managing conflict, first aid, least restrictive environment, health, and communicable disease.

5. The ability to systematically organize teaching practices and learn from experiences, including the understanding and ability to:

a. Identify and use current research in both the subject field and in other areas of practice in the profession;

b. Exercise good judgment in planning and managing time and other resources to attain goals and objectives;

c. Maximize the use of instructional time by engaging students in meaningful learning experiences;

d. Demonstrate an understanding of the economic, social, political, legal, and organizational foundations and functions of schools;

e. Accept teaching as a lifelong learning process and continue efforts to develop and improve;

f. Interact successfully with other teachers, parents, students, administrators, counselors, and other support personnel to benefit students and to advance one's own professional development;

g. Discuss and debate the evolution of education and the teacher's role in a changing society; and

h. Engage in meaningful self-evaluation and reflect on the professional practice of colleagues.

6. Commitment and willingness to participate in learning communities, including the understanding and ability to:

a. Use community and home resources to enhance school programs;

b. Design learning activities that involve representatives of volunteer groups, civic and social organizations, and public services agencies;

c. Demonstrate knowledge of the various communities in which the teacher is a member, including the professional community and local, state, national, and international communities;

d. Involve professional educators, support personnel and other stakeholders in collaborative and cooperative planning, decision-making and implementation, in order to improve educational systems at all levels; and

e. Interact with parents to maximize the learning of students at school, home, and in the local community.

7. An ability to use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.

a. Design, develop, and implement student-learning activities that integrate information technology for a variety of student grouping strategies and diverse student populations;

b. Identify and apply resources for staying current in applications of information technology in education;

c. Demonstrate knowledge of uses of multi-media, hyper-media, telecommunications, and distance learning to support teaching/learning;

d. Demonstrate knowledge about instructional management resources that assist in such activities as writing and updating curriculum; creating lesson plans and tests; and promoting, reinforcing, and organizing data regarding student performance;

e. Use information technologies to support problem solving, data collection, information management, communications, presentations, and decision-making including word processing, database management, spreadsheets, and graphic utilities;

f. Demonstrate knowledge of equitable, ethical, legal, social, physical, and psychological issues concerning use of information technology; and

g. Use information technology to enhance continuing professional development as an educator.

APPENDIX G -- WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF DR. JOYCE R. COPPIN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE, DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES, NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
JOEL I. KLEIN, *Chancellor*

TESTIMONY OF DR. JOYCE R. COPPIN
CHIEF EXECUTIVE, DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES
NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS
MAY 20, 2003

Good afternoon Chairman McKeon, Ranking Member Kildee, Congressman Owens and members of the Subcommittee.

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the pending reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and to offer our ideas on how the legislation can strengthen our ongoing efforts to attract, prepare, and retain high quality teachers in our schools.

To help our children reach higher levels of achievement, the New York City Department of Education (the Department) is working to ensure that every classroom is staffed with a highly qualified, well-supported teacher.

The Department currently employs almost 80,000 teachers in our 1,219 schools. Traditionally, the City has not been able to hire enough certified teachers to meet our needs. However, we undertook an aggressive strategy over the past few years to improve our recruitment practices and hire more certified teachers. We did so knowing that this is essential to providing students with the instructional expertise necessary for them to meet New York State's nationally-recognized high standards. With this in mind, we set a goal of hiring only certified teachers for positions in elementary schools, social studies, and English for the current year. I am proud to say that we accomplished this intermediary goal and moved forward in our efforts to meet new State regulations requiring all teachers in our schools be certified by September 2003. Certified teachers made up 86% of the 8,300 new teachers hired in September 2002. We were also able to satisfy the new No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirement to hire only highly qualified teachers in our Title I schools. Last September, I attended a forum at the White House on NCLB implementation where President Bush highlighted the City's efforts to meet new teacher quality requirements included in the law.

Despite our recent progress, the mission of securing high quality teachers for all of our classrooms remains a significant and constant challenge to our system, especially in light of the new State certification requirement for this fall. My office is working tirelessly to recruit 11,000 highly qualified teachers by this September, in light of projections that as many as 4,000 currently uncertified teachers will fail to meet the State requirement for certification and must be replaced. While this year's overall hiring number is

substantial, it is no anomaly as the system has filled an average of 9,000 teaching positions annually over the past five years.

Unfortunately, the supply of new teachers in New York State is not keeping pace with the demand. New York State colleges and universities are not producing enough teaching candidates in the areas of math, science, bilingual, and special education — disciplines in which the City desperately needs qualified teachers for the upcoming year and the foreseeable future. For example, New York State does not currently certify enough math teachers to ease the statewide shortage. In fact, the City could hire every newly certified math teacher in New York State and still not fill its 1,000 expected vacancies.

Given this reality and our commitment to improving teacher quality, the Department has worked aggressively to broaden the pool of qualfied individuals who want to become teachers. The Center for Recruitment and Professional Development was created in 2000 to build the Department's capacity to meet the increasing demand for certified teachers and develop creative means to attract them to New York City schools. The efforts of the Center have increased the percentage of newly hired teachers with appropriate State certification from 43% in September 2000 to 86% in September 2002.

This increase can be attributed to a number of proactive initiatives launched by the Department, such as the establishment of the New York City Teaching Fellows program, an increase in internationally recruited teachers, a new teachers' contract offering more competitive salaries, an aggressive advertisement campaign, numerous job fairs, and targeted placement centers for low-performing schools and hard-to-staff districts. There also has been a closer working relationship with colleges and universities to funnel a greater number of traditionally prepared teachers to New York City schools.

A common misconception is that districts are so desperate for teachers that we will hire "any warm body" to teach our children. I assure you that in New York City, nothing could be further from the truth. I would like to take a moment to highlight some of the successful components of our recruitment and preparation strategies and how they are improving teacher quality in New York City.

Created in 2000, the Teaching Fellows program addresses the fact that the traditional teacher preparation pipeline is not producing a sufficient quantity of qualified teachers for our district. The Department, in collaboration with partnering Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) in the City, tailored the Fellows program specifically to equip teachers with the skills, clinical experience and support needed to teach and succeed in urban schools. The program seeks to encourage talented and highly qualified professionals from other walks of life who want to make a difference in our City to become teachers — particularly in our lowest performing schools that are hard to staff and in most need of exceptional teachers.

Testimony of Dr. Joyce R. Coppin
May 20, 2003

The application process is rigorous and competitive to ensure that selected Fellows are of the highest quality. For the upcoming school year, the Department received almost 20,000 applications, from which 3,000 candidates were selected to begin the program next month. Prospective applicants must have received a minimum undergraduate GPA of 3.0 and demonstrated excellence in previous endeavors. Among the most attended undergraduate institutions by the 2002-03 class of Fellows were Brown, Columbia, Cornell, and NYU. Our current Fellows include former doctors, lawyers, Wall Street financiers, judges, and advertising executives.

Fellows matriculate in an accelerated and specially designed Master's Degree program paid for by the Department and offered at different college campuses. The most unique feature of the program is that it was developed in collaboration with IHEs and tailored specifically around the needs of our teachers and school system.

The curriculum follows the rigorous content and certification standards set by New York State while also providing practical, classroom-based examples and instruction. What teachers learn and do in their preparation courses can be applied the next day in their classrooms.

Left unsupported, far too many new teachers in urban schools leave the profession. Therefore, the Fellows program seeks to increase retention rates by better equipping teachers with the skills and support needed to become lifelong successful professionals. A critical component of the program is enhanced professional development and mentoring. The Fellows program addresses the challenge of supporting these new instructors by pairing each Fellow with a mentor teacher who often works within the same school, grade or subject area. Mentors observe and provide feedback on classroom instruction and serve as an important resource to Fellows.

The Fellows program continues to exceed expectations. Preliminary evidence suggests that the program is meeting the goal of recruiting, training, and retaining high quality teachers in some of the City's most challenged schools. Since the program's inception in 2000, 3,300 Fellows have entered the program and 2,800 are still teaching in these hard-to-staff locations. Of the class that will begin teaching in September 2003, 400 will be placed as math teachers, 500 as special education teachers, and 200 as bilingual/ESL teachers. These new teachers will bring a fresh perspective and enthusiasm to some of our lowest-achieving schools.

Over the last three years, we have also embarked on an ambitious effort to recruit teachers from other countries in order to help fill vacancies in our shortage areas. We have recruited throughout Canada, Austria, England, Ireland, Guyana, Jamaica, the Dominican Republic, Spain, the Philippines and Puerto Rico. These teachers are credentialed in their respective countries and have met the State's requirements for provisional certification. Over the last two years, a total of 1,077 international teachers were hired. Approximately 91% remain teaching in our system after one year. For this

upcoming school year, we have hired approximately 800 international teachers from 10 countries.

Just last week, Chancellor Joel I. Klein announced two new programs to recruit teachers for our schools. The Call Back to Teaching Program is designed to attract over 300 experienced teachers back into public school classrooms. The Excelsior Teacher Initiative is designed to attract 500 math, science and special education teachers to high need schools. These initiatives build on the success of the International and Alternative Certification Pathway to Teaching Programs and are new components of the Department's overall strategy to recruit 11,000 highly qualified teachers for New York City schools by September. The new programs will further supplement our existing teacher preparation and recruitment efforts.

We have been fortunate in New York City to work with outstanding and cooperative local universities on developing enhanced preparation programs to improve teacher quality in our schools. However, we can accelerate our progress if Congress recognizes the primacy of high poverty school districts in this effort and updates the way Title II of the Higher Education Act currently allocates funds. Such recognition would offer greater resources to districts that have the highest concentrations of low-income students and the greatest need for highly qualified teachers. Our recommendations are also aligned with Congress' goal of increasing the overall supply of highly qualified teachers.

The primary goal of our district is improved and sustained student achievement. A prerequisite for meeting this expectation is placing a highly qualified teacher in each of our classrooms. Because NCLB holds us accountable for student performance, we need to play a lead role in programs that train and prepare the teachers who serve our students.

To this end, we recommend amending Title II of the Higher Education Act to allow 40% of funds under this section to be allocated to partnerships between "high need local education agencies (LEAs)" and IHEs, with LEAs as the lead applicant and fiscal agent. This change would allow districts to have greater command over the design and implementation of teacher preparation and retention programs that best suit their unique needs. Giving us this capacity would encourage the development and implementation of district-administered programs, such as the Fellows program, that we know will attract, prepare, and retain greater numbers of highly qualified teachers.

In addition, 40% of the funds authorized under Title II should be allocated to partnerships between a "high need LEA" and IHEs, with the latter as the lead applicant and the fiscal agent. As the largest customer for teachers in the nation, we need greater input and control over what the current market produces. Our collaboration in these partnerships will improve existing preservice teacher preparation programs, and will ultimately increase the supply of high quality teachers for poor school districts.

Finally, because teacher recruitment is a critical issue for needy districts already at a competitive disadvantage with our suburban counterparts, we recommend that the current 10% authorized for recruitment purposes be raised to 20%. Because recruiting qualified teachers in poor school districts is an ongoing challenge that threatens student achievement, high need LEAs should be the lead applicant and the fiscal agent for these grants. Even with traditional pipelines and our alternative pathways, the Department expends tremendous time and money recruiting teachers.

Perhaps most importantly, the revisions just outlined will miss their mark unless the targeting of funds in the existing Higher Education Act is better focused. Currently, a partnering district must be a "high need LEA". However, the existing definition allows districts to qualify if only one school has 50% or more of its students eligible for free and reduced price lunch. This broad definition undermines the law's intent by making almost any district eligible at the expense of those truly in need. For example, in New York State the White Plains Schools District's average per pupil expenditure (APPE) is $16,178, yet it qualifies as a high need LEA because exactly one of its schools meets the current definition. While New York City also qualifies, as 899 of its 1,219 schools enroll 50% or more children eligible for free and reduced price lunch, its APPE is considerably less at $8,934. In order to better target Title II resources, we recommend defining a "high need LEA" as a district that serves at least 10,000 or 30% of children from families below the poverty line.

We also recommend that Congress assist districts like New York by creating incentives to teach in high poverty schools. The current student loan forgiveness program, which cancels up to $5,000 in exchange for teaching five years in a high poverty school district, is a good start. However, in order to attract highly qualified teachers to New York City's most challenged schools, the incentive must be increased. We support loan forgiveness up to $17,500 for five consecutive years of service. Furthermore, we encourage targeting forgiveness only to teachers in districts with at least 25% Census poverty or in a school with 60% of its students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. If we do not target this incentive to the neediest schools and districts, we will be even less competitive with our more affluent neighbors that already have a tremendous hiring advantage.

I would like to share one additional concern with the Committee. Many prospective teachers are questioning their entry into this profession as they see districts across the nation eliminating teaching positions in order to meet budget cuts. New York State is still struggling to overcome the effects of the 2001 terrorist attacks and the national economic slowdown. As a result, the Department's budget will be cut by $178 million in the upcoming school year. While our current budget situation is dire, our cuts thus far have not included any teaching positions. However, districts in many states across the nation have not been as fortunate, and the sagging economy does threaten the long-term viability of our recruitment and training efforts. In light of the national economic slowdown, it is imperative that Congress makes federal education funding a priority so

that schools — particularly those with high concentrations of poverty — have the resources needed to educate our children to high standards. Revising the Higher Education Act in the ways suggested in my testimony and increasing its authorization will increase the supply of highly qualified teachers, particularly in low-income districts. Congress should also fully fund Titles I and II of NCLB in order to help stabilize school districts during our current austerity. Collectively, these actions will enhance our efforts to meet new NCLB requirements that focus on student achievement and teacher quality.

I welcome any questions that members of the Subcommittee may have in regard to my testimony.

APPENDIX H -- THE BROAD FOUNDATION AND THE FORDHAM FOUNDATION REPORT ON, "BETTER LEADERS FOR AMERICA'S SCHOOLS: A MANIFESTO", SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY MRS. LISA GRAHAM KEEGAN


Better Leaders for
America's Schools:
A MANIFESTO

Submitted for the record
by Mrs. Lisa Graham
Keegan.

Better Leaders for America's Schools: A Manifesto

WITH PROFILES OF EDUCATION LEADERS AND
A SUMMARY OF STATE CERTIFICATION PRACTICES

May 2003

thebroadfoundation

THOMAS B. FORDHAM
INSTITUTE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD *by Chester E. Finn, Jr.* 5

INTRODUCTION *by Eli Broad* 9

BETTER LEADERS FOR AMERICA'S SCHOOLS: A MANIFESTO 11

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 13
- OVERVIEW 14
- THE PROBLEM 16
- CATCHING THE WAVE 19
- EXPANDING THE POOL 22
- A FAULTY PIPELINE 25
- SUCCESSFUL EDUCATION LEADERS 27
- OUR PROPOSAL: QUALIFICATIONS, NOT CREDENTIALS 31
- PAYING THE PRICE 38
- CONCLUSION 39
- ENDNOTES 40
- INITIAL SIGNERS (AS OF MAY 1, 2003) 42

PROFILES OF EDUCATION LEADERS *by Lawrence Meyer* 45

- PAULA DAWNING: *Superintendent, Benton Harbor Public Schools, Benton Harbor, Michigan* 47
- JOHN FRYER: *Superintendent, Duval County Public Schools, Jacksonville, Florida* 50
- JENNIFER HENRY: *Principal, Chicago Academy, Chicago, Illinois* 54
- CHRISTOPHER LUND: *Principal, Robert F. Kennedy Elementary School, Los Angeles, California* 58
- JOSEPH OLCHEFSKE: *Superintendent, Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, Washington* 61
- VANESSA WARD: *Principal, Omega School of Excellence, Dayton, Ohio* 64

CERTIFICATION OF PUBLIC-SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS: A SUMMARY OF STATE PRACTICES *by Emily Feistritzer* 67

Foreword

For America to have the great schools it needs, those schools must have great leaders – and so must their school systems.

This much is obvious. So is the reality that many U.S. schools don't have the caliber of leadership that they need today and that this problem is worsening as current principals and superintendents retire, as accountability demands escalate in the No Child Left Behind era, and—frankly—as the job of public-school leadership grows more difficult and unappealing. The hours are long, the duties many. The pay isn't great. The position seldom comes with authority equal to its responsibilities. One's bosses may be fickle, unpredictable and political. And one may or may not possess the skills, experience and knowledge needed to succeed.

Turning this situation around is plainly a huge challenge for American education but one we dare not shirk. The key question is where to find the kinds of principals and superintendents who can lead our schools to excellence.

As usual with vexing policy dilemmas, the education field has developed a conventional wisdom about how to resolve this one. And as too often happens, the conventional wisdom in this case boils down to: more of the same. We're told to improve the quantity and quality of school leadership by adding more formal training and certification requirements to those already in place. We're advised that one must first teach before one can possibly lead teachers. And we're cautioned, therefore, that the best if not the only place to look for tomorrow's leaders is within the ranks of today's educators.

As happens far too often in American education, however, this conventional wisdom turns out to be wrong, or at least incomplete. We will undoubtedly find some of tomorrow's great education leaders in the usual places, trained and licensed in the old, familiar ways. But we won't find enough of them there. And there's no reason to confine our search to the usual places.

The alternative approach—open more gates, welcome people from many different directions to enter them, minimize the hoops and hurdles and regulatory hassles, look for talent rather than paper credentials—has already taken root in public-school teaching (where it's often termed "alternative certification"). It's taken root in America's pri-

vate and charter schools. And in a dozen or more communities it's begun to take root in the superintendent's office, as leaders with such unconventional (i.e. non-education) backgrounds as New York City's Joel Klein, Los Angeles's Roy Romer, San Diego's Alan Bersin and Philadelphia's Paul Vallas strive to transform their cities' vast and challenging school systems.

Why, we ask, should such leaders be viewed as rare exceptions? And why not begin to think about the leadership of individual schools—i.e. the principal's post—in similar fashion? Why not simply seek the best leadership talent for our schools wherever it can be found?

The signers of this manifesto want American public education to consider that possibility, not as a wholesale change of course but as a promising experiment that ought to be tried in schools, school systems, perhaps entire states that aren't getting what they need from the traditional pipeline. The signers recommend lowering the barriers to entry for prospective leaders, recruiting individuals with outstanding skills from many directions, helping them acquire—from many sources—the specific knowledge that they need to lead the revival of education in America, and engaging them on terms that make it possible truly to lead, not just administer.

Deregulating the path to school leadership makes sense in its own right. It also parallels the path that many states have begun to follow to strengthen their teaching force. The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation and Thomas B. Fordham Institute have been proud to help mark that path by encouraging "outside the box" thinking about the preparation and certification of educators. Four years ago, we issued *The Teachers We Need and How to Get More of Them: A Manifesto* on behalf of several dozen state officials, prominent analysts and veteran practitioners. It argued that "for teachers, as for the schools in which they teach, the surest route to quality is to widen the entryway, deregulate the process, and hold people accountable for their results – results judged primarily in terms of classroom effectiveness as gauged by the value a teacher adds to pupils' educational experience."

In July, 1999, that manifesto became the first chapter of a volume entitled *Better Teachers, Better Schools*, which strengthened the conceptual and research foundation for a bold new approach to teacher quality.

Today, we find the case for a bold new approach to public-school leadership even more compelling. To present that case as completely as possible, the present volume contains three parts. First is *Better Leaders for America's Schools: A Manifesto*, which

reflects the views of dozens of individuals from many parts of the education and policy worlds. The initial signers of this manifesto are named on page 42. Others wishing to sign on can do so by surfing to the document on the Thomas B. Fordham web site at www.edexcellence.net/manifesto/manifesto.html and following the directions on the screen.

To illustrate the kinds of people who can make their way into positions of school leadership when the rules change, the second section of this volume profiles six unconventional but outstanding principals and superintendents. Lawrence Meyer, a former reporter and editor at *The Washington Post*, crafted these perceptive sketches.

Emily Feistritzer, President of the National Center for Education Information (NCEI), authored the third part, which summarizes the findings of a major survey that NCEI undertook to determine, for all fifty states, the requirements by which public school principals and superintendents are presently certified and to ascertain what—if any—procedures are in place for people from unconventional backgrounds to enter such positions. (The full survey can be found on-line at www.ncei.com.)

All three parts of this volume—indeed, this entire project—were supported in substantial part by the Broad Foundation, which not only made a grant to the Thomas B. Fordham Institute to cover much of the cost but which also provided immensely valuable advice, leads, encouragement and colleagueship. We are proud to publish this volume in conjunction with such a terrific partner, whose many efforts on behalf of strengthening America's public education leadership are among the most promising developments in the field. Special thanks are due not only to Eli and Edythe Broad for inspiring, funding and leading those efforts, but also to ace Broad Foundation staffers Dan Katzir and Becca Bracy. At the Fordham Institute, program director Terry Ryan did most of the heavy lifting. This project and volume could not have happened without his keen intellect, resourcefulness, boundless energy and infectious good cheer. He joins me in thanking Lawrence Meyer for his good work both in writing the profiles and in helping wordsmith the manifesto, and Emily Feistritzer and her team for yeoman work on the state survey.

We're also greatly indebted to the 14 individuals who brainstormed with us in December 2002 and subsequently helped to shape the manifesto. They include Mike Casserly, Executive Director of the Council of the Great City Schools; Michael Podgursky, Professor of Economics at the University of Missouri-Columbia; David Steiner, Department Chair at the Boston University School of Education; Sandra Stotsky, Deputy Commissioner of Academic Affairs at the Massachusetts Department

of Education; Frederick Hess, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute; Scott Hamilton, Managing Director of the Pisces Foundation; Stacey Boyd, former President and CEO of Project Achieve; Allen Grossman, Professor of Management Practice at the Harvard Business School; the Broad Foundation's Dan Katzir and Becca Bracy; Leo Klagholz, former New Jersey State Commissioner of Education; Jon Schnur, President of New Leaders for New Schools; Ann Higdon, CEO and Superintendent of the ISUS Trade and Technology Prep Charter Schools; and Mary Lee Fitzgerald, Director of Education Programs at the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds.

Thanks, too, to Fordham Institute research director Marci Kanstoroom and finance director Eric Osberg for their timely comments, editorial suggestions, and managerial support; to staff assistant Katie Somerville for her apt and thorough help; and to Emilia Ryan, who designed and laid out this publication in both its electronic and printed editions.

The Thomas B. Fordham Institute seeks to improve the quality and effectiveness of American elementary-secondary education and to deepen the understanding of educators, policymakers, journalists, parents and the general public with respect to the problems that impede high quality education in the United States and possible solutions to those problems. It shares staff, offices and trustees with the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation and is designed to advance the education reform ideas that it also shares with the Foundation. Further information can be obtained from our web site http://www.edexcellence.net/tbfinstitute/index.html or by writing us at 1627 K St., NW, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20006. (We can also be emailed through our web site). This publication is available on the Institute's web site. Hard copies can be obtained by calling 1-888-TBF-7474 (single copies are free). The Institute is neither connected with nor sponsored by Fordham University.

Chester E. Finn, Jr., President
Thomas B. Fordham Institute
Washington, DC
May 2003

Introduction

Four years ago, my family established The Broad Foundation because we believe there is no more important contribution to our nation's future than a determined, long-term commitment to improve public education. We decided to focus the Foundation's efforts on areas that no one else is specifically focused on -- improving governance, management and labor relations in the nation's largest urban school districts. These are essential, often overlooked, elements in American education that will lead to higher academic achievement for all students and to greater economic opportunities for the next generation.

Superintendents and principals are key to ensuring that all children achieve at high levels.

Unfortunately, too many current and aspiring education leaders have grown up in mediocre, failing or only incrementally improving school systems. Well-meaning educators often find themselves hired as school or school system CEOs with the required credentials but without the appropriate training or experience to successfully lead these complex organizations.

Superintendents – and increasingly principals – are responsible for personnel, facilities, financial planning, human resources, management, budgeting, labor relations, organizational development and, above all else, they are responsible for the education of our children. This is serious, urgent business – the business of providing a world-class education to every student in every classroom in every school in every district. We must get it done.

That is why it is so important that our urban public schools have the best and the brightest leaders at their helm, regardless of their professional backgrounds or paper credentials. Our nation's education system needs more highly qualified leaders – from all walks of life.

We should look for superintendents and principals within our K-12 education system, but we should also seek out talented leaders from other fields. We should create alternative pathways for school and school system administrators – as has been done for teachers – so that managerial talent from all sectors can more easily make the transition into public education. Rather than create bureaucratic barriers to entry, we should focus on strategic recruitment, induction and measures to hold leaders accountable for results once they are hired.

The Broad Foundation is pleased to be a sponsor of *Better Leaders for America's Schools*, which goes beyond the conventional wisdom and offers solutions to challenge the status quo. We appreciate the excellent work done by Chester Finn and his colleagues at The Thomas B. Fordham Institute and the National Center for Education Information on the following manifesto and companion documents. We hope that this volume will serve as a catalyst to improve the quality of leadership in our nation's public schools. In particular, we hope that this spurs state and district leaders to open avenues for outstanding professionals from all careers to take on and succeed in leadership roles in schools and districts across the country.

Eli Broad, Founder
The Broad Foundation
Los Angeles, CA
May 2003

Better Leaders for America's Schools: A Manifesto

Executive Summary

Premise: for America to have the great schools it needs, those schools must have great leaders—and so must their school systems.

Problem:

- America's schools face a leadership crisis.
- Despite a surplus in many places of people "certified" for administrative positions, our schools too often are not being led by qualified men and women.
- A certified administrator is not necessarily a qualified leader.
- Tightening requirements will not improve the situation.
- Bureaucratic requirements with little relevance to the task at hand discourage the leaders we need from entering our public schools.

Solution:

- Conventional certification requirements for public-school principals and superintendents should be radically reduced, and replaced by criteria that stress leadership qualities rather than simply an education background.
- Candidates for school-leadership positions should be recruited from inside and outside the education field, trained as necessary, and evaluated according to the results they achieve.
- School districts should play a major role in shaping the training of their school leaders—and obtaining that training from many providers, not just colleges of education.
- Principals and superintendents should be well compensated—at levels that encourage able people to assume and retain such posts.
- Superintendents and principals need sweeping authority over the personnel and operations of the schools for which they are responsible.
- Principals and superintendents who fail to produce the needed results after a reasonable period of time should not be retained.

Overview

America's public schools face a paradox. Even as states report a surplus of formally credentialed candidates for administrative positions, many schools and school systems cannot find the exceptional candidates that they need to lead them. Our public-education system confronts a leadership famine amidst a feast of "certified" leaders. This unhappy situation results from a flawed arrangement that annually confers administrator licenses upon thousands of educators who have scant interest in actually serving as school superintendents or principals and who, even when interested, often lack the exceptional leadership qualities so urgently needed in today's schools.

We cannot afford for it to be that way. It need not be that way. And in some places this dysfunctional arrangement is beginning to change. Just as many state and local governments have embraced innovative ways of recruiting and training teachers, allowing into their classrooms talented men and women who lack conventional credentials, so are some of the nation's largest school systems—including New York and Los Angeles—beginning to welcome able people with unconventional backgrounds into leadership roles.

We applaud these developments. America will not have the great schools it needs if we adhere to the view that the only way to improve school leadership is to layer more formal training and certification requirements atop those that have not worked in the past. That is a formula for failure.

Today's conventional training and certification requirements for prospective school leaders are already so burdensome that they deter many educators with leadership qualities from moving into key administrative roles, while virtually barring proven leaders from different professions. More such requirements are destined to yield more disappointment and fewer great leaders. Hence it's time to think about a different solution: One promising way to improve our schools is to *lower* the barriers to entry for prospective leaders, to search high and low for able people, to provide them the skills and knowledge they need to spearhead the effort to give America's children a superior education—and to engage them on terms that make it possible truly to lead, not merely to administer or manage.

Instead of erecting higher hurdles to entry, we should pursue two simultaneous courses. First, we should strive to locate and develop strong leaders within the educa-

tion field by recruiting proven educators with leadership qualities who may not now be seeking such roles because of insufficient salary or because of constraints that make the job of running a school or school system unappealing. Second, we should cast a wider net, seeking prospective school leaders wherever they can be found. In this document, we primarily address the second path, but it is clear that the two strategies are interconnected, particularly when it comes to creating workable terms of employment for tomorrow's school leaders.

To advocate opening the system to non-educators is not to deprecate today's school leaders or to suggest that some of tomorrow's leadership cannot be found within the profession. It is simply to recognize that many schools, school systems, and states face a shortage of quality leaders and that this problem is growing more acute. The solution is not simply to do more of what we have always done. If we are serious about leaving no child behind, we must also leave none of America's 92,000 public schools behind in the quest for effective education leaders.[1]

The Problem

If two decades of research into school effectiveness have reached any reliable conclusion, it's that successful schools invariably have dynamic, savvy, and focused leaders—women and men who are capable of rallying educators, parents, children, and community members to achieve shared goals. Yet far too many U.S. schools and school districts lack such helmsmen. A worsening shortage of top-notch principals and superintendents in public education—especially those willing to work and able to succeed in potentially difficult urban and rural situations—poses a significant barrier to our national commitment to educate all children to the limits of their abilities. "Many principals are leaving [the job] earlier and getting out as soon as they can. States are reporting shortages of qualified candidates," says Vincent Ferrandino, executive director of the 30,000-member National Association of Elementary School Principals.[2]

A recent survey of school superintendents found that fewer than two in five were satisfied with their principals' ability to make tough decisions, delegate responsibility, engage teachers in developing policies, or spend money efficiently. When filling a principal's position, 60 percent of superintendents agreed they must "take what you get."[3] Nor is the situation satisfactory in every central office. In Wisconsin, for example, a state with 431 superintendents, 65 of them changed in 2001 and 79 more changed during the first ten months of 2002. In other words, Wisconsin saw one in three of its superintendents leave their posts within the past two years.[4] At a time when Congress has set a twelve-year timetable for bringing every American student to "proficiency" in core subjects, we delude ourselves if we think we can transform thousands of weak schools into strong ones without paying urgent attention to those who lead them.

The core issue, however, is not one of quantity: Most states have plenty of people licensed as school administrators, often more than they have positions to fill. The urgent problem is quality. Our conventional procedures for training and certifying public-school administrators in the United States are simply failing to produce a sufficiency of leaders whose vision, energy, and skill can successfully raise the educational standard for all children.[5] State certification laws and regulations ordinarily set forth myriad requirements for public-school principals—requirements, incidentally, from which private schools and most charter schools are exempt—that typically include years of prior teaching experience; education-school courses in school administration,

pedagogy, psychology, and philosophy; graduate degrees; and ongoing training. In most places, a parallel set of requirements applies to candidates for the post of school superintendent.

These requirements amount to a paperwork and regulatory labyrinth that deters some able leaders from even entering, while failing to prepare those who do enter for the actual challenges of producing outstanding academic results in today's schools. When it comes to school leadership, we conclude that more—more requirements, more regulations, more courses, more credentials—is not the same as better. *Being* certified is simply not the same as being *qualified* to lead a school or school district successfully in an era of results-based accountability.

Principals

The principal's job has changed profoundly in the decades since the familiar certification regimen was put in place. At that time, its main tasks were supervising teachers, managing the building, and dealing with parents. If the school was tidy and orderly, the staff content, the parents quiescent, and the downtown bureaucracy untroubled, the principal was assumed to be doing his or her job. Today, however, while all of those old responsibilities endure, the principal's main task has evolved into something very different: to develop a vision of learning; to build a school culture and instructional programs conducive to learning for all pupils; to manage staff, students, and parents with needs and problems that did not exist or were largely ignored in the past; and, above all, to produce excellent academic results as gauged by external measures such as state proficiency tests keyed to statewide academic standards.

All of these results are supposed to happen with little additional money—and in the midst of burgeoning red tape and tightening constraints, as special programs proliferate, budgets become more complex, federal, state, and local rules proliferate, bureaucracies grow more unwieldy, and collective bargaining contracts constrict independent administrative action even more, particularly with respect to personnel.

Today's principals face a daunting situation: they shoulder greater responsibility than ever before—now typically including politics, security, public relations, finances, personnel, and technology. They have, in effect, become CEOs of small public businesses whose chief product is learning. They are profoundly accountable for their results. Yet they have scant authority to make and execute important decisions, and they are not paid much.

Superintendents

As the principal's job has been redefined, so has the superintendent's. No longer does he or she merely "run" a "system." Doing that job well today means intervening in faltering schools, mediating between school and state, collaborating with business, civic, and municipal leaders, engaging in complex labor relations, making tough decisions about priorities, finding resources, and selecting first-rate leaders for every school in the system. These skills are the core of what superintendents must do in today's world—but they're not taught in colleges of education, and no amount of credentialing can create them, either.

Catching the Wave

When it comes to teachers, America has begun to depend less on traditional credentialing. Notable changes have occurred recently in the pathways into public-school classrooms. New recruits from outside the traditional ranks are starting to make their mark. Following alternative routes, prospective teachers can bypass or shortcut the traditional training and licensure procedures. Since the early 1990s, a number of states have partially deregulated their teaching professions. The result has been an infusion of enterprise and innovation in the ways that teachers are recruited and trained. All but three states now have alternative routes to teacher certification for individuals who already have a bachelor's degree, usually in a field other than education. Approximately one-third of new teachers are entering via these unconventional routes.

Many of them are proving to be terrific classroom practitioners, willing to tackle some of the toughest school challenges. As Secretary of Education Rod Paige has observed, "alternate routes to certification demonstrate that streamlined systems can boost the quantity of teachers while maintaining—or even improving—their quality." For example, since 1990 the Teach For America (TFA) program alone has recruited close to 9,000 outstanding college graduates to work in some of the nation's most troubled public schools. A recent evaluation of the program found that "A typical TFA corps member earned a grade-point average of 3.4 out of 4.0, and 87 percent of recruits have leadership experience."[6] TFA candidates take part in an intensive five-week summer training program, practicing their classroom technique under the guidance of master teachers by day and attending workshops and discussion groups in the evening. These recruits, from a variety of academic disciplines, have directly influenced the lives of more than 1.25 million students. Many have remained in the classroom, even as others have gone on to found and lead schools and to occupy other positions of increasing influence throughout K-12 education.

Nobody claims that alternative certification will solve all the problems of the teaching field. But we already see that this experiment has not failed.[7] It has been worth trying—and we should continue refining, developing, and evaluating it even as we also work at myriad reforms of the traditional system. Pragmatism is at the core of the American experience—try something and, if that doesn't work, try something else, but, as Franklin D. Roosevelt argued in the midst of another domestic crisis two generations ago, "Above all, do *something*."

As with teaching, so with school leadership. Promising reforms should of course be undertaken in the traditional arrangements for recruiting and training school leaders. But that cannot be the whole story, not at a time when the needs are so great and when there's no convincing evidence that any one strategy will work in every situation. In school leadership as in teaching, we must also try bold new approaches. One such approach is to dispense with the traditional reliance on prior teaching experience, education-school courses, and other hallmarks of the credentialing system. Instead, public education should focus on the only measure worth considering—results in the classroom. As we accept the premise that teachers should be held accountable for classroom-level results, we would do well to take the same approach with administrators: Hold them accountable for what they and their schools produce, rather than requiring them to jump credentialing hurdles that may bear no relation to the actual skills and talents needed to succeed in the tasks at hand.

The idea of reducing the entry barriers for educational leaders is less revolutionary than it seems. A recent survey by the National Center for Education Information (NCEI) shows for the first time what states are already doing by way of alternative certification for public-school administrators. In the past five years, Michigan and South Dakota have stopped requiring certification of either principals or superintendents. Six more jurisdictions (Florida, Hawaii, North Carolina, Tennessee, Wyoming, and the District of Columbia) no longer issue certificates to superintendents. In these places, local school systems set their own leadership requirements. Eleven states have already created explicit "alternate routes" to certification as public-school administrators. Three more, while not terming the process "alternative," have programs for nontraditional candidates to assume positions of school leadership.[8] Fully 20 percent of the 58 superintendents in the Council of the Great City Schools are nontraditional, including those now serving in Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, Miami-Dade County, New York, Philadelphia, San Diego, Seattle, and Toledo. California has recently enacted a law that allows educators to become principals faster by passing a test rather than taking two more years of university course work.[9]

Though these unconventional entry paths are not yet widely used (especially for school principals), their very existence shows that American ingenuity and pragmatism are starting to operate in this domain, too. In fits and starts, something interesting and important is happening: Public education is opening itself up to talented men and women who seek to enter school leadership from nontraditional backgrounds. Common sense is breaking through the red tape as education starts to experiment with the approach that most successful modern enterprises have adopted to boost their per-

formance and productivity: Set high standards for the results to be achieved; identify clear indicators to measure progress toward those results; and then be flexible and diverse about the means by which the desired results are pursued. This strategy in education is sometimes called "standards based" or "systemic" reform. The "No Child Left Behind" legislation enacted in early 2002 adopts this approach while reinforcing the conviction that great schools are not apt to flourish unless led by great principals and superintendents.

Expanding the Pool

Although we believe that many school districts could benefit from our recommendations, our most urgent concern is with the schools and communities that are least well served by traditional arrangements for identifying, recruiting, training, licensing; and employing principals and superintendents. For their sake and that of their students, it's time to try different approaches.

In those places that are willing to innovate, we propose expanding the pool of potential school leaders by simplifying entry requirements to a bare minimum, introducing competition for training future leaders, and radically altering the terms of employment for those leaders. We urge a system that allows a wide array of talented, creative, and committed individuals to be freely considered for leadership roles in public education. That does not mean we are scrapping standards. To the contrary, we would hold school leaders to the highest standards, but these should be stated primarily in terms of school effectiveness, not the paper credentials possessed by the man or woman who occupies the principal's or superintendent's chair. In short, we propose streamlining the credentialing process so that more energy and resources focus on how school leaders perform and students achieve.

The School Leader as CEO

Private and charter schools already enjoy this flexibility when selecting their leaders. They can search for excellence in a broad, deep pool of candidates. More than one in ten of their principals have not previously been teachers.[10] Yet traditional public school educators have been wary of allowing non-educators through this widened gateway. (A recent Public Agenda survey of principals and superintendents reported "overwhelming resistance to bringing in leaders from outside education.)"[11] On average, traditional public-school principals spent 12.8 years teaching before taking the school helm and virtually none came to the job without K-12 teaching experience.[12]

Just how necessary is this? Why do private and charter schools frequently dispense with it? The usual rationale for requiring teaching experience is that the principal is first and foremost the school's "instructional leader." But let's look closer. There's no denying that a school's principal is responsible for its instructional leadership, along with much else. The core of the job is ensuring a high quality curriculum, effective

teaching in every classroom, and satisfactory academic performance by the school's pupils. But that does not mean the principal must be the "best" teacher or "principal teacher" in the school. He or she *may* assume this task directly or may instead function as the school's CEO, delegating to others—a vice principal, head teacher or dean of instruction—the weighty and complex task of designing, delivering, and supervising curriculum and instruction.

This point bears repeating. The modern term is "distributed leadership." It means that a school's leadership team must possess a great many crucial abilities and forms of expertise, instruction foremost among them. But it does not mean that the person occupying the principal's office must be an instructional expert—so long as others on the leadership team are. Though small schools may have small teams, in many of today's schools several people belong to that team—and in vast high schools they may number a dozen or more. Considering the myriad demands made on the leaders of today's schools, let's face the fact that success is apt to hinge on a team effort that goes beyond a single education "superhero" who does it all.[13]

Note, too, that in many contemporary schools, relatively little of what principals do relates directly to instruction. They are more like field commanders of an army engaged in conflicts on many fronts. As Marc Tucker and Judy Codding report, "Principals refer to themselves as 'one-minute decision makers' because they have a minute or less to decide an issue before they are confronted with the next one."[14] The day simply isn't long enough for principals to focus nonstop on the specifics of effective instruction. Their big job is to lead an organization in which others can focus all day long on that core mission.

In many lines of work, nonprofit as well as commercial, the CEO is well compensated for taking on myriad demands and long hours. Yet public-school principals are not paid very well. In Indiana, for example, experienced teachers make $50,000 or more a year while the average salary for principals is about $60,000. Yet principals in Indiana's 1,882 public schools, like principals across the country, usually work ten to twelve months of the year, meaning that they earn less per day than a veteran teacher.[15] In California, a teacher with fourteen years of experience and a master's degree can earn as much as $80,000 a year, equivalent to a beginning high-school principal.[16] Compared to other occupations, the pay difference between school leaders and their team members is very thin. On average, principals make about 1.75 times what teachers earn, while in manufacturing the difference between managers and workers is 2.8, and in law the difference between a first-year full partner and a paralegal is 2.73.[17]

In fact, however, pay is only a small part of the story. In most lines of work, an organization's CEO has sweeping authority to make and implement decisions. His span of authority keeps pace with the extent of his responsibility. Yet in today's public schools, principals are being given more responsibility without a commensurate increase in their authority to make decisions on such things as spending, staffing, and instruction. Is it any wonder that a 1999 survey of California superintendents found 90 percent reporting a lack of candidates to fill their most recent high-school principal jobs?[18]

It's clear that many changes will be needed in public education if the principal's job is to carry both the authority and the compensation that match its responsibilities. Some of these changes will be difficult to make. But we can start with one that's obvious and relatively easy: Expand the pool of potential school leaders—as is already being done to provide alternative pathways for teachers—to include many more people than the traditional certification system allows.

It is no more essential for every education leader to be a teacher than for the CEO of Bristol-Myers Squibb to be a chemist. In any organization, the similarities between technical and leadership roles and skills are incidental and the differences fundamental. When it comes to schools, leadership is so much a function of talent and prior leadership experience that it's a mistake to accord technical training a central position in the selection process. A parallel can be drawn to the MBA. Business school can surely hone the skills of a prospective or current corporate leader, but leadership capability is often found outside such programs and may or may not be created by them. Much the same can be said of journalism, the formal study of which may strengthen the skill-set of a reporter or editor but cannot create talents that don't previously exist in people.

A Faulty Pipeline

Though many of them turn out to be good at their jobs, traditional school leaders are groomed in a system that is both insular and linear. In fact, the way they are now prepared is a significant part of the problem.

According to standard public-education practice, teachers—and other insiders such as librarians and coaches—who wish to be principals *nominate themselves* by jumping through the certification hoops. Typically, a teacher takes administration courses at a school of education in the evenings, on weekends, and during the summer in order to obtain the appropriate state license. Then the teacher, if he or she truly wants to shoulder the burdens of school leadership, applies for a principal's position. Once a principal, he or she may take more courses and, if the opportunity presents itself, perhaps move into the district office. With a little luck, decent political skills, and ample ambition, an ascent to the superintendent's desk may follow. This process demonstrates an educator's perseverance, but it does little to spot and enhance leadership skills.

America faces no shortage of teachers willing to jump through the leadership-certification hoops, but we face an acute shortage of quality leaders for our schools. It's surprising to note that many states actually have a surplus of people with administrator certificates. Yet school systems in many of those states cannot fill their principal vacancies with suitable candidates because few who hold the certificates are actually interested in the challenges of leading schools. In Illinois, for example, according to the NCEI study, about 1,300 educators *annually* receive certification as school principals, although the state has a total of only 3,000 public-school principals. Nearly half of the people in Massachusetts who receive certification as principals do not seek jobs as administrators.

Nevertheless, even as the state's education schools continue to crank out a surfeit of "certified" principal candidates, schools in Chicago and other Illinois cities struggle to find and hire *capable* individuals as leaders. One reason for this anomaly: In most states, teachers who get certified as principals automatically move up the pay scale whether they move into the principal's office or not. Thus licensure becomes a way to fatten one's paycheck, not to enlarge one's responsibilities. Moreover, many states subsidize the licensure process itself, not just by contributing to enhanced salaries but also by underwriting the public universities in which most of the training occurs and, in

many places, reimbursing teachers for whatever tuition expenses they incur while attending those subsidized training programs. The public thus contributes generously to a process that ultimately fails to yield the school leaders we need.

In too many instances, moreover, the instruction these would-be administrators receive in the course of the training-and-certification cycle has little bearing on the problems that real school leaders face. And the school districts for which they work have little voice in determining their course of study. Harvard education professor Richard Elmore describes a "cartel" that controls access to school administration, running that system not to benefit schools but rather themselves. "It's an unholy alliance," he writes, "of colleges of education, state departments of education, and local education agencies that have created a credit-hour accumulation system to supply revenue to colleges and universities to supply a large reserve pool of unqualified people and to promote the certification process at the state level."[19]

This cartel surely benefits the colleges and the teachers who avail themselves of it to secure higher pay, yet it fails to produce the leaders that our schools need even as it discourages would-be leaders from taking the plunge. Christopher Lund, a former Teach For America volunteer who became the youngest school principal in Los Angeles, points to a prevailing belief "that you had to occupy certain positions before you became a principal. That's why I think there are very few young principals, because of the hoops you have to jump through."

We need to change that mindset. Expanding the pool of candidates for school leadership positions to include talented younger teachers and people from other backgrounds would bring new energy, ideas, and skills into our public schools. Breaking the cartel would also bring healthy competition to education schools, as other suppliers vie with them to provide school leaders with the training they need. A few top schools of education, including Harvard's, are already partnering with business schools to bring different insights into education-leadership programs. But such collaboration remains rare.

If we are to experiment with changes in the traditional system, what should we focus on? We consider first the characteristics of leadership; then the changes we advocate for bringing more men and women with those qualities into our public schools; and then the changes in their role that will be needed for topnotch leaders to produce the results we seek.

Successful Education Leaders

Among the essential qualities that any leader must have are energy, a sense of direction, and a determination to succeed that inspires others to perform. A leader may not personally possess every skill or expertise needed to perform every task in the organization, but he or she must be able to convey a sense of urgency to those who do perform the work. A leader must be able to define a goal and direct the institution's effort toward its realization.

No definition of educational leadership encompasses all the qualities that come into play in different circumstances. There's no one model. There may be hundreds. A style of leadership that achieves enormous success in one setting may fail in another. As Frederick Hess, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, notes: "There is no one style of 'corporate' leadership, and there neither is nor should be a unique 'educational leadership."[20]

Recognizing that diversity, let us examine more closely some of the essential qualities that superintendents and principals need in order to achieve excellence in their schools.

Superintendents

The Council of the Great City Schools found in a study[21] of large urban school districts that had improved academically and reduced their achievement gaps that their superintendents were often marked by:

- Clear vision. Successful superintendents possess clear vision about what an effective school district looks like, a strong belief system in the worth and capacity of all children, a strong will, personal humility, and a keen sense of mission to raise student achievement.
- Strong leadership. Superintendents are driven to produce results, and are able to translate their vision into clear goals, rally the support of others to attain them, and create and sustain a sense of urgency for improving student performance.
- Relentless focus. The most effective superintendents are also able to focus their own energies and the energies of others over a prolonged period on improving

student achievement in ways that are unrelenting and that are not distracted from the core mission of the school district.

- Political acuity. Superintendents in school districts large and small are required to establish priorities and balance often conflicting interests, manage the expectations of their school boards and mayors, handle the well-being of staff, communicate clearly, share credit, absorb blame, and negotiate among disparate community groups.
- Personal accountability. Superintendents have a strong sense of personal accountability for the success of their students; they insist on the accountability of others for results and establish strong data systems to monitor progress on the district's goals.
- Effective management. Superintendents are capable of managing complex, multi-layered organizations. They insist on operational excellence and financial integrity, and pride themselves on identifying talented staff and organizing them into an effective unit.
- Fortitude. The superintendent must, in Churchill's words, "never surrender." The task will always be great and the work often lonely, but, as Seattle's Joseph Olchefske says, "This is the hell I have chosen."

It's a daunting list of attributes, yes, but not one that's confined to educators. To be sure, school superintendents, particularly in large urban communities, operate in a unique political stew of determined employers, vigilant press, aggressive unions, and neighborhoods fractured by race, language, income, and religion—all contending (often with scarce resources) over the one thing they care about most, their children. But the skills needed to negotiate this landscape are not unique to educators.

Individuals with these abilities can be found in many walks of life, among men and women who have succeeded in myriad careers and professions. They are not so very different from the attributes needed for outstanding leadership in business, health care, the military, higher education, and government itself. They do not originate in university classrooms, though they may be burnished there. Yet these are the traits that employers of school superintendents should insist on—and screen for.

People who possess these skills should be welcome in public education, and a few already have been. Consider, for example, Joel Klein, a lawyer, in New York City; Roy Romer, a former governor, in Los Angeles; John Fryer, a retired Air Force general in Jacksonville, Fla.; Paul Vallas, a former city budget director, in Philadelphia; Alan

Bersin, a former federal prosecutor, in San Diego; and onetime phone-company executive Paula Dawning in Benton Harbor, Michigan.

Principals

If superintendents are education's field marshals, principals are its front-line officers. They, too, must bring certain crucial strengths to their positions. As the country loses patience with nonperforming schools and as demands mount to measure educational performance and hold people to account for it, we can no longer afford principals who are glorified managers and disciplinarians yet who shoulder little responsibility for their schools' performance. But here, too, what one typically learns in a university-based "leadership training" program—and what a state certification bureau looks for—are a far cry from the qualities that matter most to those actually selecting a school's principal. It's character that matters most, not credentials. Among the most important of those attributes:

- Leadership. A principal must take charge of inspiring and directing a team of diverse people and solving institutional problems to ensure student learning.
- Focus. The principal must take steps to ensure that the school's curriculum and teaching are aligned with state expectations—and stay that way.
- Political savvy. For principals, especially, all politics is local. They must operate in a political environment, advancing the interests of their schools while maintaining the trust and respect of teachers, students, parents, and neighborhood.
- Sense of urgency. The principal must create and sustain a sense of mission for the school, including high expectations for every student.
- Managerial competence. The principal runs what is, in effect, a midsized business. The typical principal manages 30 professionals, 14 support staffers, and a variety of outside vendors that provide services to the school, as well as a multimillion dollar budget and the care of hundreds, even thousands, of "clients."
- Resourcefulness. The principal must be able to accomplish goals while staying within budget and, when necessary, raising additional funds or leveraging other resources.
- Energy, resilience, and dedication. A principal has to work long hours, attend to myriad details, make important decisions on the spot, and withstand pressures from above and below. Without commitment, anybody's spirit would flag under the constant demands.

- Effective use of data. "Effective principals use multiple sources of data as diagnostic tools to assess, identify and apply instructional improvement," according to the National Association of Elementary School Principals. They use "data to assess student achievement and factors that affect it. They know how to communicate the meaning of data and lead the school community in using data constructively to improve teaching and learning."[22]

Where can candidates be found who are generously endowed with these many and exacting qualities? Some, to be sure, can be recruited from the ranks of educators. But why stop there? They can also be found in the military, in business and higher education, in private and charter schools, in other branches of public administration, and in the nonprofit worlds of foundations and community organizations. In short, candidates may be anywhere and everywhere, so we dare not narrow our field of vision by requiring everyone to be a veteran public-school educator. It's precisely because leaders with these vital attributes are scarce that we cannot afford to reject anybody who may possess them simply because he or she lacks conventional state certification.

Our Proposal: Qualifications, Not Credentials

Hiring a superintendent or principal is one step in a process that begins long before the final handshake. It includes four essential elements: certification, recruitment, training, and terms of employment. We consider each in turn.

Certification

It is a fundamental mistake for those doing the hiring to equate being certified with being *qualified* to lead. We see certification not as the end but the beginning of the process, serving the limited purpose of making a candidate eligible for consideration for a leadership post. It does not say anything about that person's likely effectiveness in a particular role. Those vital parts of the selection process are the responsibility of the people who employ school leaders, not the job of the state. Accordingly, we urge a bold reduction in statutory and regulatory barriers to entry into positions of public-school leadership.

Today's typical certification requirements include some or all of the following for principals and superintendents: a minimum number of years' teaching experience; specified academic courses; a graduate degree in education; a graduate degree in administration; a graduate degree in any field; on the job training, etc.

Because such requirements limit entry without assuring quality, we urge states to dispense with them, at least on a trial basis. We would pare the state's certification role to these bare minimums:

- For would-be principals, the state should require a bachelor's degree, a careful background check, and passage of a test of basic laws and regulations pertinent to the principal's job, including health and safety standards, special-education requirements, Title I funding regulations, etc. (The test may come after a person is provisionally hired and trained, as described below.)
- For aspiring superintendents, we believe that the state should require only a college education and a careful background check.

Slashing the red tape of state-level certification does not, however, mean anyone can walk in and take up the challenge of leading schools and school systems. Even as

the state allows the pool to widen, those hiring principals and superintendents should become more selective about whom they actually choose and the standards to which they hold their school leaders.

Recruitment & Selection

The mantra of those hiring school and school-system leaders should be simple: *Recruit for essential skills and attributes first. Supply the specialized knowledge later.* More specifically, school boards should seek people with manifest leadership capabilities bolstered by a solid track record of leadership success. School-specific knowledge and skills can follow. When hiring superintendents or principals, the foremost task is to identify potential leaders from the widest pool of possibilities. We should be seeking candidates with the attributes described above—attributes most apt to have been demonstrated through successful previous leadership roles.

If troubled schools are to be transformed, if we are to provide all our children with the kind of education that they deserve, we cannot continue to let nature take its course and hope that a sufficiency of such leaders will spontaneously emerge. They must be spotted, courted, recruited, and developed, as in all successful organizations. Duval County, Florida, Superintendent John Fryer, a retired Air Force general, observes, "The military spends an enormous amount of money on developing leadership management skills. There is not a systemic approach to that in education. That's one of its weaknesses...You have a teacher who spends 20 years in a classroom who might move up to be vice principal and suddenly starts learning about budgets and all that and suddenly someone says, 'You're a principal. Build a team.' Nobody really taught them."

To find strong leaders for all our schools, we dare not continue waiting for people to nominate themselves. School districts must evaluate their needs and survey the talent available to meet those needs. The school board or governing authority must take the initiative in finding, grooming, and selecting its future leaders. As Tucker and Codding of the National Center on Education and the Economy also urge, "School districts should play a major role in determining who the candidates for training will be."[23]

A recruitment policy presupposes that the recruiter takes the initiative. To do that well, school systems will need a far-flung network of advisers and informants that reaches well beyond their own communities and traditional sources. This outreach effort ought to be ambitious, not just the "old boys' network" and education-school

placement offices that have typically been relied on. The traditional way of finding candidates for leadership positions may have been sufficient for yesterday's education system, but it's obviously not a promising path to find new talent or foster needed changes in schools and school systems.

We recommend new approaches to identify people with outstanding leadership potential. Executive search firms may help but more is apt to be gained by spreading the word across the land that public education is an enterprise that seeks, employs, and rewards great leaders. Something of the sort has begun to occur in a handful of urban school systems like New York, Los Angeles, Seattle, San Diego, Jacksonville, and Benton Harbor, Michigan. It can happen in many more places. "If raising community optimism about its schools and its neighborhoods is one of the most important roles of the superintendent," write Larry Cuban and Michael Usdan, "then boards of education responsible for the selection process may well want to include candidates from outside education who have been similarly inspiring in their work settings, for example writers, religious leaders, community and labor organizers and politicians."[24]

America already has an underground market in experienced principals and superintendents who do a good job in one place and are then recruited to another. After all, the strongest evidence that a person will be an effective school leader is previous success in that role. Today, however, much of that market occurs within school systems—and among suburban systems. If we want our most challenging schools to have a good shot at engaging the very best leaders, this "marketplace" needs to become as vigorous and visible as the competition for corporate executives.

Training

Once identified as plausible candidates, how should inexperienced people be prepared for the responsibilities of public-school principals—and how can people with solid experience in one kind of school get the additional training they may need to do a first-rate job in another setting? Who can best judge what knowledge they need and how to provide it?

Today, graduate schools of education, responding to legislative and regulatory demands, offer a menu of courses that may or may not be relevant to the day-to-day realities of school leadership. People who dine from that menu then get hired as principals, regardless of whether their skills, experience, and academic courses have readied them for the issues they will confront on the job. As Hess points out, "a national survey of 1,400 middle school principals found that more than a third had taken no

coursework focused on middle school educational practices and that more than 70 per cent had taken two courses or less."[25]

There's a better approach. School systems themselves, say Tucker and Codding, should determine "what the form of the training will be and what the major action projects will be."[26] Moreover, any training program should be firmly grounded in the day-to-day reality of running schools, drawing on what works in education, business, the military and other fields emphasizing leadership training.

Events may be moving ahead of theory. Inspired leadership programs, such as New Leaders for New Schools, the Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP), and the Broad Residency in Urban Education are starting to train people from many walks of life to serve as leaders in schools and school systems. In New York City, an institute for new principals has been created that offers a corporate-style training and incentive program for our largest city's would-be principals.[27] Similar programs are emerging in school districts elsewhere to help meet a shortage of quality leaders that has, according to *The New York Times*, left some states struggling to find permanent principals for as many as one-fifth of their schools.[28]

We applaud these innovations, many of them initiated by school systems, philanthropists, and entrepreneurs who resolved to take direct action to meet an acute societal need rather than leaving it to education schools and state certification regimens. School systems may find suitably trained leaders emerging from national programs, or they may opt to design their own training expectations for leaders, then provide that instruction directly or outsource it to third parties while supervising closely to ensure that the course of study doesn't tail off into the old courses that old professors have taught for decades.

Any number of approaches could be tried. Especially for potential principals without an education background, school systems could opt for an apprenticeship, mentoring, or residency program that takes place largely within successful schools under the tutelage of proven school leaders. Other school systems may launch leadership training academies that blend book learning with internships. Or they could contract with a school of education, a corporate training center, a business school, another school system, or a specialized nonprofit group to provide instruction that follows a course of study tailored to the school system's singular needs. The state could play a role in this process to ensure a measure of reciprocity from one district to another—creating some essential commonalities in these training programs (and tailoring the state principals' certification test to those elements) even as they are customized for particular school

systems, perhaps even for particular jobs within those systems. The primary aim is to make sure that all such training arrangements are relevant to the job ahead and are of high quality. As with most efforts, the best way to ensure relevance, flexibility, and quality is to eliminate monopoly control—what Elmore terms the "cartel" approach—of training and open it to multiple providers and to competition among them.

For principals with prior experience leading schools, some specialized training may also be needed to prepare for the challenges of new schools or for changing circumstances within familiar schools. (Most of today's principals, for example, would likely benefit from a crash course in "No Child Left Behind.") Here, too, the best judge of what extra training is needed is not a distant bureaucracy or university but the school system doing the recruiting and employing. And here, too, the needed training can come from a wide array of providers. All that is needed is recognition of that possibility—and some imagination in exploiting it.

The training of superintendents, however, is somewhat different. Theirs is a broader view, more concerned with the expectations of the state, the cross currents of the community, and the priorities of the board to which they report. Political skills are a matter of judgment and experience, thus difficult to teach. They can be strengthened, however, with programs akin to those available to elected officials and corporate executives that provide seminar like forums for school leaders to work out common, real-world challenges. The marketplace has room for more of these kinds of programs. For example, prospective superintendents can profit from programs like the Broad Center for Superintendents, which conducts intensive sessions on such topics as student achievement and reinventing schools for success, using management and instructional data for decision making, the governance-management team, and planning and leading systems change.[29]

Terms of Employment

Putting all of this effort into recruitment and training will be for naught unless steps are taken to ensure that principals and superintendents have the authority to lead their schools in ways that will make them successful. We are not referring to cosmetic changes. Principals need far more authority over staffing, budgeting, hiring, spending, day-to-day maintenance, and purchasing. Principals need far greater latitude to pick their teams if they are going to be held accountable for the results. Too many superintendents, for their part, do not have the power to hold people responsible for their results. Superintendents need much greater control over district curriculum, testing and assessment, and the means for holding people accountable for student achievement.

For Principals

Principals need the tools to do their jobs. They are being held to account for their schools' performance. If they are to succeed in boosting that performance, they must be able to make essential decisions about how their schools will operate: to hire (and discharge) faculty on the basis of school need and individual performance rather than by seniority (and unconstrained by tenure rules), to deploy staff members when and where needed, and to reward exceptional performance. They must, to be sure, follow reasonable procedures and not indulge in caprice, patronage, or corruption—but they also must, at the end of the day, be in charge of those who belong to their team.

Authority over personnel, however, is only part of the answer. Principals also need greater control over scheduling, discipline, budgeting, use of technology, and instruction.

Results-based education means holding principals to a high standard for their schools' academic results; installing clear indicators to measure a school's progress toward those results; and equipping the school's leader with the flexibility and freedom to pursue those results as he or she thinks best. But it's a conditional freedom, one that lasts as long as it truly yields results. Principals must be evaluated on the basis of their schools' performance. Those who succeed should be retained, renewed, and rewarded. Those who fail to measure up after a reasonable period (which should be negotiated into their initial contract) should not be retained.

For Superintendents

The median term of service for superintendents nationally is about six years,[30] while urban school superintendents stay in their posts an average of 2.5 to four years depending on how one counts.[31] Superintendents report to school boards that are sometimes elected, sometimes appointed. Elected boards are formed with at-large or regional members, sometimes both. Appointed boards have members chosen by mayors or city councils, and a small number of boards now have both elected and appointed members. Regardless of what kind of school board a superintendent reports to, he or she should be in harmony with the board's vision for change, should be clear about the district's goals for student performance, and should be given a reasonable period of time in which to attain those goals.

Though the superintendent's job is complex and multifaceted, the employer's premier goal may be as straightforward as assuring that every child in the district attains proficiency on the state's annual assessment test. This is a clear and well-defined goal

that allows benchmarking for success. By tracking state test scores and other measurable goals, it is possible to tell if a district is moving in the right direction and how far it still has to go. The superintendent's employment contract should be tied to such results.

But it's unreasonable to hold executives accountable for results if they aren't able to select their own teams and deploy resources as they think best. Too often superintendents are faced with school board interference in the hiring and firing of central-office staff and principals. School boards should be considered to have one, and only one, employee—the superintendent—whom they hold accountable for meeting broad districtwide goals. Superintendents, for their part, must be given authority to select their staffs and school principals. The superintendent, in turn, must hold them accountable. In New York, Chancellor Joel Klein, presumably as a prelude to discharging nonperformers, has given out grades from A to F to school principals. Of more than 1000 principals, as many as 100 received Fs and another 80 to 100 received Ds.[32] In Seattle, thanks mainly to attrition, Superintendent Olchefske has been able to hire 70 of that system's 100 principals, based not on seniority or other union requirements, but on criteria that he believes will carry his vision to fruition. They are, effectively, his team and share in that vision.

Paying the Price

If we want better school leaders, we must expect to pay them better. School principals typically work at least a 60-hour week and an eleven-month year and, as earlier noted, in many school systems senior teachers earn as much as or more than their principals. Much as we value and should reward fine teachers, it is a fact that those who lead them will need to be paid substantially more if we are serious about finding and keeping great leaders. As a starting point, we propose that principals' base pay be at least 150 percent of what their schools' highest-paid teacher receives, with the possibility of an additional 50 percent in performance-related bonuses. Some principals, as a result, may earn as much as $180,000 a year, money well deserved by those who perform well.

Although we advocate increasing pay and power for principals, they have no right to employment in the absence of performance. Initial contracts for principals should be no longer than three years, with annual performance reviews during that period. And while principals should be encouraged to participate in professional organizations, they must—always—be deemed part of the management team and not engage in employee-style collective bargaining.

Successful superintendents should be well compensated, too, and this is beginning to happen. The average superintendent's salary rose roughly 10 percent from 1997-98 ($101,519) to 1999-2000 ($112,158).[33] This trend is likely to continue. Competition for a declining supply of quality leaders will bid up the price for superintendents, as it should. Salaries in some of the nation's major cities now exceed $300,000. Those cities are now attracting top talent. As salary levels rise, it makes even more sense to open the door to talented individuals from outside education who will be attracted by competitive pay.

Conclusion

The United States is approaching a crisis in school leadership. Nearly 40 percent of its 92,000 principals are eligible to retire in the next four years. In many school systems, two-thirds of the principals will reach retirement age during this decade. And those are the leaders we already have—which for many schools is not the same as the leaders we need.

Ominous as this crisis is, it also presents an opportunity, a chance to give a fair test to new approaches to finding and employing leaders for our public schools. It coincides with the greatest pressure we have ever seen for those schools to produce stronger academic results—and for their leaders to be held to account for those results. This convergence—the opportunity to engage many new school leaders and the obligation to deploy school leaders who will be highly effective—creates the window for bold innovation.

For at least a generation, as American public education has stagnated, the conventional wisdom about leadership has focused on an old idea: certify educators to fix the problem. Today, two decades after we were pronounced a "nation at risk" as a consequence of the lackluster performance of our schools, we must face the fact that the conventional wisdom is wrong. It's too inbred. It has relied on educators to decide the requirements for rising within the field of education—effectively barring the door to everyone else. Despite good intentions and honest effort, no evidence yet shows a correlation between the credentials required of school leaders and the results produced by their schools. In fact, a surplus of credentialed candidates to be principals is being produced while schools founder without effective captains at their helms.

The signers of this document appeal to America's common sense, its pragmatism, and its passion to do right by its children. Too many of our schools turn out students who are ill equipped for the world in which they will work and live. The shortage of truly qualified school leaders is worsening. The solution is not to impose yet more requirements but to enlarge the talent pool, to welcome into leadership posts the best men and women who can be found wherever they are today, to provide relevant training, to offer them attractive and workable terms of employment, and to hold them to account for their schools' results.

Better Leaders for America's Schools

Endnotes

[1] National Center for Education Statistics, http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=84.

[2] Kim L. Hooper, "Schools struggling to fill principal's jobs," *Indianapolis Star*, (January 21, 2003), p. 1.

[3] Public Agenda, "Trying to Stay Ahead of the Game: Superintendents and Principals Talk about School Leadership," (Washington DC: Public Agenda), 2001.

[4] Associated Press State and Local Wire, "Wisconsin faces school superintendent shortage," Associated Press, December 28, 2002.

[5] The difficulties facing segments of American education have been well chronicled at least since the publication of the "Nation at Risk" report in 1983. More recently, it was noted that "38 percent of fourth graders cannot read at the basic level, which means that they cannot read and understand a short passage from an age-appropriate book. In some school districts in this country this figures rises to more than 70 percent." Buzz Bartlett, "The Keys to Literacy," edited by Susannah Patton and Madelyn Holmes, (Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education), 2002, p. 6.

[6] Margaret Raymond and Stephen Fletcher, "The Teach For America Evaluation," *Education Next*, (Spring 2002), p. 63.

[7] For example, the first independent evaluation of Teach For America teachers' effect on student performance showed the impact of having a Teach For America teacher was decidedly positive. "Teach for America: An Evaluation of Teacher Differences and Student Outcomes in Houston, Texas," *CREDO*, [Macke Raymond, Stephen H. Fletcher, Javier Luque], August 2001.

[8] For details refer to table one at the end of this document, and to the full report located on the NCEI website at www.ncei.com.

[9] Jacquie Paul. "Fast-Track Test Keyed to Recruit Principals," *Press-Enterprise*, January 11, 2003, p. B6.

[10] The numbers are 12.6 percent in private schools, 10.7 percent in public charter schools, as of 2002, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, "Schools and Staffing Survey" (Fall 2002), p. 10.

[11] Public Agenda, "Trying to Stay Ahead of the Game: Superintendents and Principals Talk about School Leadership," (New York, NY: Public Agenda), 2001.

[12] National Center for Education Statistics.

[13] We've adopted this concept from Education Writers Association, "Searching for a Superhero: Can Principals do it All?" (Washington, DC: EWA Special Report), 2002.

[14] Marc S. Tucker and Judy B. Codding, *The Principal Challenge*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), 2002, p. 2.

[15] Editorial, "Principally it's a very tough job." *News-Sentinel* (Fort Wayne, IN), (January 22, 2003), p. E1.

[16] Paul, p. B6.

[17] These numbers come from the National Survey of Salaries and Wages in Public Schools; the National Association for Law Placement, Inc.; and the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[18] 1999 Association of California School Administrators Survey.

[19] Education Writers Association, p. 6.

[20] Frederick M. Hess, "A License to Lead? A New Leadership Agenda for America's Schools," (Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute), 2003.

[21] "Foundations for Success: Case Studies of How Urban School Systems Improve Student Achievement," [Jason Snipes, Fred Doolittle, Corinne Herlihy], MDRC for the Council of the Great City Schools, September 2002.

[22] National Association of Elementary School Principals, *Leading Learning Communities: Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able To Do.* (Alexandria, VA: NAESP), 2001, p. 55.

[23] Tucker and Codding, p. 25.

[24] *Powerful Reforms with Shallow Roots: Improving America's Urban Schools*, edited by Larry Cuban and Michael Usdan, (New York: Teachers College Press), 2002, p. 71.

[25] Hess, p. 18.

[26] Tucker and Codding, p. 25.

[27] New York's plan builds on the experience of other cities, and is modeled on the management-training program that John F. Welch Jr. created for General Electric when he became its chief executive. The program, in which new principals will shadow veterans, will be financed in part by a $15 million donation from the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds. For more information go to Abby Goodnough, "Plan to Lure Top Principals to Bad Schools," *New York Times*, (December 12, 2002), p. B1.

[28] Richard Weizel, "Wanted: Someone to Run the Schools." *New York Times*, (December 1, 2002), p. 1.

[29] "The Broad Center for Superintendents," www.broadcenter.org.

[30] Larry Cuban, "Leadership for Student Learning," (Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership), September 2001, p. 8.

[31] Numbers vary depending on the source. These numbers come from the National School Boards Association and the Council of the Great City Schools.

[32] Jennifer Medina. "Chancellor Gives Out Report Cards, Failing 50 Principals," *New York Times.* (January 4, 2003), p. B2.

[33] Educational Resources Information Center, Clearinghouse on Educational Management, http://eric.uoregon.edu.

Initial Signers

(as of May 1, 2003)

Steven Adamowski, *former CEO,* Cincinnati Public Schools, and *Assistant Professor of Education Leadership and Policy Studies,* University of Missouri at St. Louis

Lamar Alexander, *United States Senator*

Jeanne Allen, *President,* The Center for Education Reform

Leslye A. Arsht, *Chairman and Co-founder,* StandardsWork, Inc.

William Bennett, *Co-director,* Empower America

Alan D. Bersin, *Superintendent of Public Education,* San Diego City Schools

Stacey Boyd, *former President and CEO,* Project Achieve

Eli Broad, *Founder,* Broad Foundation

Sheila Byrd, *Education Policy Consultant*

Thomas W. Carroll, *President,* Foundation for Education Reform and Accountability

Michael D. Casserly, *Executive Director,* Council of the Great City Schools

John Chubb, *Chief Education Officer and Vice President,* Edison Schools

Judy Codding, *Vice-President,* National Center on Education and the Economy

Barbara Davidson, *Executive Director,* HireStandards

Paula Dawning, *Broad Fellow Graduate* and *Superintendent,* Benton Harbor Area Schools, Michigan

Candace deRussy, *Trustee,* State University of New York and Member of Board of Visitors, Air Force Academy

Denis P. Doyle, *Co-founder and CAO,* SchoolNet, Inc.

Bill Evers, *Research Fellow,* Hoover Institution, Stanford University

Mike Feinberg, *Co-founder,* KIPP

Emily Feistritzer, *President,* National Center for Education Information

Chester E. Finn, Jr., *President,* Thomas B. Fordham Institute

Mary Lee Fitzgerald, *former Commissioner of Education,* New Jersey Department of Education

Howard Fuller, *Distinguished Professor of Education,* Marquette University

William F. Goodling, *former Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,* United States House of Representatives

Jay P. Greene, *Senior Fellow,* Manhattan Institute

Peter R. Greer, *Headmaster,* The Montclair Kimberley Academy

Paul R. Gross, *University Professor of Life Sciences, emeritus,* University of Virginia

Allen Grossman, *Professor of Management Practice,* Harvard Business School

James W. Guthrie, *Director, Peabody Center for Education Policy,* Vanderbilt University

Scott Hamilton, *President and Co-founder,* KIPP

Eric Hanushek, *Senior Fellow,* Hoover Institution, Stanford University

Frederick Hess, *Resident Scholar,* American Enterprise Institute

Anne Higdon, *CEO and Superintendent,* ISUS Trade and Technology Prep

E.D. Hirsch, *Chairman,* Core Knowledge Foundation

Gary Huggins, *Executive Director,* Education Leaders Action Council

Dan Katzir, *Managing Director,* Broad Foundation

Lisa Graham Keegan, *CEO,* Education Leaders Council

Leo Klagholz, *Former Commissioner of Education,* New Jersey Department of Education

Martin Kozloff, *Watson Distinguished Professor of Education,* University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Rita Kramer, *Author, Ed School Follies: The Miseducation of America's Teachers*

David Levin, *Co-founder and Superintendent,* KIPP

Tom Loveless, *Director, Brown Center on Education Policy,* Brookings Institution

Cathy Nehf Lund, *Project Director,* Walton Family Foundation, Inc.

Frank J. Macchiarola, *President,* St. Francis College and former New York City Schools Chancellor

Bruno Manno, *Senior Associate for Education,* Annie E. Casey Foundation

Don McAdams, *President,* Center for Reform of School Systems

Deborah M. McGriff, *Chief Communications Officer*, Edison Schools

Terry M. Moe, *Professor, Political Science*, Stanford University

William J. Moloney, *Commissioner of Education*, Colorado Department of Education

Ronald L. Ottinger, *President, Board of Education*, San Diego City Schools

Bill Owens, *Governor of Colorado*

Michael Podgursky, *Professor of Economics*, University of Missouri at Columbia

Andrew J. Rotherham, *Director of Education Policy*, Progressive Policy Institute

David Warren Saxe, *Member*, Pennsylvania State Board of Education

John Schilling, *Chief of Staff*, Education Leaders Council

Lewis C. Solmon, *Former Dean, Graduate School of Education*, UCLA

David Steiner, *Chairman, Department of Administration, Training, and Policy Studies; School of Education*, Boston University*

Richard A. Stoff, *President*, Ohio Business Roundtable

Suzanne Tacheny, *Member*, California Board of Education

Abigail Thernstrom, *Senior Fellow*, Manhattan Institute, and member of the Massachusetts Board of Education

Marc Tucker, *President*, National Center on Education and the Economy

Herbert J. Walberg, *Fellow*, Hoover Institution, Stanford University

John Walton, Walton Family Foundation, Inc.

Bradford Wilson, *Executive Director*, National Association of Scholars

Charles Zogby, *former Secretary of Education*, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Should you want to become a signatory to this manifesto please surf to www.edexcellence.net/manifesto/manifesto.html and follow the online instructions.

* *My one reservation about the recommendations made in this manifesto, concerns the qualifications for principals of small schools. I believe that, for schools with fewer than 500 students and/or those without an assistant principal who has responsibility for instruction, the principal must be expected to function as instructional leader and therefore school districts filling such principalships should be required to select candidates with previous teaching experience.*

Profiles of Education Leaders

By Lawrence Meyer
Writer and Consultant

Paula Dawning

Superintendent, Benton Harbor Public Schools, Benton Harbor, Michigan

Paula Dawning did not come to her job as superintendent of the Benton Harbor school system from a political background, nor from one in education. She arrived after spending 23 years as an executive with AT&T, working in sales, marketing, engineering, and human resources.

And yet, as she starts out (in the fall of 2002) as the Benton Harbor school superintendent, she finds the political aspect of her new job "huge." The system is facing growing deficits and she must find ways to raise more money, or cut costs.

"I know I'm going to have to ask for a bond issue," she said just after schools opened in late August. "I've got to build a broad base of support and credibility. I've been on three radio shows in the last week; I've been on every television station that feeds this area. And I've only been here six weeks."

As a result, she finds that she is never "off duty." The job is "excruciatingly public...You are on twenty-four/seven."

"People want you to come to all kinds of events on the weekend. And people think that they need to speak to you. They want you to sit on boards to allocate money; they want you to visit their churches and speak to them; they want you to be keynote speaker [at] banquets where it is important for them to understand what is happening in the school district. As a school superintendent, you have a fairly unique position, particularly in a smaller community where you impact property values. And if you say no too many times, people view that as you are not open."

Dawning, who holds a bachelor's degree from St. Mary's College in South Bend, Indiana, a master's in education from Boston University, and an MBA from the University of Michigan, did not come to Benton Harbor to be a status quo administrator.

"My district was in need of significant change. As a non-traditional candidate, I am a change agent," she says.

When she left AT&T, she says, "I knew I wanted to do something that was different. I knew I felt particularly fortunate and blessed in my career, and I wanted to do something that would help others realize their dreams and give back."

Not certain initially what she wanted to do, she received an e-mail about a program of The Broad Foundation to train school superintendents from non-educational backgrounds. "As I researched that," she says, "it became clear to me that that was a very effective way for me to do what I wanted to do next. I started in education and I was coming back to education. It made a lot of sense to me to apply business skills to the business of education."

She was accepted into The Broad Foundation's program and began the one-year training, which was run for the foundation by the Michigan Leadership Institute, in the fall of 2001. Before she had completed the program, she was asked by the Institute, which was also handling the search for a superintendent for the Benton Harbor schools, to apply for that job.

She applied and got the job. What she also got were some major headaches. According to a recent Standard & Poor's report on the school system, "Benton Harbor Area Schools generate exceptionally below-average student results with exceptionally above average spending per pupil." The district struggles with low test-scores, a low graduation rate, and a high dropout rate. In fact, things have been so bad recently that the state of Michigan has come very close to taking over the running of the Benton Harbor school system.

This situation has created some obvious negatives, but also at least one plus. "I feel fortunate that I have a team that has been waiting for a leader to arrive," she says. "And they understand that this has to happen because there are consequences if it does not happen."

Both her education and training in business management, she says, will help her accomplish the needed changes. Her business training, she says, helps her to put benchmarks in place to measure performance so she can make mid-course corrections when necessary; yet she has ready access to education expertise. The school system has an assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction and also a director of curriculum. Dawning says she relies on them for guidance and works closely with them.

Coming from a business background, "particularly coming from a sales background," and aware that, in today's world, there are choices in education, she talks about "marketing" her school system. "The marketing of the school district when you have choices—charter schools, vouchers and all that—you appreciate the messaging, the customer focus because our customers in many respects are our children and their parents. We need to be aware that that's why we exist. That's not a mental model that exists in a focused way in education at the current time."

In business, she says, "You have a greater sense of urgency. And you have a systems approach to organizational structure and problem solving. That's the way I look at things, programmatically. That's sort of been the approach I've taken since I've been here." Her approach is to build teams "that are empowered to get things done, versus the education model that tends to allow more autonomy for lots of different people. When you need to move a system, you have to get teams in alignment with a shared purpose to move the whole team forward, which then moves the whole district forward to the benefit of the children."

The professional educators in her school system have been "very excited" about her approach. "They've offered me a great deal of encouragement. They're happy to see me here, putting children first."

"I can speak their language and that's a plus. I gave an opening day talk and even I was surprised. They interrupted me constantly during the talk with applause. That wasn't necessary for them to do. So I take it that I was hitting on key points that matter to them."

If leadership is what the Benton Harbor schools needed, Dawning says she can meet the need: "I think I'm a leader," she says. "I can point the way. I can empower people."

John Fryer

Superintendent, Duval County Public Schools, Jacksonville, Florida

John Fryer, superintendent of schools for Duval County, Florida, spent more than 30 years in the Air Force, but he does not see giving orders as the way to bring reform to education.

"If you're going to institute reform," says Fryer, a retired major general, "you have to drive it from the top but you also have to have buy-in from the bottom for it to work... You have to have intelligent people that want to do what you want them to do."

By his account, the Duval County school system, which includes Jacksonville and has about 128,000 students, was in bad shape. So was the community. A locally sponsored study found that 47 percent of the adult population were functionally illiterate, incapable of filling out a simple job application. "That didn't get produced by a great school system," Fryer says.

Fryer had flirted with education for much of his career in the Air Force and then in civilian life. He holds a bachelor's degree and a master's in political science. In addition, he served as commandant of the National War College in Washington, D.C. and interim president of the National Defense University. While at the War College, he initiated a tutoring program at a nearby public school where he, along with others from the college, helped primary school students.

After leaving the Air Force, Fryer served as executive vice president of a private company, where he again got involved with public education, helping the local school system win a grant.

He says he enjoyed being around educators. "I liked the people. I liked the culture. This was a group of people that I really enjoyed being with. They started asking me questions about the curriculum. It was obvious to me that they were looking for leadership."

In 1995, Fryer met John Stanford, another retired general, who was then superintendent of the Seattle school system. (Stanford has since died.) "When John came to Seattle," he remembers, "that was the first thing that drew me to the idea of being a superintendent. I never would have thought about it in all my life except John had done it. I said to my wife, 'That's a job I could really get excited about and I think I have a lot of tools that I've developed over my life that I could employ.'"

A few years later, he got his opportunity. Duval County was looking for a new superintendent.

"It was like a lightning bolt struck me," he says. "This all came together. My interest had been piqued in public education. I saw that leadership was important.... I'm the kind of guy who likes a challenge—a big one. I had run large organizations. I had been in education, albeit not K-12 very much. I just said this must be it." He called the chairman of the school board and she encouraged him to apply. "They were hoping to find someone who was a little out of the box."

He applied and got the job.

Fryer sees his ability to think strategically as one of the strengths that he has brought to his position. "Just by the very nature of how [school systems] get funded," he says, administrators tend to think in terms of tactics. "You... have these multiple programs overlapping and not necessarily having any strategic sense or integration or coherence and you have multiple funding streams and reporting requirements and the result is it focuses everybody at the tactical level, just keeping up with all that stuff. And the first thing to do is to get everybody to draw up to the strategic level and think about the whole set of problems as a strategic problem.

Fryer says he took up his job in 1998 "with five priorities that I call my 'High Five.' It's still the organizing thrust of the district." He ticks them off in rapid succession:

- Improving academic performance
- Improving the safety and discipline of the environment in which teachers work.
- Developing learning communities where the whole organization becomes a learning organization.
- Building high-performance management organizations at the district and school levels.
- Developing accountability systems that really enable you to see what's happening in your school system and hold people accountable.

To put this strategy into practice, Fryer went out to sell his program to the teachers and principals. He spent hours at each school meeting with faculty. He required an 80 percent "buy-in" for a school to participate. In the end, fourteen schools were chosen to implement the changes that he and his staff fashioned.

Selling the program was crucial. "When I grew up in the Air Force, it wasn't just command authority," he says. "Most of the fighting is done in the Air Force by offi-

cers who all have degrees and many have graduate degrees. You don't just tell them what to do. If it doesn't sound too smart, they might not follow you. I was used to persuading people that the way we were going was the way we ought to go."

After the first year, he sent the teachers and principals from the initial fourteen schools out to sell their colleagues. "Teachers had to convince teachers and principals had to convince principals," he says. The following year, another 49 schools signed up.

Fryer says there should be room in education for administrators who come from outside the system, but he is not categorical on the subject. "There are some people--who have different experiences who certainly can apply their talents if they've run large organizations and they understand education--who can do this job. But there are many fine educators who can do this job."

"The military spends an enormous amount on developing leadership management skills. There is not a systemic approach to that in education. That's one of its weaknesses...You have a teacher who spends 20 years in a classroom who might move up to be vice principal and suddenly starts learning about budgets and all that and suddenly someone says, 'You're a principal. Build a team.' Nobody really taught them."

Although he came to office as a reformer, Fryer did not engage in wholesale replacement of staff. "You know," he says, "in the Air Force nobody ever gave me the opportunity to fire everybody. I had to make a team out of what I had. So, though a few people thought I would come here and fire people and put new ones in, I saw a lot of good talent here. We just needed to begin to work together. We needed to learn to think strategically. We needed to get focus. We needed to take on this idea of systemic reform and have a pacing toward it that would get us where we wanted to go over time."

This strategy has resulted in students making steady improvements on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, though Duval County is still below the state average in both reading and math.

One of his first tasks as a leader, Fryer says, was "creating a sense of urgency."

"My point to teachers, to principals, to everybody is, look, there's no guarantee that public education is going to continue as we know it. We've got a lot of work to do and it's like being in a competitive business. First and foremost, the whole world is changing around us. There's a demand for different kinds of skills today. We can't just educate 25 percent and have them go off and run great things. We've got to educate most of our children to high-level skills."

"Secondly, there are a lot of threats out there. There are vouchers and charter schools. Like any good business it has competition. And I don't have a problem with that. I don't focus on vouchers being a problem or fighting that. I want to produce a great school system. So that's actually helpful. To say, 'look, those things are out there and may take over your job if we don't compete well."

Jennifer Henry

Principal, Chicago Academy, Chicago, Illinois

At 29, Jennifer Henry may well be one of the youngest school administrators in the country. Still, she has more than ten years' experience working in education and a master's degree in business administration from the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University.

While still in high school, Ms. Henry had worked in "Making Waves," an after-school tutoring program in her native Marin County, California. After graduation in 1995 from Georgetown University, where she majored in American Studies, Henry was hired to run "Making Waves," where her job involved raising $500,000 to run the program, running a summer school and hiring the faculty for it, designing and implementing the curriculum, as well as worrying "about the facilities, and communicating with the parents, and making sure the buses ran on time...It was very much like the job of a principal."

Her summer staff consisted of 60 full-time people. During the school year, she managed a staff of four and more than 100 volunteers.

She ran that program for four years, also teaching in a part-time, unpaid position at an independent high school. "I learned a lot. My learning curve always remained vertical," Henry says, "and always around leadership."

Realizing that she needed to know more about leadership and how to run an organization, she applied and was accepted to the Kellogg School. She was there for two years. Between her first and second year, she had a job with Procter & Gamble, and she could have gone to work for them after receiving her MBA, "marketing salty snacks to teen-agers," she says with a chuckle. But that wasn't what she wanted.

What she wanted to do was to return to education. Finding a job in education administration, however, was not so easy. "I called school districts around the country and, especially when they heard I had an MBA, they'd say things to me like, 'Well, we can transfer you to our business department, we need an accountant.' I would even call charter schools ... and the minute I mentioned I had an MBA, they would steer me to their books."

As she realized that she would need an administrative certificate to be an administrator, she was also reluctant to go back to school to earn it. "I really felt like I was ready to roll my sleeves up and get back into schools," she says.

When Henry heard about an organization called New Leaders for New Schools, a program that would help her get an administrative certificate by working for a year hand-in-glove with a principal in a school, she applied and was accepted.

Shortly into her fellowship, she had lunch with Jon Schnur, CEO of New Leaders. He asked her what kind of school she wanted to lead, and, when she told him, he put her in touch with the Chicago Academy, a brand-new "contract school" governed by the Academy for Urban School Leadership under contract with the Chicago Board of Education.

So it was that in October 2001, Jennifer Henry found herself as the new executive director of the Chicago Academy, working with its principal, Dr. Donald Feinstein, then in his eighteenth year in the Chicago school system.

"This is what I always dreamed of doing," Ms. Henry says.

The Chicago Academy is the city's first contract school. It is a public school, grades pre-K through seven, with 450 students chosen from the surrounding neighborhood. Its teachers are from the Chicago public school system and are paid directly by the Board of Education. The Board also handles its purchasing and other financial transactions. The only difference between the Academy and other public schools, according to Henry, is that the Academy is governed not by a public school council but by the board of the Academy for Urban School Leadership under a contract with the Board of Education.

The Chicago Academy is charged with a dual mission: to serve as a neighborhood school and as a training institute for teachers. Its 18 certified "mentor-teachers" are assisted by 32 "residents," all of whom have undergraduate degrees but lack teaching certificates. After a one-year residency, they will earn a teaching certificate and a Master of Arts in teaching. They are then placed in teams of four or five in carefully selected under-performing schools where the Academy supports them with five years of professional development and further training.

Henry says she has an excellent relationship with the school's faculty. "I think this year has been wonderful. I think I have the trust of my faculty. I have credibility with them. I built that through building one-on-one relationships, spending a

lot of time at the beginning of the year listening and learning from them. It also didn't hurt that, when I came to this school, I came with a $361,000 grant that I got for them.

"I think that they could see that I was bringing something to the table. And I think that they value the skill set I've brought from not only my business school training, but also from my previous leadership experience."

What she brings to the table, she says, includes the ability to supplement the public funds the school gets by raising money. Besides the $361,00 grant from the Chicago Community Trust—$200,000 for planning the teacher training program and $161,000 for curriculum materials and supplies for the school—she recently won a $1.5 million federal grant for the Academy for urban school leadership, to be spent over five years. In addition, she says she and board chairman Martin Koldyke have raised another $2 million for the school.

In public, Henry says, her training and experience give her an "ability to communicate the vision of our academy...where we're going in the long term and what we need to do in the short term to get there. I'm very focused on outcomes. I'm really into backward mapping, [deciding on a goal and then figuring how to accomplish it] which is what successful educators do. That's what great teachers do in their classrooms. That's also what successful businesses do."

Her MBA has helped her to "better organize my thoughts" and her training in strategic planning "can help my problem solving skills tremendously." She also finds that making analogies between what the private sector does and how it applies to education enhances her communication with the Board of Education.

At the same time, she acknowledges that she has "limited experience in the classroom." Fortunately, she says, all of the teachers at the Chicago Academy "are superb teachers." She spends a lot of time talking with them. "I'm just a sponge listening to their experiences."

Although Henry says her management training serves her well, she does not discount the importance of classroom experience for school administrators. School leaders should, in her view, have classroom experience. "I still believe, with my MBA, that the most important thing a school leader can be is the instructional leader," being able to step into a classroom, observe a teacher in action and make suggestions that will help a teacher become more effective.

She also believes that the Chicago Academy is a model that can be applied universally as a vehicle for reforming education—bringing together excellent teachers and letting them teach and train more teachers, who in turn can go out and replicate the experience.

Henry is satisfied. "This is what I always dreamed of doing." But this is not the end of her education ambitions: "I want to be a superintendent."

Christopher Lund

Principal, Robert F. Kennedy Elementary School, Los Angeles, California

Two years ago, when he was 31, Christopher A. Lund was the youngest principal in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Now, at 33, he is merely one of the youngest, after working as a teacher and administrator in the LAUSD for 11 years (since 1991).

If becoming a principal was less than a long, hard struggle for Lund by conventional measure, he says he found it "a long process" and that, if he had been allowed, he would have stepped into administration earlier. "I was frustrated by the perception of being young for the position, that I wasn't deserving of the position," he says.

After working as a teacher and an "out of classroom coordinator" in the LA school system, Lund received a master's degree in education administration from Pepperdine University. He became an assistant principal at the Robert F. Kennedy Elementary School in East Los Angeles on a waiver and then took the necessary examinations to qualify as a principal.

Within less than a year, when the top position at his school became open, Lund applied for it and, after winning a vote of 98 percent approval from parents and teachers in the school—65 percent approval was required—he, in fact, became the principal.

Lund says his program of study at Pepperdine was excellent preparation. Pepperdine is one of several schools offering the required courses to reach "Tier One" in the two-tier process to becoming a school administrator in Los Angeles. "Personally, I think it's one of the best programs in southern California," Lund says. "They do a fantastic job of emphasizing administrative responsibility as well as leadership in terms of personal, organizational leadership." That part of his preparation, he says, had added value.

From what he understands about other programs, however, they offer less—even though they meet the city and state requirements. The Cal State program, for example, lacks the leadership element that Pepperdine offers, but focuses instead on "nuts and bolts" rather than training administrators to be "change agents," as he puts it.

The Tier Two course, which is required for educators after they assume administrative positions, Lund says, offers little more by way of professional growth. "In essence,

you're serving time." Nonetheless, public-school administrators in California must go through the process. "It's a mandate," he says. "It's something you have to do, so you get it done."

Lund became an educator more or less by accident. After growing up in the Chicago suburbs, he graduated from Northwestern University in 1991 with a combined major in international studies and Spanish literature. Facing a sagging job market, he applied and was accepted into Teach for America, then in its early days. He accepted a teaching position in Los Angeles.

What he thought would be a short experience turned out to be a career. "I actually went in and kind of felt called to it," he said.

It was after he became a teacher, in his third year in the LA school system, that he says he became aware of a principal's potential for effecting change. He was teaching in a school in East Los Angeles that had had three principals in five years. "Basically," he says, "what I saw was how one person in that titular position can change the dynamic of an entire institution. It amazed me, but it also intrigued me in that change can be for the better, or it can be for the worse. So, I basically saw an opportunity to have a greater impact than what I was having in the classroom. I saw administration as a way of impacting an entire school."

LAUSD's procedures for becoming a principal are "thorough," but Lund isn't convinced that they serve a purpose. "They're certainly challenging," he says of the tests, "but I'm not sure that the caliber of administrators [in LA] is better than other districts."

There is, or used to be, a belief in the school system, he says, "that you had to occupy certain positions before you became a principal. That's why I think there are very few young principals, because of the hoops you have to jump through." He says the "hoops" consist not just of the tests but also "the unwritten code of administration" that a would-be principal has to serve in certain antecedent jobs before he or she can become a principal.

He says he didn't avoid those steps—he simply served the bare minimum of time to fulfill the requirement.

Although Lund says he experiences frustrations with the school system, he is also learning how to operate within it. He builds relationships, he says, and "I don't take no for an answer." He still sees himself as an "agent of change" but "in such a behemoth system...there's only so much you can change."

Lund is also active in the charter school movement; an activity that he knows wins him little applause among the old guard. He sees his activity as a "unique way to work outside the system and still be part of a public education system...pushing public schools to compete."

At his own school, the Robert F. Kennedy Elementary School, Lund's strategy seems to be working. Although the school is 200 points below the target score of 800 on the state's Academic Performance Index, it was "about average" when compared to similar schools on the basis of its 2001 scores. In 2001-02, it showed a 50-point gain in its Index score, meeting its growth target.

To initiate change, Lund says, a principal must be a strong organizational leader as well as an instructional leader. "How do you move a school that has had 30 years of under performance history with children who are on all national accounts at a disadvantage on multiple levels?" he asks. "You have to be able to understand those things and change a school culture and you're not going to change a school culture just by being a manager. You need to be a strong leader. Pull people on board, establish a vision that people can buy into and help create and move people in a positive direction."

Joseph Olchefske

Superintendent, Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, Washington

Joseph Olchefske took office as superintendent of Seattle's public schools with a mandate for change. In fact, he was part of that change—a superintendent with less than three years of experience in education.

Olchefske, who began as chief financial officer for the school system in 1995, became its chief operating officer in 1997 and was appointed acting superintendent in 1998 when Superintendent John Stanford became ill. After Stanford's death later that year, Olchefske was named superintendent of a school system that now has about 50,000 students, 7,000 employees and a budget of $435 million.

With a bachelor's degree from the University of Chicago and a master's in city and regional planning from Harvard's Kennedy School, Olchefske had no background or special interest in education when he became Seattle's CFO in 1995 at the suggestion of Stanford, a retired Army general who had just been hired as superintendent.

Olchefske says he has never found his lack of conventional education credentials to be a problem. "I didn't have to spend any time learning what was. I had to figure out what could be. In that sense, there's a huge advantage for a non-traditional superintendent because ...I could just ask the simple question, 'Why do we do this?'"

He has continued and amplified the program of reform initiated by his predecessor. Following that agenda, the Seattle school system has decentralized its operation. Students can vote with their feet, opting to attend any public school in the system. Schools that fail to attract students run the risk of being closed. (To date, one school has been merged with another and a second merger is under consideration.)

The Seattle school system features a "Freedom Agenda" initiated by Olchefske that allows individual schools filling vacancies to hire teachers according to each school's needs. Any teacher, regardless of seniority, can apply for a position and the school can hire any one who meets the state's standards.

The school system also adopted a "Performance Agenda" with a clear set of standards for students, teachers, and administrators. Olchefske recently described the relationship between the two agendas: "The Freedom Agenda and the Performance Agenda create a tight-loose management model, and the two are inextricably linked.

To start, the Freedom Agenda creates authority and power in schools. It challenges principals and teachers to design and deliver customized education for students and communities. If the reforms stopped there, we would have created chaos. We would have a laissez-faire model where schools are empowered [yet] without guidance and boundaries. This is the reason we implemented the Performance Agenda. It defines the nonnegotiable goals, the standards to which we must hold ourselves. It communicates to teachers and principals where they must end up. In all, the two sets of reforms interact to create the right environment for excellence," Olchefske noted in a recent interview with the Harvard Business School.

"The new meaning of schools" in the 21st century, he says, is based on "a core set of higher level skills that every child has when they leave the system so they can be high-functioning members of an information age economy. And our system was never designed to do that. So, to me, the core purpose is around what I call 'the every child agenda'—how we can create high achievement ... universally because the world, the citizenship, the economy in the 21st century demand it."

Because of attrition and retirements, Olchefske has been able to hire 70 of Seattle's 100 principals and 23 of the top 25 administrators. As a result, he says, there is little resistance at the top to the model he is trying to create. He describes the teacher union as being "progressive," taking positions from "helpful to neutral" on the changes he has sought.

"The biggest problem is 'out there." he says. "It's parents. It's the community. It's our own memory of what school is. 'What do you mean you're not going to have a six-period day? What do you mean you're going to give credits without having to attend a class? What do you mean I have to pass this test or I'm not going to get a diploma? What do you mean I have to go to school longer?"

The superintendency is a political job, Olchefske says, and he defines his role "by saying I only do three things and I need to be expert in three things: I need to be expert at vision and strategy. Number two, I have to be expert in communications in all of its forms—formal and informal. And, third, I need to be expert at personnel and a small number of very important personnel decisions. And everything else I have to hire for."

"I think the key thing is the ability to attract really strong people and being unabashed about hiring them."

Olchefske works six days a week, typically from 8 a.m. until 10 p.m. Last year (2001-02), he attended 85 PTA meetings to present his vision and to explain the changes the system was making.

Prior to joining the school system, Olchefske was an investment banker with Piper Jaffray in Seattle. He says he took a 50 percent pay cut to come to work for the school system, a decision he says he regrets only when paying his bills.

"The work continues to be truly beyond complex," he says. "I do believe that it's the most difficult job that exists given its complexity, but this is the hell I chose. I'm enjoying it. I don't have any trouble getting up in the morning."

Academically, the changes he has instituted seem to be paying off. Reading and math scores for fourth, seventh, and tenth graders have all improved since he took the helm in Seattle. Perhaps as a result, his lack of education credentials, he says is "increasingly an irrelevant criterion. I think really the test is around the leadership capabilities of the person, the vision that they can bring and the energy and discipline that they can bring to accomplish that vision. And one of the things I'm proudest of is that people don't consider me a non-educator anymore."

No good deed goes unpunished, however. Olchefske's tenure in Seattle has drawn its share of controversy and problems. In October 2002, he disclosed that the district had overspent its 2001-02 budget by $22 million and faced a shortfall in 2002-03 of $12 million. Some within the school system tried to nudge him toward the exit door but in early November the school board voted to retain him as superintendent. The board—and much of the Seattle community—sees him as a man who solves a lot more problems than he causes.

Epilogue: On April 14, 2003, Mr. Olchefske resigned as Seattle's Superintendent, saying the $34 million financial shortfall that occurred on his watch created an environment so toxic it detracted from his ability to lead the district effectively. What appears to have happened is that Olchefske's agenda of uniformly high expectations for every child roiled the Seattle Education Association, which bided its time until news of the district's financial problems surfaced, then pounced. According to the ***Seattle Post-Intelligencer****, "The financial crisis quickly became a lightning rod for a broad range of gripes about everything from standardized report cards to Olchefske's leadership style and his hiring of principals." The outsider's perspective that gave Olchefske a clear-eyed view of the system's needs and fresh approaches to meeting them also got him branded as one who didn't appreciate the "culture of education."*

Vanessa Ward

Principal, Omega School of Excellence, Dayton, Ohio

Vanessa Ward did not set out to found a charter school, or any school, for that matter. Her original plan was much less ambitious: to run an after-school program where children could be tutored and helped to strengthen the weak spots in their education. From there, it just grew.

Although Reverend Ward has worked in education for two decades, she did not rise to her current position through the regular public K-12 system. An ordained minister with a master's degree in theological studies from the United Theological Seminary in Dayton, Ohio, Ward worked at the seminary as director of trans-cultural studies and taught a course on trans-cultural globalization.

At the same time, she served as director of Christian education in the Omega Baptist Church, where her husband, Daryl, is the pastor. She also supervised an after-school program for children in the church "and realized that the time we spent with the children was not sufficient. The kids were coming with such poor skills that we really couldn't get into helping them. And so, in that frustration, we said we actually needed to do more than this after-school program. We actually needed to start a school." She was asked to form a task force to study the issue and come up with a proposal.

Out of that effort, the Omega School of Excellence emerged. It is a public charter school (in Ohio they're called "community schools") with an annual budget of about $1.2 million.

The school has a mission: "Our focus is to prepare leaders for the 21st century. And that's a big task. The whole sense of getting students academically prepared plus emotionally and with a sense of commitment and responsibility to their community is of the essence for me. That's what I do all day in my ministry: empower people to make a difference. And I don't think you start when they graduate from high school, but you really start with them when they're young."

Vanessa Ward was the founder and is now principal of Omega, which opened in 2000 with 93 students in grades five and six. In its second year, the enrollment grew to 147 students and a seventh grade was added. In 2002-03, an eighth grade was added along with another 53 students. Eventually, the school will have about 240 students. Classes range in size from eighteen to 20 students. It's a secular public school, current-

ly housed within the building used by Omega Baptist Church—a building that, not long ago, was occupied by Temple Israel.

Students at Omega attend school from 7:30 a.m. until 4:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday and until 3:30 p.m. on Friday. Rev. Ward's school is built around the well-known KIPP (Knowledge Is Power Program) model developed by Michael Feinberg and David Levin.

Omega started with a dean of instruction with 30 years of experience in the Dayton school system, and she reports to Rev. Ward. That person has become dean of students and the school now also has a curriculum director and a part-time school treasurer to handle its finances.

One of the gaps in her experience as principal of Omega, Rev. Ward says, is her lack of previous management background. "This is a business. It's a startup business. I think most persons who are in education don't necessarily come with those gifts—managing budgets and forecasting, insuring that you're making the best decisions fiscally to allow a startup business to survive."

She says she tries to deal with her lack of management experience by looking to "people who know what they're doing, having resources, finding those resources, soliciting their support, bringing on a team of people who can carry this through. By having a treasurer who has experience and is assured of having really clean audits, good books. That's a great blessing that I think a number of schools have challenges with."

She also looks to her board for advice and support and has sought assistance from Dayton's School Resource Center, which provides management support for charter schools. She also took a ten-week course in management at the Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce.

Ward says that not coming through the education establishment is both strength, and a weakness. "I basically don't know what can't be done. I don't have the limitation of 'Well, we did it that way before and it didn't work.' I actually believe that every kid can learn and should learn. There are times when I feel like that's the motivation and it takes us to the next level and there are times when I feel like I'm out here by myself, that maybe what I'm thinking is not realistic or what I'm aiming for can't be done. But then there's a part of me that says it has to be done."

Ward estimates that more than three quarters of her time is spent with students, parents, teachers, and the community, "working through a mission, first of all defining it and shaping it. I'm a builder. My husband and I have been blessed, ... to start things

from nothing, literally with a vision and an idea and a commitment and passion and work really hard, roll up our sleeves and do it."

Her own children attended a prestigious private school in Dayton. "What I saw that my kids had—the education they had—was excellent; the teachers they had are excited; the teachers go above and beyond expectations to make sure that their students learn. And I said, 'Why can't that be possible?' I mean every child deserves that, whether their parents are able to finance it or not. They deserve it. I really keep before me what I've seen happen in that school as a model. ... And whenever I think about what can be done and I push the mark a little bit, it's because that's the benchmark for me. The teachers do give those extra hours and it's not all about their salaries, and it's not all about people being there because it's a safe place. They're there because it's a place where everybody wants their kids to be there. You know they pay for it. They pay tuition for their kids to be there. And I'm getting that here at the Omega School. The parents are here because they want their kids here. And, therefore, they make the effort. When I say we're having a parent-teacher conference, I have 97 percent show up for those. Parents are responding. It's a community of support that I had always heard was not present in the public schools—but I'm getting it."

Is Omega's experience unique or can it be replicated? "I think it's universally applicable. If you have teachers who want to do it, parents who want to do it and students who start living up to the expectations because you keep raising the bar and saying this is where you need to get. You don't lower it. You keep it up and you tell them to keep moving—encourage them."

Despite the resentment that some in the education establishment feel toward reform efforts such as charter schools, Vanessa Ward sees "great change happening, even in our local area." The Dayton Public School System is in the midst of a major reform initiative that would not have happened without the pressure exerted by the charter schools. Almost 20 percent of Dayton's K-12 students go to charter schools like Omega. Despite the claims from some in the traditional system that charter schools are stealing their money and children, Ward makes it clear that she's not negative toward public schools. "I just want all of us to do a better job," she says. Because Ward cares deeply about Dayton's children she has decided to do more than just talk about reform. She is now helping to lead it.

Certification Of Public-School Administrators

A Summary Of State Practices

By Emily Feistritzer, President

The National Center for Education Information

States bear responsibility for certifying (or licensing) public school personnel and they go about this in varied ways. For the past two decades, the National Center for Education Information (NCEI) has been tracking and reporting on their approaches to teacher certification, particularly "alternative" routes. That information has had a significant impact on the widening movement to bring people from careers other than education into public-school teaching posts.

Drawing upon that experience, in July-October 2002, with support from the Broad Foundation and the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, NCEI set out to determine what states are doing regarding certification of principals and superintendents. Data came from a thorough telephone and email survey of state certification officials. We asked them to describe the regular routes for certifying school administrators as well as activities (if any) concerning alternatives by which nontraditional candidates might become certified to lead public schools and school systems. If a state reported that it had some form of alternative route for administrators, we obtained a description of entry and completion requirements. We also queried respondents about the degree of interest (if any) evident in their states regarding the idea of bringing nontraditional candidates into public-school leadership positions—and the degree of interest among such people in leading public schools and school systems.

Other survey questions included:

- Is the state experiencing a principal and/or superintendent demand/supply problem?
- How many new administrator certificates (for principal and superintendent) has the state issued in each of the last five years?
- How many new principals and superintendents have actually been hired in the state during each of the last five years?
- Does the state issue any kind of certification waivers for public-school leaders?

Among the more interesting findings:

- As yet, there is no general move afoot to bring people from outside the ranks of traditional educators into school leadership positions, although some large urban school systems have begun to do this at the superintendent's level and a number of states have begun to create alternative pathways for certifying principals and superintendents.
- Eleven states report having alternate routes of various kinds for both principals and superintendents: California, Idaho, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts,

Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Ohio (not used), Tennessee (not used), and Texas (only for people who have been teachers and/or principals). Three additional states – New Jersey, New York, and Oregon – say they don't have alternate routes but actually have programs by which nontraditional candidates may get into administration jobs.

- Four states (Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, and Kansas) have alternate routes for superintendents, but not for principals.
- State certification officials report that many other jurisdictions are "thinking about" alternative routes for school administrators, due primarily to interest expressed by elected officials and the success of alternative routes for teachers. Nearly all states are also considering the possibility of bringing nontraditional candidates into the system as principals and superintendents. Licensing officials report, however, that there is little interest in such innovations at the local level. (This pretty much mirrors the sentiment regarding alternative routes for teachers in the late 1980s.)
- In general, states report no serious shortage of school administrators. However, some are encountering spot shortages, particularly in urban and rural areas. Some states also expressed concerns about the quality of people in school administrator positions. (See table 1 for more details).
- States report they are issuing far more administrator certificates than they have people actually seeking to lead schools and school districts. Many such certificates appear to be going to teachers seeking higher pay. (See table 2 for more details).
- Nearly all states require that public-school administrators have prior teaching and/or related experience in K-12 schools. This follows from the states' view that principals are "instructional leaders," not "CEO's".
- Regular certification routes for principals and superintendents consist, for the most part, of post-graduate programs in university departments of school leadership or school administration. These programs vary considerably, however, in requirements for entry, content, duration and exit. For example, some require internships while others rely solely on coursework. Some require exit tests or assessments, though most do not.
- Two states (Michigan and South Dakota) do not require certification of either principals or superintendents. Five additional states (Florida, Hawaii, North Carolina, Tennessee and Wyoming) as well as the District of Columbia do not

issue certificates to superintendents. In all these states, local districts set their own requirements, although these tend to resemble what other states require through traditional certification.

- Hawaii has an alternate route for principals, but not for its superintendent. (Hawaii has only one school district.) Florida passed legislation in 2002 giving local school boards authority to set their own alternative qualifications for persons wishing to become principals.
- Most of the extant alternate route programs are controlled and operated by colleges and universities.
- Very few candidates are going through any of the alternate route programs for administrators that states say they have.

The full survey, and supporting data and analysis, are available at www.ncei.com.

Table 1: State by state overview of administrator certification*

State	1) Is state experiencing a shortage of school adminstrators?	2) Does state require certification for principals and/or superintendents?		3) Does state have certification waivers for school administrators?	4) Does state have alternate routes to certification for principals and/or superintendents?
		Principals	Superintendents		
Alabama	Some	Yes	Yes	No	Thinking about
Alaska	Maybe future	Yes	Yes	No	No
Arizona	Not aware	Yes	Yes	No	No
Arkansas	Maybe future	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
California	Some areas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes - New 2002 law, not yet implemented
Colorado	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes (Superintendents)
Connecticut	No	Yes	Yes	No	Discussing
Delaware	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Discussing
District of Columbia	No	Yes (since 2000)	No	No	No
Florida	Maybe future	Yes	No	No	2002 law gives local school districts discretion to set their own alternative qualifications for persons wishing to become principals.
Georgia	Maybe future	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (Superintendents)
Hawaii	Yes (Principals)	Yes	No	No	Yes (Principals)
Idaho	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (Limited Approval Alternatives)	Yes
Illinois	Yes - Some	Yes	Yes	n/a	Yes (Superintendents)
Indiana	No	Yes	Yes	No (Emergency)	No
Iowa	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (Conditional)	Proposed
Kansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes (Superintendents) - New, started in 2002
Kentucky	No	Yes	Yes	Not available	Yes
Louisiana	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes (Superintendents)	No
Maine	Yes - Some	Yes	Yes	Yes (Principals)	No
Maryland	Yes (Principals)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (Principals)
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Michigan	No data; Not applicable	No 2/	No 2/	No	No
Minnesota	Yes - Some	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Summary

State	1) Is state experiencing a shortage of school adminstrators?	2) Does state require certification for principals and/or superintendents?		3) Does state have certification waivers for school administrators?	4) Does state have alternate routes to certification for principals and/or superintendents?
		Principals	Superintendents		
Mississippi	Yes - Small	Yes	Yes	No (formerly called Emergency)	Yes (for entry-level only - Assistant Principals)
Missouri	Quality Issues	Yes	Yes	No	No
Montana	Not available	Yes	Yes	No	No
Nebraska	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Nevada	No	Yes	No 4/	No	No
New Hampshire	Yes (Principals)	Yes	Yes	Yes (Permission to Employ - rarely used)	Yes
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes (says no)
New Mexico	Yes - Some	Yes	Yes	Yes (few)	No
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (Superintendent)	Yes (says no)
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	No	No (Provisional)	No
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (not used)	No
Ohio	Yes (Principals)	Yes	Yes	Not available	Yes
Oklahoma	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Oregon	No data	Yes	Yes	Yes (Exceptional)	Yes (says no)
Pennsylvania	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (Emergency)	No
Rhode Island	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (Crossover & Emergency)	No
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (Permit)	Discussing - no need
South Dakota	No	No 5/	No 5/	Not applicable	No
Tennessee	No	Yes	No	Yes (Permit)	Yes (Principals)
Texas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Utah	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (Letter of Authorization)	No
Vermont	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Considering
Virginia	Yes (Principals)	Yes	Yes	No (Provisional)	Yes (Superintendents)
Washington	Not available	Yes	No	No	No
West Virginia	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Wisconsin	Yes (Superintendents) Principals - No, but Quality Issues	Yes	Yes	No (temporary Administrator License for Superintendent)	No

State	1) Is state experiencing a shortage of school adminstrators?	2) Does state require certification for principals and/or superintendents?		3) Does state have certification waivers for school administrators?	4) Does state have alternate routes to certification for principals and/or superintendents?
		Principals	Superintendents		
Wyoming	No -but Quality Issues	Yes	No	Yes (Principals)	No

* This information was provided by state licensing officials from July-October 2002. This is a rapidly changing area. The full report on which this table is based can be found at the National Center for Education Information web site <http://www.ncei.com/>.

1/ Massachusetts -- Local school districts are reluctant to seriously consider non-traditional candidates to fill school administrator positions.

2/ Since 1999, Michigan has not had any state certification of principals or superintendents.

3/ Minnesota -- This alternate route has been used for superintendents; not thus far for principals.

4/ Nevada issues Administrative Endorsements to both principals and superintendents, but a superintendent may serve without either an endorsement or teacher license. State law allows a district to hire a superintendent without these credentials, but a fully qualified district official must handle duties such as supervision of licensed personnel).

5/ In 1995, the South Dakota state legislature repealed the requirement that principals and superintendents be certified.

Table 2: Certificates issued and school administrators employed*

State	1) Number of public schools 2000-01*	2) Average number of initial principal certificates issued per year, 1998-2002**	3) Number of School Districts 2000-01*	4) Average number of initial superintendent certificates issued per year, 1998-2002**
Alabama	1,508	516	128	n/a
Alaska	513	n/a	53	n/a
Arizona	1,652	n/a	410	n/a
Arkansas	1,133	n/a	310	n/a
California	8,570	1,914	985	n/a
Colorado	1,611	n/a	176	n/a
Connecticut	1,167	n/a	166	n/a
DC	184	n/a	19	n/a
Delaware	165	n/a	1	n/a
Florida	3,300	3,769	67	n/a
Georgia	1,946	n/a	180	n/a
Hawaii	261	n/a	1	n/a
Idaho	672	n/a	115	n/a
Illinois	4,092	1,318	894	129
Indiana	1,946	n/a	295	n/a
Iowa	1,534	n/a	374	n/a
Kansas	1,430	304	304	88
Kentucky	1,526	599	176	71
Louisiana	1,503	642	78	36
Maine	697	n/a	282	n/a
Maryland	1,383	46	24	35
Massachusetts	1,602	n/a	349	n/a
Michigan	3,840	n/a	734	n/a
Minnesota	2,108	n/a	415	n/a
Mississippi	1,019	287	152	n/a
Missouri	2,285	747	524	102
Montana	873	n/a	453	n/a
Nebraska	1,276	n/a	576	n/a
Nevada	510	n/a	17	n/a
New Hampshire	526	3	178	1
New Jersey	2,319	n/a	604	n/a
New Mexico	765	n/a	89	n/a
New York	4,260	n/a	703	n/a
North Carolina	2,115	214	120	n/a
North Dakota	537	n/a	230	n/a
Ohio	3,787	n/a	662	n/a

State	1) Number of public schools 2000-01*	2) Average number of initial principal certificates issued per year, 1998-2002**	3) Number of School Districts 2000-01*	4) Average number of initial superintendent certificates issued per year, 1998-2002**
Oklahoma	1,821	n/a	544	n/a
Oregon	1,244	253	197	27
Pennsylvania	3,091	n/a	501	n/a
Rhode Island	325	n/a	36	n/a
South Carolina	1,113	n/a	90	n/a
South Dakota	744	n/a	176	n/a
Tennessee	1,624	663	138	n/a
Texas	7,318	n/a	1040	n/a
Utah	791	464	40	n/a
Vermont	330	n/a	288	n/a
Virginia	1,911	n/a	135	n/a
Washington	2,295	435	296	48
West Virginia	824	n/a	55	n/a
Wisconsin	2,154	n/a	431	n/a
Wyoming	382	n/a	48	n/a
TOTAL	90,582	n/a	14,859	n/a

* Data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
** Data from the National Center for Education Information.

The full report on which this table is based can be found at <http://www.ncei.com/>

Better Leaders for America's Schools:

A MANIFESTO

1

the broad foundation

10900 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90024
Telephone: (310) 954-5050
Fax: (310) 954-5051
www.broadfoundation.org

THOMAS B. FORDHAM
INSTITUTE

1627 K St., N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 223-5452
Fax: (202) 223-9226
www.edexcellence.net

To order publications: 1-888-TBF-7474
(single copies are free)

APPENDIX I -- QUESTIONS TO WITNESSES SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY REPRESENTATIVE MAX BURNS AND RESPONSES FROM DR. JERRY ROBBINS, DR. ARTHUR E. WISE, DR. LOUANNE KENNEDY, AND MS. KATI HAYCOCK.

Committee on Education and the Workforce
Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness
Hearing on
"America's Teacher Colleges: Are They Making the Grade"
May 20, 2003

Questions submitted for the record by representative Max Burns:

Having spent over 20 in the college classroom, I am very familiar with higher education. I certainly recognize the need for strong academic content and for teaching future teachers how to teach. Teacher preparation is imperative for a successful educational system. While some colleges and universities focus primarily on pedagogy, others solely stress academic content. How might we encourage a balance between these two important points on the education spectrum?

A number of states have reported a 100 percent pass rate. Is it possible to evaluate states with such a high rate of success, and if so, how?

What are the benefits of accreditation at the national level rather than the state level?

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

BY REPRESENTATIVE MAX BURNS

Representative Max Burns asks:

1. ". . .while some colleges and universities focus primarily on pedagogy [in teacher preparation programs], other solely stress academic content. How might we encourage a balance between these two important points on the education spectrum?"

Response: With all due respect to Representative Burns' assertion, I question the extent to which it is accurate. Almost all (perhaps all) states have some sort of teacher preparation program review and approval process and it is my understanding that no state with such a process would permit a teacher preparation program to be mostly/entirely either "content" or "pedagogy." Certainly such an imbalance could not occur in an NCATE-accredited institution, which directly (and indirectly through its affiliated "professional speciality associations") require preparation programs to have an appropriate balance among general education, content specialty (-ies), and pedagogical/professional studies.

Congressional incentives for state education agencies to have strong, rigorous, well-balanced teacher preparation program approval and periodic re-approval processes would not be inappropriate. Congressional incentives for teacher preparation programs to be NCATE accredited would further address the concern raised in this question.

2. "A number of states have reported a 100 percent pass rate. Is it possible to evaluate states with such a high rate of success, and, if so, how."

Response: My first response is that the teacher test score data that have been gathered and that continue to be gathered under Title II of the HEA have very little meaning. These data come from a variety of tests, even in the same teaching field, that differ appreciably from each other. Further, some of the tests that are in use are "relatively easy" and some are "relatively hard." Most important, the "cut scores" for pass/fail differ considerably among the subject field tests even in the same state and, certainly, among the states. As a result, to compare the results of the test in X field with the test in Y field, even for the same institution, is essentially meaningless. To compare institution A with institution B, even in the same state, is also essentially meaningless, in that one may have many takers of "hard" tests and the other many takers of "easy" tests. To make comparisons across state lines is worse than comparing "apples and oranges."

Unless and until there is some single, relevant, appropriate assessment(s) applied uniformly to all teacher education preparation programs (and alternative routes to entry to the profession) in the country, there is no way that the Congress or anyone else can "evaluate" institutions or states with any strong degree of meaning.

Institutions and states with 100% pass rates should be warmly applauded. These institutions and states are giving a type of "warranty" to the public that should be interpreted as "we are not going to release the student from our program until he/she can demonstrate that she/he knows the content that has been prescribed for this teaching field."

If a school district employer knows that the institution just over the state line in the next state "releases" to become a teacher say, 20% of its students who have not passed a test, but my institution will not "release" a person to become a teacher until she/he has passed the state test, my institution has a great advantage over the other institution in having graduates hired.

Yes, it's very possible to evaluate states that have a high rate of success. A 90% pass rate is reasonably good, a 95% pass rate is even better, a 98% pass rate is better still, and a 100% pass rate is not only best of all, but highly desirable.

3. "What are the benefits of accreditation at the national level rather than the state level?"

Response: P-12 students and their families are highly mobile across state lines. Teachers, too, are mobile across state lines during the course of their careers. It is in the national interest to have good schools and good teachers in all 50 states and other jurisdictions. The quality of teacher preparation should be both high and reasonably consistent across all states. At the present time, essentially the only vehicle for ensuring high and consistent quality across state lines is national accreditation of teacher preparation programs.

The national accreditation of medical schools ensures that the quality of the training received by physicians is essentially the same in all states. The national accreditation of law schools ensures that the quality of the training received by lawyers is essentially the same in all states. One can go through a lengthy list of occupational groups where some accreditation or quasi-accreditation process (even for skilled trades) ensures that the quality of training received by newcomers to that occupational group is essentially the same throughout the United States.

Left to their own devices, the 50 states have ended up with varying quality levels of oversight for teacher preparation programs. Congress seems to be calling for not only higher quality, but greater consistency. National accreditation of teacher education programs is one way to accomplish that.

Jerry Robbins, Dean
College of Education
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI 48197



Copy: Provost Schollaert, Vice President Reid

NCATE
The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20015
202-466-7496 • 202-296-6620 (fax) • www.ncate.org

June 17, 2003

TO: **US House of Representatives Committee on Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness**

FROM: **Arthur E. Wise, President, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education**

RE: **Question Submitted for the Record by Representative Max Burns at the May 20, 2003 Hearing on "America's Teacher Colleges: Are They Making the Grade?"**

Question Submitted for the Record by Representative Max Burns
US House of Representatives Committee on Education and the Workforce
Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness

"Having spent over 20 years in the college classroom, I am very familiar with higher education. I certainly recognize the need for strong academic content and for teaching future teachers how to teach. Teacher preparation is imperative for a successful educational system. While some colleges and universities focus primarily on pedagogy, others solely stress academic content. How might we encourage a balance between these two important points on the education spectrum?

A number of states have reported a 100 percent pass rate. Is it possible to evaluate states with such a high rate of success, and if so, how?

What are the benefits of accreditation at the national level rather than the state level?"

NCATE Accreditation Promotes a Balance of Content and Pedagogy

Content knowledge is one important indicator of readiness to teach. NCATE requires institutions to offer a comprehensive approach to the development and preparation of teachers and other school personnel in order to achieve national accreditation. In 2001, NCATE launched its new performance-based accreditation system, which calls for multiple sources of evidence that candidates have acquired or developed not only content knowledge but also the ability to teach so that students learn. NCATE has content standards in the major disciplines as well as general standards all candidates must master.

NCATE accredited institutions must:

1) Provide evidence based on a comprehensive assessment system that their candidates know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn;
2) Provide assessment results demonstrating that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards;
3) Prepare new teachers to teach the great diversity of students who are in today's classrooms;
4) Prepare new teachers to use technology effectively;
5) Offer more clinical opportunities throughout the candidates' program and sponsor intensive supervised experiences in schools; and,
6) Track the progress of new teachers from admission to graduation and into the first years of teaching.

How Teaching Matters, an ETS study released in October, 2000, finds that teachers' classroom practices greatly influence student achievement, and that more attention needs to be paid to improving classroom practices. Student achievement increases when students have teachers who are trained in developing higher order thinking skills, who are skilled at implementing hands-on experiences in the classroom, and who are trained to work with special populations. The findings support the need for content-specific pedagogy, the 'how to teach' portion of teacher development, and dispels the idea that only subject matter knowledge is necessary in order to teach effectively. Students of teachers who conduct hands-on learning activities outperform their peers by more than 70 percent of a grade level in math and 40 percent of a grade level in science. Students whose teachers have received training in working with special populations outperform their peers by more than a full grade level.

The National Research Council published a report that indicates that teachers must be highly skilled in working with students to develop true understanding of concepts. The level of skill that a teacher must have to ensure student understanding takes time to develop. The Council's study found that teachers must be very skilled at working with students' preexisting and mistaken ideas about how the world works. As students tend to maintain mistaken understandings, even after they have been taught a new model that contradicts the naïve understanding. Studies of young children all the way to physics students at elite colleges confirm this finding.

All of these principles and data provide strong evidence that content knowledge alone, while necessary, is not sufficient knowledge for a teacher today. Clinical practice and professional study are crucial.

Evaluating State Teacher Candidate Licensing Assessment Scores

The seemingly inflated percentage of candidates that pass the state's teacher licensing score may be viewed from two different perspectives. On one hand, it assures the public that the institution has weeded out candidates that cannot pass the state licensing assessment; on the other hand, however, this approach does not address the spirit of the 1998 Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act related to teacher quality. Indeed, most educators and the public–including NCATE–believe that if institutions can not produce a significant majority of teacher candidates able to pass the state licensing examination, it is not providing an adequate preparation program. As well, if the institution is selective in admitting only those candidates that are highly disposed to performing well on the state licensing examination, but do not offer these candidates the necessary knowledge and skills for becoming an effective teacher, the provision designed to assure quality teacher preparation in Title II of the 1998 Higher Education Act does not successfully address the intent of the legislation either. Congress and NCATE want to know that institutions add value by helping candidates to become knowledgeable and effective teachers.

NCATE supports a quality assurance system for the preparation and licensing of the teaching profession to assure quality teachers in our nation's classrooms. A system–similar to other professions–in which the profession (NCATE) accredits the institution based on standards and multiple assessments of its candidates' performance at key transition points throughout the preparation program; and, the state administers a comprehensive series of assessments to determine the individual candidates' knowledge of

the subject matter and his/her ability to teach prior to receiving an licensing verifying that he/she is a highly qualified teacher.

Benefits of NCATE Accreditation

NCATE is not merely an accrediting agency—it is a force for the reform of teacher preparation. As institutions meet the standards of NCATE, they are reforming themselves. NCATE's expectations for teacher preparation institutions are a radical change.

Policymakers are searching for ways to scale up school and higher education reforms occurring in small pockets across America. The U.S. Department of Education and private foundations fund reform projects at P–12 schools and institutions; some of those reforms take hold, others disappear once the funds are gone. The hope, of course, is that reforms that make a difference in student learning will be integrated into the culture of the P–12 classroom—and in higher education. Creating lasting change is a daunting challenge. The advantage of the NCATE system is that it serves to institutionalize reforms. NCATE creates new norms of behavior around reform ideas and concepts in teacher preparation.

NCATE's accreditation has a built-in system of evaluating and re-evaluating its programs and candidates' performance in order to constantly reform and ensure teacher quality. Institutions that engage in the NCATE accreditation process continually renew and improve their programs, for the system is not static. NCATE's philosophy of embracing new ways of thinking, technology and research data demonstrates its dedication to the goal that no child will be left behind.

NCATE recognizes the rightful role of the states in protecting the public interest by assuring the quality of teacher education institutions. To that end, NCATE has entered into partnerships with 48 states, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico to work together in assessing teacher education institutions. The purpose of NCATE's state partnership program is to save states and institutions time and expense by eliminating duplication of effort and paperwork in conducting state approval and NCATE accreditation reviews of teacher education institutions jointly. As well, it is often challenging for states to conduct objective reviews when faced with conflict of interest concerns or the pure politics of issuing an adverse decision about an institution with influential alumni.

The program has also created an alignment between state teacher education standards and NCATE's national, professional standards for teacher preparation. NCATE standards are closely aligned with state teacher education standards due—in large part—to the relationship between NCATE and its partner states. States are accepting NCATE standards or using them to jump start their own standard-setting process. In fact, many states already rely on NCATE's accreditation findings when making decisions about approving teacher education institutions. This saves the state significant time and expense, while ensuring that high and rigorous standards are applied to the states' teacher education institutions.

References

Donovan, M.S., Bransford, J. D., and Pellegrino, J.W., Eds. *How people learn: bridging research and practice*. National Academy Press, National Research Council. Washington, D.C. 1999

Mitchell, K.J., Robinson, D.Z., Plake, B.S., and Knowles, K.T. Eds. *Testing Teacher Candidates: The Role of Licensure Tests in Improving Teacher Quality*. National Research Council. Washington, D.C., National Academy Press 2001

Response by: Louanne Kennedy

Committee on Education and the Workforce
Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness
Hearing on
"America's Teacher Colleges: Are They Making the Grade"

Questions submitted for the record by representative Max Burns

Response by: Louanne Kennedy
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
California State University, Northridge

Question 1: Having spent over 20 years in the college classroom, I am very familiar with higher education. I certainly recognize the need for strong academic content and for teaching future teachers how to teach. Teacher preparation is imperative for a successful educational system. While some colleges and universities focus primarily on pedagogy, others solely stress academic content. How might we encourage a balance between these two important points on the education spectrum?

Several models for teacher education programs have been created to provide future teachers with a balance between knowledge of subject matter and skills in pedagogy. One such effort, Project 30, is a consortium of thirty universities that are working together to encourage a greater role for the arts and sciences in teacher education and collaboration between arts and sciences faculty and education faculty. It has become increasingly clear that the best assessment of a teacher candidate's understanding of concepts in the arts and sciences is a test of the candidate's ability to explain these concepts to a group of students in an age appropriate manner. Dr. Lee Shulman of the Carnegie Foundation and others have developed the idea of "pedagogical content knowledge," in which pedagogical skill is understood to be related directly to mastery of subject matter. For example, a teacher needs to understand a work of literature deeply enough to be able to teach the book to students of different backgrounds and different experiences in literary study. At the university, arts and sciences faculty need to understand the pedagogical skills required to teach subject matter concepts, and education faculty need to join with their colleagues in the arts and sciences in integrating pedagogy and subject matter content.

The idea of "pedagogical content knowledge" is being discussed broadly across the nation. There is already a sizeable bibliography that includes such titles as *Knowing and Teaching Elementary Mathematics* and *Teachers' Knowledge of Subject Matter As It Relates to Their Teaching Practice.* However, it will take a more concentrated effort to bring arts and sciences faculty and education faculty more closely together in this discussion. Leaders of regional and national organizations within the academic disciplines and within the field of education must be enlisted to provide opportunities for exploration and discussion of "pedagogical content knowledge." Accreditation agencies could also be helpful in bridging the gap between the arts and sciences and the field of pedagogy.

Response by: Louanne Kennedy

The Carnegie Corporation has recently funded four universities including California State University, Northridge (CSUN) to develop models that use pedagogical content knowledge as one of the bases of teacher preparation. Here at CSUN, several courses are co-taught by faculty from the Arts and Sciences and Education so that teacher candidates learn the content and at the same time learn the methodology for conveying that content to K-12 students. The integration of content and pedagogy throughout the curriculum of beginning teachers is critical to the success of that teacher. After granting a teaching credential, the university must follow the beginning teacher for the first two years in the K-12 classroom so the University can help in areas where either content or pedagogy is found wanting. CSUN sponsors such programs and follows our graduates so they can receive "just on time" assistance in preparing their pupils to perform at expected levels. High standards, immersion of teachers in pedagogical content knowledge, and support for beginning teachers are the minimum components of a successful teacher preparation program. Ultimately, pupil learning is the proper accountability measure of the university's success in preparing teachers.

Since Congressman Burns has experience in the college classroom, he is aware of the separation that often occurs between Arts and Sciences Colleges and Education Colleges. These barriers can be broken down through financial support that frees faculty from both areas to engage together in the study of pedagogical content knowledge. The Title II grant received by California State University made our successful work possible. We now jointly prepare elementary teachers in content and pedagogy by bringing together groups of faculty from all relevant disciplines to develop the curriculum. We have similar success in preparing Math and English secondary teachers and are moving forward to include other disciplines in secondary teacher preparation. The California State University system, the largest system in the United States, surveys all of its beginning teachers as well as their principals to evaluate how well they have mastered methodology and content. Curriculum revisions are made when the results of these surveys indicate the need to do so. At California State University, Northridge, we are moving beyond these surveys to evaluate teacher performance and our preparation of teachers by direct measures of K-12 pupil learning. This is not an easy task but one that all universities preparing teachers must undertake.

Question 2: A number of states have reported a 100 percent pass rate. Is it possible to evaluate states with such a high rate of success, and if so, how?

At present, the states determine their own assessment of teacher education programs, teacher candidates, and practicing teachers. California, for example, requires that prospective elementary school teachers pass a state mandated reading examination, but there is no requirement for prospective middle and high school teachers. The states vary in their decisions on who should be assessed, what skills or knowledge should be assessed, and what level of proficiency is minimally acceptable. Many of the states in fact have agreed to adopt the standards of NCATE. Whatever standards are followed should be based upon the achievement of the pupils in the K-12 classrooms. However, we are just now beginning to understand the importance of linking the teacher education

program, the performance of teachers in the K-12 classrooms, and the achievement of pupils in the K-12 classes. We are starting pilot projects on collecting and analyzing the data that will help to assess the effectiveness of teacher education as reflected in the achievement of pupils in the K-12 classes.

There is always a possibility that a 100% pass rate on a teacher qualifying examination in a particular state indicates an exceptionally high level of teacher preparation. However, many of our current performance tests target only minimum competency. The important measure we have yet to create will correlate K-12 pupil performance with adequacy in teaching and adequacy in teacher preparation. The best indication of whether pass rates by beginning teachers have real meaning will be the success of their K-12 pupils in meeting high standards.

3. What are the benefits of accreditation at the national level rather than at the state level?

At present, most accreditation in the United States is performed regionally, offering accreditation to entire institutions, or nationally, offering accreditation to individual disciplines or professional programs. Most institutional accreditation in the Western United States is performed by WASC, the regional accrediting body for California, Hawaii, and Guam.

There are several advantages in using this regional and national approach: 1) it is highly cost effective since it relies on peer review rather than oversight by state agencies, 2) it assures high levels of reliability since reviewers work voluntarily and under the accreditors' conflict of interest policies, and 3) it advances regional and national standards, assuring that quality is not sacrificed to local interests and expediencies.

In some regions of the country, the number of unaccredited institutions exceeds the number of accredited institutions, although all of them possess some sort of state permission for their operation. States do perform an important function in quality assurance through their licensing function, but as a state-based function licensure is limited to minimal requirements for state operation and is typically performed by state employees, who may or may not have particular expertise in judging the quality of higher education programs.

Another state-level process for quality assurance lies in state certification of teachers and approval of teacher-training programs. In California, these processes are performed by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Agencies or commissions such as CTC are organized around specific standards and typically have no external oversight, though they may have in-state boards. They tend to define specific curricula and outcomes for teacher training programs within the state, and approval by these agencies is required for programs to operate in the state. Teaching standards commissions in the various states follow different criteria and approaches to measuring program success.

National teacher accreditation is something different. While it presumes programs have met the standards of their state certification commissions, it works to establish national

standards and benchmarks and to develop the profession of teacher education as a whole. It operates with more rigorous standards, requires improvement of performance, and considers benchmarks that measure an individual institution against a broad national review of institutional performance.

Accreditation in the United States is a unique system of quality assurance, although many countries are now exploring the possibility of emulating our American model. It offers a cost-effective, objective way for experts to engage in peer review with official governmental recognition but without the need for expensive and intrusive governmental control. The preparation of teachers, like the preparation of physicians, is best judged by other qualified and independent professionals, and accrediting bodies, such as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, seek to offer a broad, national perspective of teacher and pupil performance. As accreditation is increasingly emphasizing pupil performance as the means for judging institutional effectiveness, the need for national norms and a national approach to quality assurance in teacher education will be even greater.

Response of Kati Haycock, Director, Education Trust

To questions submitted for the record by Representative Max Burns

June 17, 2003

1. ***Balancing Content and Pedagogy***. My own experiences with teacher preparation programs have convinced me of a general tendency to short content, rather than pedagogy. But I'll grant that it is possible to err in the opposite direction. The best possible protection against an imbalance between the two is probably a licensure exam that probes deeply into a prospective teacher's knowledge in both areas—in truth, what probably matters most is what is often called "pedagogical content knowledge". Rigorous accreditation processes that carefully examine what preparation programs do in both content and pedagogy could also help.

2. ***100 Percent Pass Rates.*** In most of the states where large numbers of institutions have 100 percent pass rates, it is because either state or institutional leaders have allowed colleges to withold their final approval of the teachers they produce until they pass all relevant licensure exams. So 100 percent doesn't mean that every student who completed all of the other requirements for certification—the coursework, student teaching and the like—passed the exam. Bottom line is that this practice completely guts what Congress intended. Hopefully, this problem will be fixed during this reauthorization. Several fixes are necessary. First, institutions that test only at the point of admission must be required to administer another test upon completion, so value added can be measured at the institutional level. Second, all students who complete at least one year of teacher preparation should be included in each institution's pass rate calculation. Finally, states that have pass rates consistently above 90 percent should be asked to reexamine their standards and assessments to make sure that they really do represent what teachers need to know to teach students to high standards.

3. ***National vs. State Accreditation.*** This question might be better addressed by someone else, because we are not big fans of accreditation as it is currently practiced at either the national or the state level. Presumably, of course, a national process should help to pull standards upward in states that tend to expect very little. That would have to be its chief virtue. But some states—including, for example, Louisiana—have shown that there is real value-added in state-level institutional reviews, as well. These can focus much more effectively on assuring that teachers being trained within a state are learning exactly what they need to know to teach to state standards—including how to access the key resources provided within the state.

APPENDIX J -- WRITTEN STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY REPRESENTATIVE BETTY MCCOLLUM

Statement on 21st Century Subcommittee Hearing on Reauthorization of Title II of Higher Education Act

Congresswoman Betty McCollum

May 20, 2003

Today, we will review Title II of the Higher Education Act, which provides grants for the improvement of teacher quality and holds schools of education accountable for the caliber of their graduates. This important hearing will give us an opportunity to examine this legislation and learn about how we can expand opportunities for teacher education institutions and states to better prepare teachers for the classroom and produce learning results for all children.

As states, local school districts and public schools struggle to meet the mandates of *No Child Left Behind*, the availability of high-quality teachers is more important than ever. To fulfill the requirement that teachers in every classroom are highly qualified by the end of the 2004-2005 school year, we must build on efforts to improve teacher education programs and ensure that all states have high standards for these programs and teacher certification. Further, we must continue to recognize that teachers must possess a comprehensive set of skills and knowledge to help every student succeed. We must not only measure the quality of a teacher by the level of their content knowledge, but we must also guarantee that teachers have the skills necessary to respond to the unique needs of each and every student.

Fortunately, Minnesota is ahead of the curve in the efforts to ensure that all students have quality teachers. In 2001, the Minnesota Board of Teaching adopted redesigned initial teacher licensing standards. These include both content mastery and pedagogical skills and knowledge standards for initial licensure to be acquired in approved teacher preparation programs. Minnesota leads the nation in teachers teaching in the subjects for which they are qualified – currently 93% of teachers teach in their content area. Minnesota public school teachers are the most qualified in the country – in a study that used 12 indicators of teacher qualification, Minnesota ranked first.

States such as Minnesota must be rewarded for showing real results. Our efforts to improve standards for teacher education and certification must not end at getting all states up to par. It is vital that we provide opportunities for states such as Minnesota to continue to improve their programs and act as models for the nation. I look forward to working with my colleagues to improve Title II of the Higher Education Act and meeting the goal of placing qualified teachers in every classroom.

APPENDIX K -- LETTER SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD FROM DR. DARYAO S. KHARTI AND DR. ANNE O. HUGHES

Committee on Education and the Workforce
U.S. House of Representatives
2181 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Attn: Mr. Rich Stombres, Professional Staff Member

Dear Mr. Stombres,

It was very good talking to you after the hearing on "America's Teacher Colleges: Are They Making the Grade?" was adjourned on May 20, 2003. I really enjoyed the testimonies of the experts in this field of teacher training. While, many of the witnesses spoke about their role in the training of teachers in teacher colleges, there was not much in the way of offering a solution(s) to the preparation and lack of qualified teachers in the city schools of America that are facing diversity of enormous proportional. What I heard were the same old remedies, and how great they were.

However, I am very pleased that a number of committee members asked some tough questions of the witnesses in the area of teacher preparation, but the answers provided by the witnesses were vague and self-serving. What was appalling to me was the absence of real classroom teachers in the witness chair. I would have liked to see some real teachers on the witness stand who face these problems on a daily basis and then could describe the extent to which their experiences at a teacher college prepared or did not prepare them for their classrooms.

In any event, let me introduce myself. I am a professor in the department of physics at the University of the District of Columbia. In this position, I have taught courses in physics, computer science, and mathematics to a completely diverse student body at many levels of the degree programs. I am a member of a team of professors who have researched the problems of student attrition, particularly in math, science and engineering, lack of rigor in teacher preparation, and the pedagogical techniques that work with diverse student population. Of course, these techniques will work with almost any population. The experiences in the use of these pedagogical techniques and the successes we had with student retention are documented in our first book, *American Education Apartheid—Again?* by Drs. Daryao S. Khatri and Anne O. Hughes. This book also includes a compressed teaching model for teacher training. This model is fully

expanded in our upcoming book, *The New American Teacher* (to be published by December 2003).

Here is our (Drs. Khatri and Hughes) position in regard to this very important issue of preparing qualified teachers and what can be done to address it.

Based on our knowledge of the education courses that are required for secondary level teaching certification in our local universities, we know that a minimum of 18 to 24 credit hours are required of candidates who already have a baccalaureate degree in a recognized discipline. We contend that much of the content included in these education courses is not really preparing a prospective teacher for actual classroom teaching. This situation is further aggravated when students to be taught come from different cultures and/or are poor.

In addition, training in technology is listed as a 1-3 credit course in a limited number of institutions and still seems to have a minor role in preparing teachers for certification. This practice is completely contrary to what is going on in the society and in most of the public schools where technology is taking on an increasingly greater role in teaching and learning. The colleges of education seemingly are "out of sync" with the school clientele who they are trying to serve.

Moreover, the colleges of education throughout the country, and specifically those preparing teachers for inner-city schools, have come under severe criticisms from all segments of the American society for several reasons: lack of rigor in teacher preparation, irrelevancy of many of the courses they teach to new teachers, and the length of the training program for content-qualified professionals seeking teacher certification..

We also contend that another reason why these professionals can be prepared in 2 1/2 months in the proposed teaching model is because individuals who are content-trained and have declared their intention to teach bring with them social and academic skills that are critical in the successful teaching process. Such skills are often overlooked in the teaching of traditional teacher certification. Among these skills are: confidence in their ability to learn, adaptability, enthusiasm, solid verbal ability to communicate, ease in dealing with people, time management and study skills, etc. In our experience, we have discovered that such skills are the prerequisites for successful pedagogical training

in our model and ultimately for successful classroom teaching because they allow the compressed training to be completed in a limited time period.

Our proposal, therefore, is to support efforts by teacher training institutions or other entities for "Alternative Teaching Certification" that can grant provisional certification for content-qualified professionals in a limited time of approximately 2 ½ months when the program is carried out on a full-time basis, every day of the week. This proposal is predicated on the assumption that only teachers and a supportive environment around students in the school can cure the problems of student failure. Supportive parents are great to have, but we must teach all students whether they have supportive parents or not. Absence of interested parents in a student's academic life cannot be an excuse for not teaching that student.

TABLE OF INDEXES

Chairman McKeon, 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35
Mr. Carter, 30, 31
Mr. Cole, 18, 19, 21
Mr. Ehlers, 22, 23, 24
Mr. Gingrey, 26, 28
Mr. Kildee, 4, 6, 21, 22
Mr. Owens, 6, 28, 29, 30
Mr. Payne, 34, 35
Mr. Robbins, 14, 20, 21, 26, 29, 33
Mr. Tierney, 32, 33, 34
Mr. Van Hollen, 35
Mr. Wise, 11, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28, 33
Mrs. McCarthy, 25, 26
Ms. Coppin, 17, 20, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34
Ms. Haycock, 9, 19, 28, 32, 34, 35
Ms. Keegan, 7, 19, 22, 27, 31, 32, 34
Ms. Kennedy, 13, 20, 29, 33