



Teacher Quality and P-16 Reform: The State Policy Context

NANCY L. ZIMPHER

DECEMBER 1999

State Strategies that Support
Successful Student Transitions from
Secondary to Postsecondary Education

A JOINT INITIATIVE OF SHEEO AND ACT, INC.



STATE HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

COPIES OF THIS DOCUMENT ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SHEEO OFFICE, 707 SEVENTEENTH STREET, SUITE 2700, DENVER, CO 80202-3427, 303-299-3686; www.sheeo.org

This strategy brief is supported through a grant from the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Education.

FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Teacher quality has been one of the most hotly debated education policy issues over the past five years. Central to the discussions are strategies to align teacher education and professional development programs at colleges and universities with the reform of K-12 education. Recent national initiatives and new federal funding for teacher preparation and recruitment resulting from amendments to the Higher Education Act also have supported these efforts. Additional new federal dollars for teacher professional development are expected in the forthcoming amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In many states, public officials have joined K-12 and postsecondary education leaders to restructure teacher preparation and professional development programs under the auspices of statewide K-16 initiatives. This strategy brief reviews these efforts in Georgia, Maryland, and Ohio.

The author of this report, Nancy L. Zimpher, brings tremendous expertise to this issue. Dr. Zimpher is chancellor at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, and formerly dean of education at The Ohio State University. She also is a recognized national advocate for teacher education reform as an advisor to the U.S. Department of Education and the Holmes Group, among others.

Information for this strategy brief was collected initially by SHEEO and ACT, Inc. as part of the study on state strategies that support successful student transitions from K-12 to postsecondary education conducted from 1997-1998. The case studies of Georgia, Maryland, and Ohio were updated and critiqued by Jan Kettlewell, University System of Georgia, Michael Rosenthal and Paula Fitzwater, Maryland Higher Education Commission, and Jonathan Tafel, Ohio Board of Regents. These individuals have been key contributors to and leaders of the K-16 efforts in their states. SHEEO appreciates the commitment and energy they bring to this challenging work.

SHEEO also would like to thank Edward Crowe, Donald Carstensen, Robert Wallhaus, Alene Russell, and Sandra Ruppert for their review of early drafts of this document. In addition, we appreciate the editorial and production support of Catherine Walker and Paul Albright.

SHEEO has used this strategy brief series to address key state policy challenges aimed at helping students make successful transitions from K-12 to postsecondary education, including:

- Postsecondary remediation
- School-college partnerships
- Competency-based admissions
- Statewide K-16 systems
- Teacher quality

To encourage interstate sharing and networking, each document is available through the Student Transitions link on the SHEEO web site at www.sheeo.org. We hope this series contributes to productive state and national discussions on statewide systems that link K-12 and postsecondary education aimed at increased student achievement, and we welcome suggestions for continuing and strengthening our work in this area.

Esther M. Rodriguez
Associate Executive Director
SHEEO



Teacher Quality and P-16 Reform: The State Policy Context

INTRODUCTION

As we enter the year 2000, policy alignment in teacher education appears possible. For nearly two decades, national policymakers, state officials, and local educators have struggle

And yet, according to a national commission on teaching, "...America is still a very long way from realizing that future."²

Colleges and universities often have been criticized for contributing to the deficiencies of K-12 schools. Michael Timpane, senior advisor for education policy at the Rand Corporation recently observed: "Year in and year out, schools of education produce the 250,000 to 300,000 graduates who staff the great majority of our nation's classrooms, with usually significant prowess. At the same time, schools of education are assigned much of the blame for all that is imperfect or lacking in K-12. Common sense suggests that there is plenty of blame to go around and that schools of education can only do what their profession and their universities permit them to do. That said, much stands in the way of their becoming what they must be to produce uniformly excellent teachers for reformed high-performance schools."³

It is disappointing that higher education in general has had so little involvement in the

contemporary school reform initiatives, thus, begging the question of the relationship of higher education to the K-12 enterprise and the consequences thereof for teacher education. According to Timpane, "In no other country is public, especially secondary education, so distant from higher education. In every other country, there is a ministry of education to be sure, but there is also an unquestioned assumption that the universities are deeply involved and responsible for the evolution of secondary education."⁴ As we will see in the forthcoming analysis, this separation of higher education's responsibilities from those of K-12 education is being reconsidered in a few states. In Georgia, Maryland, Ohio, and other states, state higher education systems are working with their state K-12 counterparts to bring the two systems together.

Work in the states is being supported by a number of national initiatives aimed at reforming the teaching profession. For example, recent efforts of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) and Teacher Quality Enhancement Program of the U.S. Department of Education stress *quality* at each point of a teacher's career - from recruitment to initial preparation, to the transition of the beginning years of teaching, and throughout continuing professional develop-

ment. These national blueprints for achieving quality in teacher education serve to involve interested states as partners in the design and implementation of effective strategies and programs.

This policy brief will examine state-level strategies aimed at incorporating quality teacher education and professional development programs as part of new state K-16 or P-16 systems. The brief begins with a review of state-level initiatives in three states - Georgia, Maryland, and Ohio. It includes analyses of critical components that contribute to the success of the initiatives. The brief concludes with suggestions of what more could be done to strengthen the preparation and development of quality teachers within states' P-16 paradigms.

CASE STUDY: THE CO-REFORM OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN GEORGIA

The state of Georgia's P-16 initiative began in 1995 and is a collaborative development of the Office of School Readiness (OSR), the Department of Education (DOE), the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE), and the University System of Georgia (USG). Beyond the broad-based involvement of these agencies, individuals were involved representing P-12 and postsecondary educators, school board members, youth advocacy organizations, community members, and legislative and business leaders. Georgia's P-16 initiative has identified five goals:

1. To improve student achievement from preschool through postsecondary education;
2. To help students move smoothly from one education system to another;
3. To ensure that all students who enter postsecondary education are prepared to succeed;
4. To increase access and success of all students in postsecondary education, especially from minority and low income groups;
5. To focus reform of all education organizations on practices that result in children and youth meeting high academic standards.

The last goal focuses specifically on the "co-reform of teacher education, advanced educator preparation programs, and public schools toward practices that result in all children meeting high academic standards." To direct the goal of co-reform, Georgia's P-16 initiative is formed around a statewide P-16 council and several local and regional P-16 councils. These local and regional councils are voluntary groups representing P-16 educators and the broader local communities that collaborate and promote changes in public P-16 education systems. It is important to note that local P-16 councils make recommendations that are advanced to the state P-16 council and then forwarded to the proper authorities and governing boards at the preschool, K-12, adult education, and university system level. P-16 councils

are not government structures and they have no authority in policy or in law.

Leadership has been critical to the successful establishment of P-16 as a statewide priority. Georgia's P-16 initiative grew out of joint consultation of the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia, State Superintendent of Schools, and Commissioner of Technical and Adult Education in 1995. The discussions resulted in approval by the Board of Regents of the state university system of a P-16 policy direction. Subsequently, former Governor Zell Miller appointed the Georgia P-16 Council to provide leadership and overall coordination of P-16, and determined that the council would report conjointly to him and the Superintendent of Schools, the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia, and the Commissioner of Technical and Adult Education. A fourth co-leader was appointed from the Office of School Readiness.

The council set overarching goals for P-16 to improve student success. “The successful student has met high standards and demonstrated achievement at each level, and is ready to advance to the next level - of work, of occupational training, of education - resulting in productive employment and responsible citizenship.” This goal helped give local and regional P-16 councils direction for creating curricular reforms and initial work plans.

In 1996, the Georgia P-16 Council targeted teacher quality as a priority. A P-16 Teachers and Teacher Education Sub-Committee was appointed to assess what needed to change in Georgia in order to improve teacher quality, and

AREAS TARGETED FOR GEORGIA'S LOCAL AND REGIONAL P-16 COUNCIL WORKPLANS

- ▶ **Develop standards of what students should know and be able to do.**
- ▶ **Develop assessments of student progress from preschool through postsecondary education.**
- ▶ **Design rigorous quality curriculum.**
- ▶ **Create quality teacher education programs and initiatives.**

to develop recommendations for change. During the early work of this sub-committee, Georgia became a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF). The Teachers and Teacher Education Sub-Committee became the council's action arm for carrying out Georgia's participation as a partner state with the national commission.

Early work of the Teachers and Teacher Education Sub-Committee resulted in:

- ▶ An over-all framework for change;
- ▶ Recommendations to increase the availability of alternative teacher preparation programs and to strengthen traditional programs;
- ▶ Completion of “The Status of Teaching in Georgia,” a 1998 state status report of each of the following NCTAF recommendations:
 1. Establish standards for both students and teachers,

2. Enhance teacher preparation and professional development,
3. Put a qualified teacher in every classroom,
4. Encourage and reward knowledge and skills,
5. Create schools that are genuine learning organizations.

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TEACHING AND AMERICA'S FUTURE (NCTAF)

Formed in 1994, NCTAF is a bipartisan, blue ribbon panel composed of policy makers, educators, and business leaders dedicated to providing an action agenda for meeting America's educational challenges. NCTAF's 1996 report, "What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future," states that the reform of education depends on restructuring the teaching profession. The report establishes a comprehensive framework for transforming how teachers are recruited, selected, developed, assessed and rewarded. Georgia, Maryland, and Ohio are among the partner states working with support of NCTAF to develop strategies for improving the quality of education.

Georgia's Professional Standards Commission and Board of Regents took immediate action on these recommendations. In 1997, the Professional Standards Commission put in place the Innovative Program Rule to expand alternative teacher preparation programs, and in 1998, the commission approved the first alternative teacher preparation program. Following a full year of study, the Board of Regents adopted in 1998 the Policy on Teacher Preparation to be phased in at all public universities that prepare teachers. This policy includes 10 principles organized under three categories: quality assurance, collaboration, and responsiveness.

QUALITY ASSURANCE

1. The university system will guarantee the quality of any teacher that graduates.
2. The university system will guarantee that all of its graduates in early childhood education can demonstrate accomplishment in teaching children to read and to do mathematics.
3. Graduate programs for teachers will adhere to the general principles of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
4. The university system will assure that graduates of its programs for school leaders and counselors are able to create learning environments that support teacher success in bringing students from diverse groups to high levels of learning.

COLLABORATION

5. Teacher preparation programs will be the shared responsibility of education faculty, arts and sciences faculty, and classroom teachers in the schools.
6. Through partnerships with P-12 schools, universities that prepare teachers will have an ongoing responsibility to collaborate with schools in mentoring, induction and professional development programs for classroom teachers and school leaders.

RESPONSIVENESS

7. All teacher preparation programs will implement aggressive recruitment policies to increase the numbers, to raise the caliber, and to expand the diversity of teacher candidates and to balance supply and demand.
8. The university system will expand the number of teacher certification programs offered to individuals who already hold bachelor's degrees from accredited colleges in order to increase opportunities for individuals seeking second career teaching.
9. The university system will work with the Department of Education and the Professional Standards Commission to bring an end to out-of-field teaching in Georgia.
10. The university system will encourage institutions that prepare teachers to give added emphasis to policies that support the efforts of faculty to model effective teaching, to focus their research on ways

to improve classroom teaching and student learning within P-12 schools, and to support increased participation of teacher preparation faculty in the public schools.

Once the regents approved these principles, guidelines for implementation were developed including key elements, principles, and actions. Implementation of the reviewed programs and practices to meet the full intent of these principles and actions began to be phased in throughout the university system in the fall of 1998. All revised teacher education programs, both undergraduate and graduate, will be in place for students admitted to programs beginning in the fall of 2000.

The overall direction of this policy has been to shift from a primary focus on inputs (courses, credit hours, and number of clock hours of internships in schools) to results (teacher, counselor, and administrator candidates able to bring about increased learning of children in schools). However, Georgia leaders recognize that both inputs and teacher and administrative performance are critical to policy effectiveness. Thus, aspects of this policy emphasize courses and credit hours required, as well as performance by focusing on what a candidate must know and be able to do. The primary result of this state initiative is that all those recommended for teacher certification will have the knowledge and skills necessary to increase the academic achievement levels of diverse groups of students.

CASE STUDY: THE FUTURE EDUCATION OF ALL TEACHERS IN MARYLAND

Begun in the same year as the Georgia effort, Maryland's K-16 Partnership for Teaching and Learning is an alliance of the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), and the University System of Maryland (USM). This partnership has a four-part agenda:

1. To set clear and consistent expectations for student learning;
2. To provide effective teacher training and professional development;
3. To eliminate barriers and redundancy between schools and colleges;
4. To provide incentives for collaboration among segments at the local levels to raise student achievement.

Key to the Maryland initiative has been new licensure regulations aimed at certifying and re-certifying highly qualified teachers and reforming teacher education. The 1995 report of the Teacher Education Task Force has been adopted as the template for the future education of all teachers in Maryland. The initiative has many thrusts, including:

1. Strengthening the undergraduate preparation of teachers with an increased emphasis on providing a solid foundation in academic disciplines;
2. Providing school-based professional training in professional development schools;

3. Offering multiple paths to teacher certification;
4. Linking teacher training with school priorities and reform initiatives;
5. Re-examining teacher certification and licensing policies;
6. Developing accountability and assessment throughout teacher education programs and the continuing professional development of teachers.

The Maryland K-16 Partnership for Teaching and Learning is built on the reforms inaugurated by the Maryland State Department of Education and the Maryland Higher Education Commission. The partnership is "a bold departure from traditional educational reform, heralding a new and substantive collaboration among leaders in the business community, K-16 education, and local and state government." Accordingly, the view from Maryland is that the success of this partnership depends on "necessary change, significant improvement and constant assessment."

The partnership was designed to address and develop strategies for strengthening K-12 standards, competencies and assessments, the professional development of teachers, and community engagement in the K-16 initiative. Further, the partnership's leaders acknowledge that they can achieve their goals more effectively by working together than working as individual organizations. Thus, the focus of the partnership has been to foster opportunities for its members to establish comprehensive and substantive collaboration that would enable all

stakeholders to engage in far-reaching changes needed in the Maryland education system.

It is particularly important to understand the relationship of the work of this partnership to teacher education. Specifically, the partnership calls on higher education to take seriously its obligation to educate new teachers who have the knowledge, skill, and competence to teach in tomorrow's classrooms, and in partnership with local school systems, engage in the continuous professional development of teachers. Given this charge, the state's K-16 partnership's Leadership Council created the Professional Development Design Team in 1996 and charged it with recommending changes in education and the continuing professional development of teachers. These recommendations were to be consistent with state-approved initiatives included in several key documents: *Redesign of Teacher Education* (MHEC's Teacher Education Task Force report); *Professional Development in Maryland's Public Schools* (a report of the Maryland Business Roundtable Task Force on Professional Development); *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future); and MSDE's *Schools for Success Program*.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MARYLAND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DESIGN TEAM

- 1. The state should provide incentive funds to accelerate the implementation of the "Redesign" through activities such as the creation of additional PDS's, the development of performance-based assessments, rewards for K-16 faculty, accreditation of teacher education programs, and the development of continuing professional development for all K-16 educators.**
- 2. Higher education teacher preparation programs should receive national accreditation and meet the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) or Maryland's Essential Dimensions of Teaching (EDoT) standards.**
- 3. Initial teacher certification should include performance-based assessments measuring knowledge in academic areas and pedagogy.**
- 4. Students entering teacher preparation programs should complete an extensive student teaching internship in a professional development school.**
- 5. Local school systems should provide career-long professional development consistent with Maryland's Schools for Success initiative, improved student learning, local school system goals, and the individual school's improvement plan.**
- 6. Maryland's business community should provide visible and active leadership and advocacy for K-16 professional development.**
- 7. The higher education faculty reward structure should fully credit participation in the reform of K-16 education.**
- 8. Additional resources should be targeted for schools that work primarily with underserved children.**

In developing its recommendations, the design team adopted a broad view of professional development and its role in education reform. From this perspective, professional development requires partnerships among schools, higher education institutions, and other appropriate entities to enable teachers to develop further expertise in subject content, teaching strategies, uses of technologies, and other central elements in teaching to high standards. Further, professional development must be accessible statewide as part of the effort to improve and integrate the recruitment, selection, preparation, initial licensing, induction, ongoing development and support, and the advanced certification of educators. Finally, according to the design team, professional development should be evaluated based on its impact on teacher effectiveness and student learning, and this assessment should be used as a guide for subsequent professional development efforts. This comprehensive set of recommendations builds on and reflects the perceived continuum of teacher development and linkages with state policy-making bodies already underway in the state.

Key to the redesign of teacher education in Maryland has been the establishment of 14 pilot Professional Development Schools (PDS). These 14 PDS's involve a partnership between a local school system and a higher education institution. This network likely will expand and hopefully ensure that all teachers in Maryland have access to significant internship experiences, mentoring assessment, and career planning. To further enhance and coordinate the initiative, Maryland's PDS's are linked to one another in a statewide, state and federally supported network through such initiatives as the federal Eisenhower Professional Development Program and Goals 2000.

MODEL FOR K-16 COLLABORATION: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS (PDS)

The purpose of professional development schools (PDS) is to more fully integrate the academic and clinical training of teachers. The idea for PDS's came into being during the 1980s and is based on the model of the teaching hospital in the field of medicine. Like teaching hospitals, PDS's allow teachers-in-training to learn about the practice of teaching under the guidance of teacher mentors and teacher educators. In addition to a focus on professional preparation for prospective teachers, PDS's also are the locus of professional development activities for both veteran school-teachers and faculty from the institution of higher education. As of 1996, there were more than 600 institutions that called themselves PDS's, although they vary widely in terms of their structure and content. Ohio and Maryland are among the states that have established state policy supports for PDS's as part of their reform of teacher education and induction programs.

Sources: Clark, R. Professional Development Schools: Policy and Finance. Washington D.C.: AACTE, 1997. Darling-Hammond, Linda, et.al. Teacher Recruitment, Selection, and Induction in Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice (Darling-Hammond, L. and G. Sykes, Eds.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1999.

The agenda for K-16 in Maryland primarily targets two aligned state education policies: the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP) and Maryland Teacher Education Redesign. MSPP — the state’s school reform agenda — is a comprehensive three-tiered accountability plan requiring the state, local school systems, and individual schools to systematically address improvement. The Maryland Teacher Education Redesign sets forth basic principles that call for a strong academic foundation, school-based preparation, linkage with school reform, diversity of teacher candidates and of children they have taught, developmental assessment, and career-long professional development. A component of this reform is performance-based standards used for evaluation and teacher candidate performance assessment.

On the basis of these initiatives, Maryland sought membership as a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF). In order to examine the state agenda and contribute to the national reform, Maryland’s proposal to NCTAF was comprehensive and organized around the continuum of teacher professional development. In its proposal, the state laid out a number of current initiatives followed by concerns and plans for the future. The strategy includes the following components:

Recruitment: A study has been recommended on teacher recruitment to answer the question of why Maryland imports teachers in high demand areas while overproducing educators in other teaching areas.

Teacher preparation: Increasing the number of institutions with nationally accredited teacher education programs is a priority. Furthermore, the state is focused on institutionalizing professional development schools in colleges and universities. Measurable outcomes include the extent to which PDS’s are included in institutional language on long-range planning and have effectively engaged their K-12 partners.

Teacher accountability: There are recommendations that the Maryland School Report be expanded to include issues of teacher quality, including attendance, licensure, assignment consistency, and number of teachers who have received certification through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

Teacher induction: A review has been recommended of the continuing professional development of teachers during the entry years and the degree to which PDS’s can assist in documenting and disseminating effective strategies for assisting beginning teachers. Beginning teacher support is a statewide priority.

Licensing and certification: There is a continuing focus on upgrading certification with assessment by setting high scores on Praxis tests developed by the Education Testing Service (ETS), using the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and NBPTS standards as models for state performance assessments, minimizing the “credit count” route to licensure, and minimizing the use of emergency certificates.

TIGHTENING THE LINKAGES: AN ALIGNMENT OF STANDARDS

There is a growing consensus among many states that standards for accreditation of teacher preparation programs, initial licensing for teachers, and advanced certification for veteran teachers should be aligned. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) describes this alignment of standards as a "three-legged stool":

Preparation: The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is a coalition of 33 professional associations that evaluate and accredit teacher preparation programs. NCATE is revising its standards to become more performance based in addition to its currently required standards for course offerings and student-teaching experiences. Known as NCATE 2000, the new standards will include evidence of teacher candidates' and graduates' effectiveness in the classroom. In most states, NCATE accreditation is voluntary; 17 states require it.

Licensure: The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) is a consortium of 38 state education agencies, higher education institutions, and national education organizations dedicated to the reform of education, licensing and on-going professional development of teachers. Because of the considerable variability in state licensing standards, INTASC developed new model standards that could serve as the basis for a test of teaching knowledge for an initial

license and for a performance assessment of teaching skills for a continuing professional license.

Advanced Certification: The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was formed in 1987 to provide advanced certification to accomplished teachers. The National Board standards provide performance-based benchmarks for accomplished teaching. Currently, 38 states offer at least one incentive for National Board Certification and 31 of those states offer multiple incentives that provide financial support and use National Board Certification to permit greater interstate mobility for accomplished teachers. NBPTS announced in November 1999 that nearly 4,800 teachers had received certification and more than 8,500 candidates had applied to undergo the process in the 1999-2000 school year.

Although many states and numerous education organizations have endorsed NCTAF's proposal for an alignment of standards based on the "three-legged stool" model, the Thomas Fordham Foundation recently released a teacher quality "manifesto" on behalf of several dozen governors, state education chiefs, and others which takes issues with this proposal. The manifesto contends that rules and tests that govern teacher certification have little to do with true classroom performance. Rather than tighten regulations, states are urged to simplify entry and hiring into the profession and allow the market to guide both teacher quality and quantity.

Professional development: There also is a continuing focus on the NBPTS and the assignment of state representatives needed to facilitate the assessments, as well as a systemwide strategy to develop and encourage teacher self-assessment as an approach to professional development.

The state's commitment to providing all students with caring and competent teachers is apparent in recent legislation. Maryland now pays teachers' fees for National Board certification and requires staff development to promote and support candidates engaged in the process. In teacher education, all colleges and universities with at least 2,000 students are now required to become nationally accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The 1999 General Assembly adopted legislation providing salary incentives for National Board certified teachers, a tax credit for teachers' graduate work, a \$1,000 signing bonus for teachers graduating in the top 10 percent of their class, teacher scholarships, beginning teacher mentoring, and an optional extension of teacher tenure from two to three years.

CASE STUDY: THE BEST TEACHERS FOR OHIO'S CHILDREN

In 1996, the Ohio State Department of Education approved standards that created a state-of-the-art, performance-driven licensure system to significantly strengthen the preparation and professional development of Ohio teachers. All Ohio institutions are required to meet

teacher preparation standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). These new standards provide mentors to help ensure that beginning teachers have ongoing accurate feedback about their progress and that teachers use assessments and requirements for continuous professional development throughout their career. Teachers in Ohio now are required to earn a master's degree or complete 30 semester hours of graduate credit in classroom teaching and/or in an area of licensure within 10 years of issuance of the initial professional teaching license. The reform initiatives also include incentives for teachers to pursue NBPTS certification. Teachers who successfully complete NBPTS assessments receive a financial incentive permanently attached to their annual salary.

OUTCOMES OF OHIO'S APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION AND LICENSURE STANDARDS

- ▶ **Set forth requirements for what teachers should know and be able to do.**
- ▶ **Strengthened college and university preparation programs.**
- ▶ **Required successful completion of an approved program of educator preparation and an entry-year program.**
- ▶ **Established strong licensure requirements.**
- ▶ **Intensified professional development through life-long learning.**

Companion elements to Ohio's teacher reform agenda are Ohio's Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC's), organized to help ensure high quality sources of professional development for all educators and school support personnel. RPDC's achieve their mission by disseminating exemplary educational practices, facilitating individual and organizational development, encouraging self-reflection and life-long learning, valuing local and regional needs, providing a flexible regional delivery system that is comprehensive and equitable, promoting collaborative leadership, communicating actively with service providers and advocating the use of technology.

Through initiatives originated in the State Department of Education, there also have been organizational adjustments that have signaled an increased emphasis on school-higher educational partnerships to improve teaching and learning. Teacher recruitment has focused particularly on Ohio's teaching force becoming more diverse in its promotion of school improvement. One significant strategy for meeting these expectations is the creation of 19 model projects funded to serve as promising initiatives to draw unrepresentative individuals in the teaching field.

A significant proportion of Ohio's Goals 2000 funds were directed toward partnerships to work on tasks that would yield a solid set of alternatives for professional development. A partnership assistance and coordination plan for school-higher education partnerships was developed, the goal of which was to establish linkages between 24 funded school-higher

education partnership projects. The state has connected this partnership assistance coordination team with a national advisory panel and a set of peer consultants – field-based personnel – to bring these initiatives together.

While Ohio has had significant resources available to improve teacher education, it has not historically taken a holistic approach to these reforms. As some have observed, Ohio is “program rich but system poor.” For instance, while Goals 2000 funds have been used to fund partnerships between colleges of education and K-12 schools, there was no previous effort to link these dollars to other initiatives such as the teacher professional development grants available under the Eisenhower Professional Development Program of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Interestingly, a remedy for achieving more policy and practice coherence has emerged in Ohio through a somewhat unlikely channel.

Ohio's K-16 effort grew out of a statewide study to review remediation in postsecondary education. The Secondary and Higher Education Remediation Advisory Commission (SHERAC) was convened by the Ohio Board of Regents and the State Department of Education in 1996 to “prepare a plan to significantly reduce the levels of remedial work required by students entering Ohio's state-assisted colleges and universities.” Its goals, published in 1997, are:

1. To communicate college level expectations through faculty from K-12 and

higher education communities collaborating on the definition of freshman admission standards and common placement guidelines.

2. To develop a continuum of early assessment so that educators can pinpoint problems when they first occur and promote continuous progress towards college readiness.
3. To create the Ohio “learning extensions” that would link ideas and knowledge of high school teachers with faculty from Ohio’s colleges of education and faculty who teach entry-level college courses in arts and sciences, both at the university and for teacher professional development.
4. To target existing resources that provide incentives for schools, colleges, and universities to engage in collaborative programs.
5. To build a common agenda for data collection, for charting a common path for all education in Ohio for the 21st century and by appointing a joint council to encourage the ongoing dialogue, collaboration and partnership between K-12 and higher education communities in Ohio.

When SHERAC produced its 1997 report, *A Total Approach, Improving College Preparation in Ohio*, much of it focused on the relationship of high school graduation to admission to college, particularly a continuum of early assessment and intervention. However, one of the most relevant consequences of

the SHERAC report has been its call for the establishment of a permanent joint council to oversee the implementation of its report and ensure partnerships between K-12 and higher education in the state’s educational reform efforts. This joint council did come to fruition and has been meeting for two years.

Complementing SHERAC’s statewide infrastructure for systemically linking programs (K-16), Ohio’s Building Excellent Schools for Today and the 21st Century (BEST) establishes a public forum for developing and implementing education reform strategies. BEST is a statewide consortium of business, labor, education, and community groups committed to improving educational opportunities and results for Ohio children. It became the umbrella for Ohio’s partnership with the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF). One element of BEST’s education reform agenda has been the provision of world-class teachers for Ohio’s youth. As an initial step, BEST’s NCTAF sub-committee developed an Ohio policy inventory of preparation, profiles, and practices for the 108,000 certificated school staff of Ohio’s 1.8 million students in kindergarten through grade 12.

Like the audits promised by Georgia and Maryland, Ohio’s continuing reform will flow out of a teacher development continuum covering teacher quality policy including acceptance into a teacher preparation program, advanced certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and ongoing professional development.

COMPARATIVELY SPEAKING

Based on this review of the reform initiatives of three states — Maryland, Georgia and Ohio — it is apparent that each state has made serious commitments to improving teacher quality. Components of their blueprints for change could be used in other states. The following suggests some of the ways in which other states can adopt these changes.

A formal expression of systemwide approaches and strategic partnerships —

K-16: One issue that sets the initiatives in these three states apart from other states is the integration and alignment of policies and practices across systems. Most notable in all three states is the commitment to achieve some degree of collaboration between and among the higher education governing or coordinating board and, where appropriate, university systems, with the state superintendent or chief state school officer. In a couple of instances, other boards and entities that serve the general interests across the continuum of P-16 also are part of the partnerships. In Georgia, this is the P-16 Council; in Maryland, it is the K-16 Partnership for Teaching and Learning; in Ohio it is the Joint Council of the Board of Regents and the State Department of Education. Notable in Georgia is the specific role of the governor in formulating the P-16 council and working with it.

Local partnerships are important in each state as vehicles enabling the K-12 sector to work more effectively with higher education. In

most instances, the links to higher education include not only schools of education but also colleges of arts and sciences, and the business community. In Ohio, the structure for professional development is regionalized. In Georgia, there are regional and local P-16 councils.

In the three states studied, the partnerships have undertaken common initiatives and outcomes. For example, there is heavy reliance on the concept of the partnership school or the professional development school. These programs jointly engage K-12 and higher education in the initial preparation of teachers and underscore the importance of continuing professional development, particularly during the beginning years of teaching.

Promoting shared governance and resource allocation: In some instances, regulations have been codified through the state's legislative body, supported by the office of the governor, and resource allocation traced to the reform initiatives. Incentive funding is used to stimulate and enhance the growth and effectiveness of emerging partnerships.

A commitment to teacher quality: Each state has developed a particular agenda on behalf of attaining or achieving teacher quality. Through the P-16 structures, there is a clear link between learner outcomes, pupil achievement in the K-12 sector, and the role of colleges and schools of education in producing teachers qualified to enhance learner outcomes. Beyond this, all three states have parlayed interest in teacher education into a commitment not only to the schools of educa-

tion but also to colleges of arts and sciences. This has evoked, at some level, a greater awareness of making teacher education an all-university responsibility. The Joint Council in Ohio has convened an advisory committee on this and related topics. In addition, in Ohio and to some extent in Georgia, the ways in which professors teach in higher education and teachers teach in K-12 are linked through opportunities to work together on issues of faculty/teacher development.

There are emerging statements, particularly in Maryland, about outcome assessments and the impact of teacher quality on student success. In every instance, teacher quality is defined by reforms fostered in teacher licensure and certification. The transition in language from teacher certification to teacher licensure in all three states makes room for the acknowledgement of national board certification. In every state, there is an incentive program for teacher participation with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

Participation in networks aimed at achieving comprehensive education reform: All three states demonstrate a clear link between the state's reform initiatives and national networks. All three are launch states for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), and they have also received grants from the U.S. Department of Education's Teacher Quality Enhancement Program to help expand and strengthen programs. Georgia, Maryland, and Ohio strategi-

cally use federal resources through the Eisenhower Professional Development Program of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act and state and local systemic initiatives of the National Science Foundation to leverage statewide commitment to their reform goals. And each state has developed member partnerships in one or more of the renewal networks, including the Holmes Partnership or the Goodlad Renewal Network, or in the case of school reform, the Sizer Network or "Success for All" from John Hopkins.

Focusing state policy studies and tools on strategies that address critical state needs: Issues of teacher supply and demand are reaching the forefront. Maryland's reform focuses the state's continuing need to import teachers in certain disciplines when the state is overproducing teachers in some of these same areas. Thus, the disconnect remains between the number of teachers prepared and the actual distribution of those teachers to where they are needed (mostly urban sites). In addition, all three states have programs supporting diversifying the teaching force, particularly the 10-year history of Ohio's alternative models for attracting a more diverse population into teaching.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION TO IMPROVE TEACHER QUALITY

The 1998 federal Higher Education Act was amended to include financial incentives for college students to become teachers and for institutions of higher education to produce better teachers. Two types of teacher quality enhancement grants were awarded:

State Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants: The state grants will support comprehensive statewide reforms that tackle critical system changes. These initiatives include strengthening teacher certification and licensing standards and establishing or strengthening alternative pathways into teaching.

Teacher Recruitment Partnership Grants: The teacher recruitment grants will support partnerships between universities and school districts that aim to attract new students to the teaching profession and reduce shortages. The partnerships must include a college or university with a teacher training program, a school or college of arts or sciences and a high-need school district.

Georgia, Maryland, and Ohio are among the 24 states that shared in the \$33.4 million appropriated for the state grants in 1999. Georgia's Armstrong Atlantic State University also received a teacher recruitment grant as part of the \$9.6 million appropriated for that program.

In each state, the issues of standards and assessments and measures of accountability are at the forefront of the reform agenda. All three states have some linkage to national accreditation, and Ohio and Maryland use the NCATE standards as the vehicle for program approval for higher education in its teacher preparation programs.

CONCLUSION

While the states profiled have made tremendous gains in coordinating teacher education reform efforts with K-16 initiatives to improve student achievement, many formidable challenges remain. The following suggestions are offered to help state and institutional leaders with the next steps in P-16 reform in relation to teacher quality.

Develop policies that support state-level joint councils or partnerships: P-16 activities in the three states studied and many others often are the result of multiple task forces, commissions, councils, and partnerships formed during the past decade. In many cases, these groups start with different charges but reach similar or identical goals. To some observers, the work of these multiple organizations seems redundant. In some instances, competing recommendations seem to exacerbate disconnects in education policy. One suggestion for supporting and sustaining a systemic P-16 agenda is to authorize state-level councils - a body representing the shared interests of P-12 and postsecondary education - in state law or policy. The primary focus should be to coordinate and enhance the state's P-16 education reform

agenda so that policy recommendations and subsequent implementation can have the greatest possible impact.

Institutionalize partnerships at colleges, universities, and local schools: Most of the evolving activity of school-university partnerships has been initiated at the local level. Literally hundreds of professional development school or partnership school initiatives have been developed; however, they often are products of a small group of faculty and teachers agreeing to participate or cooperate, in most cases without the legitimacy or leverage of a full district and full university partnership. Satewide partnerships should continue to encourage local partnerships and find ways to institutionalize them, including through resource allocation or restructuring faculty rewards and incentives. State strategies also should require local school districts and universities to commit matching resources so that professional development schools and clinical programs have stability and longevity.

Increase commitment to university-wide support for teacher education: While the notion of all-university engagement in teacher education has advanced to a proper stage of rhetorical support, examples of effective all-university support for teacher quality are slow to emerge. A number of groups around the country advocate support for teacher education at the all-university level, particularly through the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), SHEEO, the National Association of System Heads (NASH), and

other higher education constituent organizations. These organizations have formed task forces to ensure that university system chief executives attend to teacher education. Institution-wide strategies should require actual programmatic integration among education schools, colleges of arts and sciences, and other professions serving the needs of children, youth, and families. Partnerships at the local level among school districts and higher education institutions are stimulated by the federal government's recent Title II (HEA) partnership grants requiring commitment and support of the institutions as a stipulation of their applications. Particularly in states where university coordination is the function of a statewide system, support for P-16 partnerships can be orchestrated and supported at the system level.

Align state policies on teacher quality with the needs and concerns of education

constituency groups: Among the challenges to the alignment of policies targeting P-16 education reform and teacher quality is the linkage with policies and practices of individual constituent groups. Teachers unions, school district administrators, local parent/teacher organizations, learned societies, and various other political entities strongly affect the conditions that either militate against or ameliorate the goals of achieving enhanced teacher quality. For example, all constituent groups seem to support policies to develop teacher induction programs. However, to ensure that these programs are effectively developed and implemented requires changes across the various interest groups. Hiring practices, as well as job assignments at local school districts,

need to change to provide beginning teachers with adequate time and support for professional development. Union contracts need to be modified to provide opportunities for veteran teachers to serve as peer consultants and mentors. Job descriptions and rewards of faculty in education and the arts and sciences will need to be reassessed to allow professors opportunities to work in K-12 schools and help guide the work of teachers in their beginning years of teaching. State-level strategies aligning the advocacy and/or actions of these groups with state-level programs is needed so that policy implementation is possible and policy goals are achieved.

Questions remain. How can states institutionalize strategies to enhance pre-service pro-

grams, the role of the arts and sciences faculty in the preparation of teachers, and the roles and responsibilities of education schools, arts and sciences colleges, and the entire university in support of quality teacher preparation? Also not addressed here, but critical to continued policy development in this area, is the need to examine the nature of general education as the foundation for better-prepared teachers, the relationship between community colleges and universities preparing teachers, and teacher access to expert professional development.

Statewide P-16 structures provide the foundation for change to occur. The knowledge and skills of teachers and the higher achievement levels of students will provide the proof of real accomplishment.

ENDNOTES

- 1 National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, April 1983).
- 2 *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, September 1996).
- 3 Timpane, P. Michael, *Higher Education and the Schools* (Colorado: State Higher Education Executive Officers, December 1998).
- 4 Ibid.

