

# LEADING TO CAMPUS PLANS

- RESPONDING TO EMERGING FEDERAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS
- RESPONDING TO DEREGULATION PROPOSALS
- RESPONDING TO STATE ACTIONS FOR HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS
- RESPONDING TO EFFORTS TO CHANGE TITLE II (HEA)

No Child Left Behind Seminar



## RESPONDING TO EMERGING FEDERAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION:

---

*U.S. Education Secretary Rod Paige makes a number of recommendations in his annual report regarding education schools<sup>1</sup>. He urges that states:*

- Support alternative routes
- End the exclusive franchise of education schools
- Reduce the number of mandated or prescribed courses
- Make education school enrollment optional for teacher candidates

*He bases his recommendations on four claims or assertions:*

- Education school coursework fails to contribute to K-12 student learning
- Licensure discourages more talented candidates from entering the profession
- Alternative routes bring more and more high quality candidates to teaching
- Verbal ability and content knowledge matter most as qualifications for teaching

It seems imperative that each state association mount an aggressive campaign to rebut each of the claims and frame a policy proposal that asserts the importance of “traditional” teacher education. Such efforts have to be data driven and evidence based and lead to policies for state action.

*Given that the Paige assertions are likely to lead to similar claims by state policy makers:*

- Is it important to address these claims on your campus?
- Who is likely to voice these claims and what will be the consequence?
- If you decide to rebut these assertions do you attack all four claims simultaneously or separately?
- How would you prioritize the claims in terms of the one needing immediate attention?
- Is there evidence from previous studies in your state that can bolster your argument?
- Is there research underway or planned that will address these claims on your campus?
- Who should take the lead in addressing each claim?
- What is the researchable question?
- How do you gain policy maker and reporter confidence in the integrity of the findings?
- Are you prepared to deal with the consequences if the findings are found to support the Paige assertion?

---

<sup>1</sup> Paige, R. (2002) Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education

## RESPONDING TO DEREGULATION PROPOSALS

---

University of Virginia Assistant Professor Frederick Hess has offered a proposal for deregulating teacher licensure and eliminating state program approval.<sup>2</sup> His proposal has been given a great deal of attention by the Bush administration, featured at the White House Conference on Teacher Education, and included as the major policy recommendation in the U.S. Education Secretary's recent report on teacher quality. He suggests that state agencies (and, I presume, independent standards boards) should streamline state licensure systems. That streamlining should result in a system that is restricted to guaranteeing that applicants for teaching:

- Have no criminal record
- Have completed a degree program in an academic subject taught in a K-12 school
- Have passed a test of essential knowledge and skills

The Hess recommendations must not go unanswered. Do you defend the current system of licensure and program approval? Do you describe an ideal system? Could national accreditation serve as a substitute for state program approval? Is there a value added to program approval? Is there a value added to national accreditation? Do the multiple licensures used by the state advantage or disadvantage your programs? Would the proposed new system protect children?

### *Questions and Considerations:*

- Is this the time to study the issue?
- Do you commission a study group to address this issue? If so, who do you invite to join you in the effort?
- What is the evidence that you need to show that professional licensure matters?
- How will you build an evidentiary base to gain the necessary information?

---

<sup>2</sup> Hess, F. (2001) *Tear Down This Wall: The Case for a Radical Overhaul of Teacher Certification*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.

## RESPONDING TO STATE ACTIONS FOR HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

---

*Sec. 2113 of Part A of Title II of the No Child Left Behind authorizes a number of activities:*<sup>3</sup>

- Recruiting highly qualified individuals to enter teaching through alternative routes
- Comparing the merits of specific professional development programs relative to their impact on student academic achievement
- Reforming and streamlining licensure requirements to ensure subject matter mastery
- Mentoring new teachers in how to use assessment data to guide instruction
- Implementing new teacher testing in the state that emphasizes academic content knowledge

*Section 1119 of Title I calls for a state plan to meet the expectations of having a highly qualified teacher in every classroom in every school by 2005. The plan is to include:*

- Annual measurable objectives for each school in the state relative to the percentage of highly qualified teachers
- Annual measurable objectives for each school relative to the number of teachers who are receiving high quality scientifically based professional development

It seems important that teacher education leaders be involved in a significant way in the determination of which NCLB activities the state will invest in. Similarly, it seems important that each state association be involved in the planning process to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified and are receiving high quality professional development.

*Questions and Considerations:*

- Who will appoint members of the state planning group?
- How will you secure an appointment for yourself or one of your colleagues?
- Which of the priorities (allowable activities) should the state invest in?
- How do you influence the state's decision?

---

<sup>3</sup> Paige, R. (2002). *Improving Teacher Quality: State Grants*. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC.

## RESPONDING TO EFFORTS TO CHANGE TITLE II, SEC. 207 OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

---

The Higher Education Act of 1998 requires education schools to report to their respective state agencies by April 7 of each year pass rates of graduates (program completers) who took the state teacher assessments within three years of completing the program.

*Education schools are to provide the following additional information:*

- Confirmation that the teacher education program has been approved by the state
- Comparison of the program's pass rate with the average pass rate for other programs in the state
- Number of students in the program
- Average number of hours of supervised practice teaching
- Whether the program has been designated as low performing by the state (Sec. 208)

The Education Trust, in a recent report, calls upon Congress "to revisit the requirements of the law" when it reauthorizes the Higher Education Act in 2003.<sup>4</sup> It urges that new "institutional accountability systems with substance" be constructed and "more rigorous licensure examinations" be developed and used. Finally, it calls for "honest data, publicly reported." It is certain that the report will receive considerable attention.

It seems important that the state associations have a position relative to the reporting requirements contained in Title II of the Higher Education Act.

*Questions and Considerations:*

- Do we seek to uncouple degree attainment (a university responsibility) from program completion?
- Do we seek to have the state test teacher candidates after they have obtained their degrees?
- Do we attempt to have all candidates tested regardless of the route they pursue with results reported by all programs (university and alternative)?
- If we call for all providers to be treated similarly, are there consequences we should anticipate?
- What other evidence should teacher education programs be prepared to submit to satisfy accountability provisions of the law?

---

<sup>4</sup> Interpret with Caution: The First State Title II Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation. Washington, DC: The Education Trust, June 2002.