

Presidents' Summit on Teacher Quality: Summary Report

On September 15 and 16, 1999, Secretary Riley convened almost sixty-five presidents and chancellors of the nation's institutions of higher education, representing forty states, to discuss their role in elevating the importance and improving the quality of teacher preparation on their campuses. A series of small group sessions, the central part of the Summit, provided the opportunity for college and university presidents to discuss specific issues around improving teacher education and to generate concrete action steps that they and their colleagues could take.

The Summary Report

- The report is 15 pages long. It is ready in final form.
- For each of three topics discussed at the Presidents' Summit—mission and structure, partnerships, and accountability—the report lists the next steps proposed by the Summit participants. Here are some examples:

Mission and Structure

- Declare that the institution's main responsibility is to improve public schools.
- Make arts and sciences deans equally responsible for the success of teacher preparation programs.
- Institute university-funded scholarships for students who enter the teaching profession, sending a clear message about its value.
- Establish as a priority the equipping of education faculty with technology.
- Play a greater advocacy role to uncover the scandalous "dirty little secret" about underprepared teachers and states' willingness to grant waivers.

Partnerships

- Revise the reward system to provide incentives for faculty—arts and sciences as well as education—to get deeply involved in all aspects of teacher preparation.
- Examine the extent to which the program is meeting the needs of local schools for high quality teachers in each subject area, and make significant changes as a result.

Accountability

- Become actively involved in state teacher certification issues and in state or national efforts to strengthen accountability for teacher preparation program results.
- Guarantee the performance of new teachers to the school districts that hire them, with two conditions: the teachers must be teaching in the fields and at grade levels in which they prepared to teach.

The report's recommendations reinforce a number of Administration positions and programs:

- They reinforce the need for partnerships among teacher education programs, the arts and sciences, and K-12 schools—the cornerstone of the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants in Title II of the HEA.
- They discuss the need for greater accountability and higher standards for teachers and for teacher preparation institutions.
- They address the need to end the practice of granting emergency licenses for teachers.
- They address the need to prepare new teachers to use technology—the cornerstone of the Administration's Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program.

Presidents' Summit on Teacher Quality

The issues surrounding teacher quality and student learning are severe and urgent....Presidents should worry less about exactly what to do. The important thing is to do something, to try something.

--Recommendation of Summit participants

Few would disagree that ensuring well-prepared teachers is essential to the nation's goal of educating all children to high standards. But how does one translate a desire to improve teacher education into the actions that must be taken to achieve that goal?

On September 15 and 16, 1999, Secretary Riley convened almost sixty-five presidents and chancellors of the nation's institutions of higher education, representing forty states, to discuss their role in elevating the importance and improving the quality of teacher preparation on their campuses. A series of small group sessions, the central part of the Summit, provided the opportunity for college and university presidents to discuss specific issues around improving teacher education and to generate concrete action steps that they and their colleagues could take.

Presidents met in small groups, each facilitated by one of their peers and by an individual with a national perspective on the topic of discussion. Each session focused on one of three topics:

- mission and structure;
- partnerships; and
- accountability.

The pages that follow frame the importance of each of these three discussion themes and present challenges and critical questions, which Summit participants received in advance of the Summit. Next, for each theme—mission and structure, partnerships, and accountability—readers will find recommendations, generated by the presidents who attended the Summit, of actions that higher education presidents and chancellors might take to improve teacher education at their institutions.

These next steps do not represent consensus among Summit participants. The recommendations are provided in their entirety so that leaders of higher education institutions throughout the nation might find several ideas that they can implement on their own campuses.

Mission and Structure

Declare that the institution's main responsibility is to improve public schools.

--Recommendation of Summit participants

The Importance

All of our nation's children need to be well educated—not only for moral reasons, but also because our country depends on it. Failure to provide all children with a sound education is unacceptable in this information age in which education is essential to both a sound economy and a viable democracy. The strong public schools that give us a healthy nation depend on quality teacher education. All our efforts to improve student learning depend on better teaching in schools throughout the country.

Institutions of higher education—the engines of education reform—have the power to produce better teachers. After all, since all teachers have college degrees, these institutions educate and train every school and college teacher in America. While the responsibility for improving education nationwide falls on many shoulders, colleges and universities play a particularly important role. It is time for higher education as a whole to accept the responsibility for teacher education that it abdicated to colleges of education earlier in this century.

For higher education institutions, the overarching challenge is to bring the preparation of teachers back to the position it once held in American higher education—as a core mission function that involves all segments of the campus and has the active support of top university leaders. Campus chief executives, provosts, and even trustees must be willing to create and sustain the changes in policy, structure, and practice that result in a focus on quality teacher preparation throughout an institution. To be successful in meeting the needs of students, teacher preparation reform must be comprehensive, must involve the entire college or university, and should be sustained over time by a set of campus-wide values that become embedded in the institution's culture.

The Issues

The following comments, intended to present a variety of viewpoints about the challenges that presidents face, helped to provoke thoughtful discussion among the Summit participants.

- Teacher education's history has led to many of its current weaknesses. During this century, we have seen the transition from Normal Schools to research institutions, as well as the states' increased reliance on colleges of education to shape teacher preparation.
- The preparation of teachers has been marginalized on many campuses, buried under the weight of other priorities that receive more support from faculty and from university leaders.
- Reforms come with political and financial costs. Inertia and built-in rigidities inhibit reforms.
- Schools of education have struggled unsuccessfully to earn respect within the higher education culture. They suffer from "prestige deprivation" and "second-class citizenship."
- Organizational barriers and incentive systems impede collaboration across the campus in preparing teachers. Teacher education operates from a position of a "splendid isolation" that is neither a splendid nor a useful isolation.
- Faculty involvement in K-12 schools, from education and from arts and sciences, is not recognized and rewarded. An emphasis on tenure, scholarship, and research have led to the neglect of K-12 schools, particularly those in the inner cities and rural areas.
- Higher education has not done enough to contribute the tremendous power of its research and scholarship to answer key policy questions faced by the K-12 schools near them.
- Teacher education programs are often cited as "cash cows" within universities. Traditional funding systems are inadequate.
- Schools of education often have higher student/faculty ratios than other schools.

Tough Questions to Consider

The following were the kinds of questions that presidents were asked to consider before coming to the Summit.

- Does teacher preparation—as a campus-wide function—have status on my campus consistent with other key mission functions?
- How is teacher education funded at my institution?
- Have I made commitment to high-quality teacher preparation a major factor in making policy decisions, setting budget priorities, and choosing deans and faculty at my institution?

- Does the tenure process at my institution reward faculty who teach undergraduates and undertake related work in K–12 schools?
- Do faculty members throughout my institution see educating teachers as one of their main missions?

Next Steps

These are complex issues central to the current debate over student achievement in the United States and the future of higher education. In discussing what can be done to address them, the presidents and chancellors at the Summit generated the following action steps. They are examples of steps that presidents have taken, or steps that presidents could take, to demonstrate their commitment to elevating teacher education on their campuses.

- Ask publicly whether the university wants to be committed to a strong college of education. If the answer is yes, be willing to support it with the resources it needs.
- Make arts and sciences deans equally responsible for the success of teacher preparation programs. Establish reporting lines to the provost or to the president that bridge the organizational barriers between discrete college units.
- Redefine scholarship on campus for promotion and tenure decisions and faculty merit salary rewards. Recognize that faculty assignments involving field activities with cohort groups of students take more time than teaching a campus-based class.
- Examine and revise the balance expected of all faculty in teaching, service, and research activities so that the expectations held by the university are consistent with its stated commitment to high quality teaching and teacher preparation.
- Examine the expectations of senior and junior faculty regarding the work of K-16 partnership building and outreach to the schools. If they are inadequate, make appropriate changes to teaching loads, reward systems, and budget allocations to departments and to colleges.
- Identify and implement ways to use the budget as an effective tool to leverage change at the college and department levels.
- Move the department of education to the “signature building” on campus. This relocation will give value to the department and will provide a powerful message to both the community and the institution regarding the importance of the department.
- Institute university-funded scholarships for students who enter the teaching profession, sending a clear message about its value.
- Define the mission of the institution in terms of service to the region in which it sits, and drive the teacher preparation programs toward this mission.
- Consciously take opportunities to be advocates for teacher preparation programs, which often suffer from low comparative prestige within universities. Stress their

critical role in serving society and their consequent centrality to the mission of a strong university.

- Declare that the institution's main responsibility is to improve public schools. As chancellor, give system presidents a "carte blanche" to reform, which can lead to a turnover of deans and the redesign of most programs. If programs are of poor quality, note this publicly.
- As chancellor, increase enrollment, secure more funding, and allocate it to teacher education. In order to receive increased funding, presidents within the university system will need to do more teacher education.
- Make a statement about how a president spends his or her time by making as many school visits as possible. Do not underestimate the symbolic value of what a president says and does.
- Announce up front that for the entire campus, teacher education is a priority. Most faculty have children and so are interested in the quality of the schools.
- Establish as a priority the equipping of education faculty with technology. This will give a strong message regarding the importance of the department.
- Institute a policy that education programs must be nationally accredited.
- Require faculty to develop an annual professional development plan that reflects their work with schools and children as well as with university students.
- Have a discussion with the provost regarding the mission of the institution.
- Compile data about children and education in the community and use them to captivate people and to raise their interest in supporting a focus on teacher education.
- Work to ensure a strong statewide system because improving teacher education cannot be sufficiently addressed one institution at a time in some states.
- Speak out about the need for a cultural shift in the appreciation of teachers, for higher teacher salaries, for higher standards, and for throwing out the current "byzantine" licensing requirements and creating better ones.
- Play a greater advocacy role in order to influence policy that affects teaching and to uncover the scandalous "dirty little secret" about underprepared teachers and states' willingness to grant waivers. (States would never waive requirements this way in the health professions.)
- Write an op-ed on public policy and teaching.
- Encourage colleges of education to declare charter schools of education. These are places that "go for broke" and depart from the pack.
- Use external funding as a catalyst for change.
- Invest in faculty development.
- Tweak the institution's governance so that it provides an overall structure that addresses long-term concerns.

Partnerships

Be a “door opener” for education as well as arts and sciences faculty. By taking faculty members with them on school visits, presidents will help them to become ambassadors for increased contact with schools.

-- Recommendation of Summit participants

The Importance

Preparing good teachers has never been more important or challenging than it is today. The changing demographics of the student body and increasing expectations for all students inevitably lead us to demand more of teachers. Preparing them to meet these higher expectations is a campus-wide challenge.

Schools of education cannot do this alone. Prospective teachers need sufficient content knowledge and the teaching skills to convey that knowledge to diverse students in increasingly challenging classrooms. Preparing teachers who are ready to meet these challenges successfully can only be accomplished through commitment of the entire university and its active involvement with local schools. In this sense, the preparation of teachers is a three-way responsibility of arts and sciences, education, and the schools. Too often, one of these partners is asked to shoulder the full load. Let us transform teacher education into a coordinated effort among K–12 school educators and faculty of both education and the arts and sciences at our institutions of higher education.

The Issues

The following comments, intended to present a variety of viewpoints about the challenges that presidents face, helped to provoke thoughtful discussion among the Summit participants.

- Parents, employers, and policymakers expect teachers to have strong academic preparation in the subjects they teach. An institutional commitment to strong teacher preparation means revamping the general curriculum to prepare teachers with the content they need to be successful. In particular, many elementary teachers do not receive the strong liberal arts background they need.
- During the last half-century, the traditional separation on higher education campuses of schools of education from the arts and sciences, as well as the “second-class citizenship” of education, have made collaboration among the two difficult. Making teacher education an important mission of the arts and sciences disciplines takes sustained leadership from many levels.

- Integrating the liberal arts and education can be expensive because it requires the development of a new set of courses.
- Over the years, schools of education have minimized their connection to local schools, especially as faculty sought recognition within the higher education culture rather than through involvement in schools. The result is that methods courses are generally taught exclusively on campus, and supervision of student teaching has been left to faculty adjuncts.
- Prospective teachers often do not get the extensive field experiences and real connections to schools that they need to apply and practice what they have learned.
- Reducing the high attrition rate for new teachers by supporting them as they begin their careers demands close working relationships between higher education institutions and local schools.
- Lack of partnerships among schools and higher education faculty can mean that the faculty are not well versed in standards for K–12 students. They need this knowledge so that they can expose their prospective teachers to the standards to which they will be asked to teach when they begin their careers.
- Deans and faculty members, hired within an established higher education culture, often are not chosen on the basis of their commitment to enhancing institutional and school district relationships.

Tough Questions to Consider

The following were the kinds of questions that presidents were asked to consider before coming to the Summit.

- How involved am I as president in building real partnerships with the schools where our students teach?
- To what extent is the teacher preparation program at my institution driven by local school improvement goals and student achievement challenges?
- What do I know about the adequacy of the content knowledge, teaching skills and clinical experiences of teachers who receive degrees from my institution? On whom do I rely for information about their training and their quality?
- How closely do the arts and sciences and education faculty members work together in the preparation of teachers?
- Can I list specific ways that my institution has made improving teaching and learning in local schools a main priority?
- Are hiring decisions for deans and faculty made on the basis of criteria consistent with our mission as a teacher training institution?

Next Steps

These are complex issues central to the current debate over student achievement in the United States and the future of higher education. In discussing what can be done to address them, the presidents and chancellors at the Summit generated the following action steps. They are examples of steps that presidents have taken, or steps that presidents could take, to demonstrate their commitment to partnerships on their campuses.

- Revise the reward system to provide incentives for faculty—arts and sciences as well as education—to get deeply involved in all aspects of teacher preparation.
- Put in place a process to ensure that campus teacher preparation and K–12 partnership priorities influence the selection of faculty members, deans, and department chairs.
- Examine the extent to which the program is meeting the needs of local schools for high quality teachers in each subject area, and make significant changes as a result.
- Insist on partnerships of equity and integrity. Exercise leadership to model such partnerships, establish personal relationships with superintendents, principals, and fellow presidents, require that grant applications and other program initiatives within the institution bring together cross-institutional resources and perspectives, and encourage collaborative, rather than competitive, relationships with other institutions in the region.
- Engage K–12 students, teachers, and administrators in evaluating the teacher preparation program.
- Lend personal support to the establishment and effective operation of a K-16 council that is chaired by the president or provost and includes a department chairperson, deans of education and the arts and sciences, and the superintendent in order to bring partners regularly to the table.
- Put in place an infrastructure that ensures that all the appropriate partners are at the table on a regular basis at both the state and the metropolitan levels.
- Build partnerships not just with arts and sciences, but also with the agriculture school, business school, and others. Partnerships need to be built *within* the university, first and foremost.
- Form a team between the school of arts and sciences and the school of education in order to ensure university cohesion and collaboration. Ensure that the undergraduate affairs department, deans, associate deans, and stellar faculty from both colleges are on board.
- Since presidents have discretion over the institution's budget, redirect funds to ensure that education gets its share.

- Find out what resources (including faculty) you have in your own institution with which to develop partnerships.
- Make it clear to appointed arts and science deans that they will be involved in teacher education, and that their duties will include collaborating with the college of education faculty and dean.
- Find out whether the education dean has the knowledge and skills needed to form partnerships. Ask, “Do I have an appropriate dean?” before committing oneself to further action as a president.
- Ensure that the provost is taking responsibility for ensuring that arts and sciences and education are partners.
- Insist that all research projects conducted at the institution—not just those within the education school—that deal with teaching or learning have a classroom teacher on the team that designs and implements the research.
- View partnerships with the arts and sciences as avenues for the recruitment of education majors and as ways to help overcome the negative reputation of education schools.
- Recruit the best deans and students into the college of education.
- Declare that there can be no unilateral decision-making with regard to teacher education. (Insist on conversations with arts and sciences and the local schools.)
- Think outside the box in strengthening the arts and science connection. If the education dean has impeccable credentials but no connection to schools, appoint a member of the arts and science faculty to be the dean of the education school.
- Create one college of the arts, sciences, and education under one roof.
- Experiment with ideas such as England’s Open University and distance learning. Have faculty work in teams to create new programs.
- Build a strong partnership with public schools focused on meeting their needs. In turn, this will encourage the public school system to become a strong advocate for the college.
- Give faculty status to K–12 teachers who, as professional colleagues of the teacher preparation faculty, can serve as mentors to student teachers and new graduates.
- Seek the development of mechanisms and expectations that require education faculty to return to the public schools to teach from time to time (e.g., every five years) throughout their university careers.
- Establish an entrepreneurial rapid-response team that is capable of providing quickly developed, customized solutions to rapidly emerging problems. (Otherwise, the emergent needs of the schools will occur in quick time, as they usually do, while the processes of response from higher education will continue to occur in slow time.)
- Every year, spend two weeks of vacation time in the surrounding public schools.

- Be a “door opener” for education as well as arts and sciences faculty. By taking faculty members with them on school visits, presidents will help them to become ambassadors for increased contact with schools.
- Recognize that building quality teacher education programs at the university depends on extended clinical experiences, which require deep partnerships with schools. (One would not dream of neglecting a strong clinical component at the medical school.) Strong teacher education cannot happen by placing student teachers in schools for a few weeks.
- Establish, cultivate, and maintain a direct and personal relationship with the school district superintendent.
- Take the K–12 superintendent out for breakfast once a month.
- Be aware of and work to erase the snobbery that exists between university education professors and their K–12 partners.
- Involve a broad array of partners—broader than that to which presidents are accustomed. Include teacher unions, community and technical colleges, and businesses. There are very few partnerships that are strong throughout the continuum.
- Interact with a group of community members, enabling them to talk about the community that surrounds the institution. Emphasize the importance of bringing everyone together at the same time in order to alleviate the tendency to “pass the buck.”
- Create school-to-work apprenticeships for teaching careers in local high schools.
- Open a public school in a university building on campus.
- Approach the governor and have a conversation about working for a common cause in support of a K–12 funding request.
- Be responsible for keeping graduates in a cycle of continuous education. Encourage the development of formal arrangements and programs that provide the opportunity for teacher graduates to continue to maintain an active relationship with their universities and to participate in continuing professional development and education programs. Invite graduates to return at no cost to utilize resources such as a technology center.
- Develop a mechanism through existing national associations to communicate information about effective practices, together with the data that demonstrates their success in enhancing student learning, so that other universities and school districts can replicate initiatives that have been proven to work.
- Engage retired teachers. Encourage schools of education to develop organized opportunities to engage them in innovative ways, such as mentoring prospective teachers, in their teacher education programs.
- Create summer employment opportunities for faculty by funding their proposals that involve innovative partnerships.

- Make a personal effort to assure that governors and state legislators are well informed about matters of teacher quality. Engage them and their staff in all of the key activities generated out of major school/university partnerships.
- Stress the value and status of teachers. Work with state governments to give teachers tax breaks, grocery discounts, etc.
- Speak out in the community about the importance of partnerships.
- Be willing to admit that presidents and their institutions do not have all the answers.
- Ensure that all parties have a say in the other's programs in order for partnerships to work.

Accountability

In partnership with the school districts and the state, agree on key elements of teacher quality and find ways to judge the institution's program in terms of its ability to develop these attributes in prospective teachers.

--Recommendation of Summit participants

The Importance

Improving the achievement of our elementary and secondary students is a national goal. States have been pursuing this goal by emphasizing the need for high educational standards and for student accountability systems reflecting those standards. Increasingly, however, the public is calling for higher standards and greater accountability for the teachers who work with our students. As a result, the policies and practices of the institutions of higher education that produce teachers, and the states that certify them, have come under scrutiny. States and the federal government are implementing new accountability measures and reporting requirements for states and for colleges and universities.

Institutions of higher education have started taking steps to improve and to be accountable for teacher education. But there is a need for leaders in higher education to take bolder action to ensure that America's new teachers are of the highest quality during the next decade when over two million new teachers will be hired. While state and federal accountability measures can be refined and improved over time, institutions of higher education have two choices. They can fight the new push for accountability and miss the chance to use these tools as an incentive to improve, or they can insist on playing a leadership role in finding meaningful and appropriate ways to measure the quality of teacher education.

Accountability is not just an external mandate. It can also be developed and institutionalized within the campus culture in ways consistent with a college or university's mission, and as a spur to continuous improvement. After all, if we believe in our responsibility to prepare teachers well, we must be willing to find appropriate ways to measure whether we have succeeded—and ultimately, whether our teachers are succeeding in their new classrooms.

The Issues

The following comments, intended to present a variety of viewpoints about the challenges that presidents face, helped to provoke thoughtful discussion among the Summit participants.

- Higher education institutions have traditionally judged the quality of the teachers they produce through course grades and a limited student teaching experience. Meanwhile, policymakers have shifted to a results-oriented, standards-based approach for students and, increasingly, for teachers and higher education institutions as well.
- States are becoming less satisfied that graduation from a teacher education program ensures that a new teacher is qualified to teach students well. There is a growing trend toward high-stakes testing in which teacher education program approval is based on teaching candidates' performance on standardized licensing exams.
- Many people question the validity of evaluating programs based on accreditation, degree completion, or pass rates on paper-and-pencil licensing exams. The classroom performance of teacher education graduates is a better guide to program quality.
- Accreditation judgments in general tend to be based on an examination of the institution rather than a focus on the enhancement of K–12 schools.
- Institutions of higher education and states tend not to act as partners in teacher preparation; they more often have adversarial relationships.
- Admissions standards for teacher education play an important up-front role in accountability, but they often are set too low or without consideration of the kinds of individuals we want to bring into the profession.
- Some critics are so convinced of the inadequacy of teacher education and state licensing requirements that they propose to do away with them altogether.

Tough Questions to Consider

The following were the kinds of questions that presidents were asked to consider before coming to the Summit.

- Are the standards used to judge teacher preparation programs and new teachers driven by concern about quantity or quality?
- Are the admissions and retention standards in my teacher preparation program high enough to ensure high-quality graduates?
- How does my institution *know* that our teaching candidates have strong content knowledge and good teaching skills?

- If teaching performance is the ultimate test of quality, how good is the clinical experience component of our program?
 - Will preservice students and current K–12 teachers and administrators agree with the program assessment judgments of my teacher preparation faculty and administrators?
 - What role can my institution play in determining the measures of accountability on which our graduates and we will be judged?
 - How does the teacher preparation program at my school stack up against the best in the country on the measures included in the report card mandated by Title II of the Higher Education Act?
-

Next Steps

These are complex issues central to the current debate over student achievement in the United States and the future of higher education. In discussing what can be done to address them, the presidents and chancellors at the Summit generated the following action steps. They are examples of steps that presidents have taken, or steps that presidents could take, to demonstrate their commitment to strengthening accountability on their campuses.

- Become actively involved in state teacher certification issues and in state or national efforts to strengthen accountability for teacher preparation program results.
- Examine the extent to which teacher licensure pass rates for a teacher preparation program are real measures of quality, or artifacts of a weak test and low cut scores, as part of the implementation of a program improvement strategy.
- Convene a campus group of key faculty and administrators to set program quality goals and to develop good indicators that could be used to decide how well the institution measures up.
- Develop program goals and implementation strategies with a campus-wide group that includes K–12 teachers and administrators as full members.
- Guarantee the performance of new teachers to the school districts that hire them, with two conditions: the teachers must be teaching in the fields and at grade levels in which they prepared to teach.
- Set standards for the institution's graduates that are higher than the state standards for entering the teaching profession.
- Adopt a formal admissions process that includes an assessment of whether candidates have the basic skills needed to succeed in the program.
- Get serious about how the institution's products (teachers) are affected by what the institution does. Higher education is the only "industry" that does not know anything about the quality of its product.

- Ensure a process for evaluating student learning and individualized instruction, which can take place even in large universities. Insist on accountability throughout the entire process of teacher education. Develop something like the Ford process for building in accountability at each stage of the process.
- Adopt an accountability system for the institution and for its students, whereby an institution-wide commitment to teaching a specific set of knowledge and skills is established and candidates are assessed at regular intervals to measure their progress—and that of the program—in relation to those skills.
- In partnership with the school districts and the state, agree on key elements of teacher quality and find ways to judge the institution's program in terms of its ability to develop these attributes in prospective teachers. Institutions need to confirm to policymakers and the public that these qualities have in fact been exhibited at levels to justify the receipt of a state license.
- Work within and outside the institution to reach consensus about what the “end” of accountability is while allowing institutions to use different means in order to get there.
- Use multiple measures of performance that could include portfolios. The bottom line is: “Do our teachers have a positive impact on the learning performance of their students?”
- Shift the focus to exit standards instead of tests. What do the students know, and what are they able to do?
- Discuss the evaluation of the teacher education programs at school convocations and trustee meetings.
- Work in a group with other presidents to address accountability, including how well teachers teach in the K–12 schools and how well professors teach in the colleges of education and arts and sciences.
- Encourage faculty and academic administrators to develop ways of providing measurable results that demonstrate the impact on student learning of their various initiatives and programs.
- Use standardized tests for leverage, not as the only measure of accountability.
- Establish high expectations for deans of education and address how they are prepared.
- Form support systems with other presidents who are willing to take a stand for teacher education.
- Use the university's experts in assessment and evaluation to inform other faculty members in education and the arts and sciences.
- Promote teacher education, make it a university-wide enterprise, and make national accreditation mandatory.
- Increase the use of standardized testing as a barometer on the success of a program.
- Since institutions inevitably are going to be held accountable, embrace accountability and gain control of it.