

URGENTTotal Pages: 38

LRM ID: CJB81

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Washington, D.C. 20503-0001**

Friday, July 25, 1997

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer - See Distribution below
Janet R. Forsgren
FROM: Janet R. Forsgren (for) Assistant Director for Legislative Reference
OMB CONTACT: Constance J. Bowers
PHONE: (202)395-3803 FAX: (202)395-6148

SUBJECT: REVISED EDUCATION Draft Bill on Higher Education Act Reauthorization,
Title V -- Teacher Recruitment and Training (NOTE: changes from the July
23rd version are marked.)

DEADLINE: 5:00 p.m. Monday, July 28, 1997

In accordance with OMB Circular A-19, OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President. Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or receipts for purposes of the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

COMMENTS:
DISTRIBUTION LIST

AGENCIES:

76-National Economic Council - Sonyia Matthews - (202) 45/6-6630
84-National Science Foundation - Lawrence Rudolph - (703) 306-1060
61-JUSTICE - Andrew Fois - (202) 514-2141
71-National Council on Disability - Speed Davis - (202) 272-2004
59-INTERIOR - Jane Lyder - (202) 208-4371
24-Corporation for Natl and Community Service - Gene Sofer - (202) 606-5000

EOP:

Kathryn B. Stack
Timothy A. Rosado
Barry White
Robert M. Shireman
Michael Cohen
William R. Kincaid
Robert G. Damus
William P. Marshall
Daniel J. Chenok
Jonathan H. Schnur
Daryl E. Chubin
David Radzanowski

Pamela B. VanWie
Jennifer L. Klein

RESPONSE TO
LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL
MEMORANDUM

_____ Concur
 _____ No Objection
 _____ No Comment
 _____ See proposed edits on pages _____
 _____ Other: _____
 _____ FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this response sheet

**Title V of the Higher Education Act:
U.S. Department of Education's Proposal for Reauthorization**

The Department of Education proposes a targeted agenda for the reauthorization of Title V of the Higher Education Act. In contrast to the current law's authorization of numerous small, fragmented programs, the Department's proposal focuses succinctly on recruiting new teachers for high-poverty urban and rural areas, preparing them well, and supporting them during induction, the critical first stage of a teacher's career.

While the Federal government already addresses the professional development of current teachers, little has been invested in developing new teachers. Because our Nation will be preparing more teachers than ever before, and for increasingly challenging classrooms, a Federal investment targeted to teacher recruitment, preparation, and induction can have a significant impact.

Our proposal has two parts: (1) support for the highest-quality teacher preparation for underserved urban and rural areas, and (2) recruitment of qualified teachers for these underserved areas. Both parts of the proposal also address induction, the time period in which 30% of new teachers leave the field, in part because of a lack of support and quality preparation.

Lighthouse Partnerships for Teacher Preparation: Our proposed Lighthouse Partnerships program would identify a variety of institutions that prepare teachers well, in strong collaboration with school districts in high-poverty urban and rural areas, and promote the expansion of their best practices to other institutions. The program would be authorized at \$30 million for fiscal year 1999.

The proposal addresses three critical needs in teacher preparation. First, as a Nation, we must identify best practices in teacher education, especially in preparing teachers to teach in high-poverty schools. The research and evaluation literature on teacher education programs that would tell us how best to prepare teachers does not yet exist. As a result, teacher preparation programs vary widely in approach and quality. Second, when exemplary teacher education practices are identified, they should be disseminated and spread to other institutions; otherwise, good programs will remain islands of excellence with little impact on the great majority of prospective teachers. Third, because quality teacher preparation demands strong collaboration with elementary and secondary schools, school districts and teacher preparation institutions must work together in real partnerships to prepare teachers.

The Lighthouse Partnerships program would award five-year competitive grants to partnerships among institutions ("lead institutions") that are exemplary in preparing teachers for high-need areas, the school districts with which they collaborate, and a number of "partner institutions" that want to improve their teacher preparation.

programs. Other entities, including community colleges and States, could be partners as well.

After a pre-application competition, a number of exemplary institutions and their partner school districts would be invited to submit full applications in partnership with other institutions of their choosing. Grantees would have to meet a set of rigorous criteria measuring such factors as the quality of lead institutions' teacher preparation programs, including their strong partnership with elementary and secondary schools in underserved areas, and the strength of the proposed partnership with other institutions of higher education.

Funds would be used for refinement and evaluation of the lead institution's teacher education programs; for the aggressive dissemination of information about best practices in teacher preparation to other institutions that prepare teachers; for technical assistance by the lead institution in improving the partner institutions' teacher preparation programs; for subgrants to the partner institutions for the implementation of program improvements; for joint activities with school districts in the partnership; for recruitment of potential teachers for underserved areas; and for assessing the effectiveness of the grant activities.

Strong evaluation provisions in the legislation would require that the partnerships document improvement in teacher preparation programs at the lead and partner institutions and that they show improvement in the effectiveness and diversity of students completing their programs. In addition, they must show improvement in student achievement at the elementary and secondary schools with which they collaborate.

✓ **Recruiting New Teachers for Underserved Areas:** Our Nation's schools will need to hire over two million teachers in the next decade, and they need a ~~more~~ diverse teaching force. Urban and rural schools will experience the most severe teacher shortages; at the same time, students in those schools often need the most qualified teachers.

talented well-prepared and

The Federal government cannot solve these recruitment challenges alone, but it can be a catalyst that stimulates the recruitment of minority teachers and teachers in areas of high need. We propose a program to increase the number of students, especially minority students, who complete high-quality teacher preparation programs and teach in underserved areas. The program would be authorized at \$39 million for fiscal year 1999 (with small portion of these funds available to pay the cost of continuation grants under the predecessor Minority Teacher Recruitment program.)

The program would award five-year competitive grants to partnerships between institutions of higher education and school districts in underserved urban and rural areas, in conjunction with other partners such as community colleges, teachers'

unions, community organizations, and States, to recruit and prepare teachers. Together the partners would determine the needs of high-poverty schools in their communities, such as the need for more minority teachers or for teachers in particular subjects. Having completed this needs assessment, the partners would identify a pool of potential teachers fitting those needs, recruit individuals from this pool, and design high-quality preparation and induction programs tailored to those individuals.

The needs of the respective partnerships would determine their recruitment focus. Special consideration would be given to applications from minority-serving institutions and to applications most likely to result in increases in the numbers of minority individuals, including language minority individuals, and individuals with disabilities in the teaching force.

The program would support scholarships for potential teachers. Applicants would determine the funding level and number of these scholarships according to the needs of their students. Because scholarships alone are often not enough to attract and retain participants in the program, the grantees could also provide support services such as academic counseling, tutoring, mentoring, child care, and transportation. Grantees could provide support services during participants' first three years of teaching, as well.

Individuals recruited into the program would commit to teach for at least three years in underserved school districts, defined by poverty level. The grantees would be judged by their success in preparing teachers to teach to high standards and in placing and retaining new teachers in high-need communities. Thus, they would have strong incentives to prepare students well for the challenges of teaching in high-poverty urban and rural schools and to support them effectively during their first years of teaching. Grantees also would have to show evidence that the numbers of minority teachers and teachers in high-poverty areas are increased.

A matching requirement would help to ensure that the program activities continue after Federal funding ends. Over the five-year grant period, the Federal share of the costs of the program activities would be reduced incrementally from 90 percent to 50 percent.

A focused Federal investment in teacher recruitment and preparation can make a substantial impact on the development of new teachers. The Department's proposal for the reauthorization of Title V would be an effective answer to our Nation's challenges in teaching.

HEA, TITLE VDRAFT

July 25, 1997

"TITLE V--EDUCATOR RECRUITMENT, PREPARATION, AND INDUCTION

"FINDINGS

"SEC. 501. The Congress finds as follows:

"(1) What teachers know and can do has a critical impact on student achievement, yet too often prospective teachers are not receiving the initial preparation they need in order to teach children from diverse backgrounds to challenging standards.

~~While outstanding teacher preparation programs exist in different regions of the country, many prospective teachers are not in rigorous clinically-based programs and do not receive high-quality preparation (aligned with challenging content and performance standards) in the subject areas they will teach, and in child development and teaching methods.~~

"(2) A number of elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States are implementing ^{effective} educational reform strategies ~~that are research-based, have records of demonstrated effectiveness in enabling students to achieve to high [State or local] standards, are replicable in diverse and challenging circumstances, and are supported by networks of researchers and experienced practitioners.~~ Yet preparation to implement these strategies is not generally a central component of initial teacher preparation. The result is that most newly prepared teachers do not have a thorough grounding in the most effective classroom practices.

"(3) Institutions of higher education that provide teachers for urban and rural schools that enroll concentrations of children from low-income families often have the greatest need to restructure their teacher preparation programs ~~because the teachers they graduate will face the greatest classroom challenges.~~

"(4) Improvement of teacher preparation in mathematics and reading represents a particular challenge for American education. For example, most future elementary and middle-school mathematics teachers take no more than one or two college-level mathematics courses, and these courses are not designed for prospective teachers and do not cover the mathematics content that elementary and middle-school teachers **[should]** teach; nor do many prospective teachers learn the teaching methods needed to enable students to meet challenging mathematics standards. In reading, most teacher preparation programs have not incorporated the large body of research on effective reading instruction. **[SENTENCE DELETED]** ~~Progress has been particularly slow in preparing teachers to teach reading in a way that meets the wide range of learning needs in the classroom.~~

"(5) If current trends continue, American schools will need to hire more than two million teachers in the next decade to educate an increasing number of students and to replace current teachers who will retire or leave the profession. Recent trends in the number of people preparing to enter teaching indicate that the normal operation of the labor market, by itself, will not

produce the number of qualified teachers schools will need.

"(6) Schools are already having trouble recruiting qualified teachers. ~~The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future~~ found that 50,000 uncertified individuals ~~annually enter teaching because schools, frequently those in urban and rural areas with large concentrations of children from low-income families, cannot find all the certified teachers they need.~~ According to the Commission, 12 percent of newly hired ~~teachers enter teaching without any relevant training, and an additional 14 percent enter without having met State licensure standards, fewer than three-quarters of all new teachers are fully qualified.~~

~~"(7) Teaching excellence and diversity are inextricably connected. By bringing distinctive life experiences and perspectives into the classroom, providing valuable role models for all students, enriching the instructional curriculum and the school climate, and strengthening connections to parents and communities, teachers from diverse racial and ethnic groups, and those with disabilities, enhance the quality of American education. Yet today, members of racial and ethnic minority groups make up only 13 percent of the teaching force, and few individuals with disabilities are teaching in American classrooms.~~

"(8) The Federal Government, by itself, cannot ensure needed improvements in teacher preparation or solve the problem of teacher shortages. However, the Government can make limited,

targeted investments that--

"(A) encourage more institutions of higher education that operate teacher preparation programs, working in partnership with local educational agencies and States, to adopt the practices and strategies of the best programs; and

"(B) encourage more people, [and a more diverse mix of people,] people to enter teaching, complete high-quality preparation programs, and teach in underserved communities.

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 502. [The purpose of this title is to help meet the natural need to recruit, prepare, and retain a high-quality and diverse supply of elementary and secondary education teachers, particularly for schools in urban and rural areas with concentrations of children from low-income families, by--]

"(1) authoriz[ing] support for partnerships among institutions of higher education that operate exemplary teacher preparation programs, other institutions of higher education seeking to improve their programs, public elementary and secondary schools, and States, in order to improve the quality of the initial preparation of teachers for high-poverty communities;

"(2) authoriz[ing] support for partnerships to increase the number, ~~and~~ ^{diversity} of students who enter teacher education programs, complete high-quality preparation programs, and teach ^{well} in underserved urban and rural communities; and

"(3) encourag[ing] through such partnerships, the

creation of a more diverse teaching force, through the recruitment and preparation of minority individuals, [including] language minority individuals, and individuals with disabilities, to enter teaching.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 503. (a) AUTHORIZATION FOR PARTS A AND B. There are authorized to be appropriated--

"(1) \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years to carry out the program of Lighthouse Partnerships under part A; and

"(2) \$39,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years to carry out the program of Recruiting New Teachers for Underserved Areas under part B.

"(b) TRANSITION. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may use funds appropriated under subsection (a) to make continuation awards for projects that were funded under subpart 2 of part E of title V of this Act, as in effect [prior to enactment of {name of Act}].

"PART A--LIGHTHOUSE PARTNERSHIPS

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 511. As used in this part, the following terms have the following meanings:

"(1) (A) The term 'lead institution' means an institution of higher education that--

"(i) operates an exemplary [teacher preparation] program of significant size in one or more areas of teacher preparation, which may include the preparation of principals and other educational administrators;

"(ii) desires to assist other institutions of higher education in improving their programs and to serve as a national model for effective teacher preparation; and

"(iii) prepares teachers for teaching positions in urban and rural communities with concentrations of children from low-income families.

"(B) A lead institution [may participate] in a consortium with one or more two-year colleges with which it has articulation agreements relating to teacher preparation.

"(2) The term 'lighthouse partnership' means a partnership of a lead institution, partner institutions, and State and local educational agencies, that is dedicated to improving the quality of teacher preparation programs. Within each partnership, the lead institution shall act as the fiscal agent for the grant.

"(3) The term 'partner institution' means an institution of higher education that--

"(A) prepares teachers for their initial entry

into the teaching profession;

"(B) desires to improve its program with assistance from a lead institution; and

"(C) prepares teachers for teaching positions in urban and rural communities with concentrations of children from low-income families.

"(4) The term 'teacher preparation program' means a program operated by an institution of higher education that prepares students to obtain initial teacher licensure and to teach in elementary and secondary schools. Such a program may also prepare students to become preschool teachers if the institution serves a State or school districts in which preschool education is provided as free, public education.

"GRANTS TO LIGHTHOUSE PARTNERSHIPS

"SEC. 512. (a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.--(1) From funds appropriated under section 503(1) for this part for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make competitive grants to lighthouse partnerships.

"(2) Each grant under paragraph (1) shall be for a period not to exceed five years.

"(3) The Secretary shall--

"(A) make continuation awards, for the second and succeeding years, only after determining that the partnership is

making satisfactory progress in carrying out the grant; and

"(B) conduct an intensive review of the partnership's progress, with the assistance of outside experts, before making the continuation award for the fourth year of the grant.

"(b) LIMITATION. No partnership may receive more than two grants under this part.

"PREAPPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 513. (a) PREAPPLICATIONS. Each lead institution that wishes to participate in a lighthouse partnership that will apply for a grant under this part shall submit a preapplication to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, except that the lead institution need not identify the other members of the partnership until it submits an application under subsection (b). [The Secretary shall use a peer review process to review such preapplications.]

"(b) APPLICATIONS REQUIRED. Any lighthouse partnership desiring to receive a grant under this part shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

"(c) CONTENTS. Each application shall include ~~at least~~

"(1) a description of the teacher preparation program operated by the lead institution, ~~including information on the curriculum, the faculty, and the number and characteristics of students served;~~

"(2) evidence of the quality of the institution's teacher preparation program, covering

~~"(A) the extent to which the institution provides a coherent program, in one or more areas of teacher education, that--~~

~~"(i) is organized around a sound conceptual framework reflecting the best of what is known, from research and practice, on teacher education;~~

~~"(ii) prepares teachers to implement research-based instructional programs of demonstrated effectiveness and to teach their students to high content standards; and~~

~~"(iii) reflects high standards for teaching, such as the standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and for teacher education;~~

~~"(B) the commitment of the institution to its program of teacher preparation, which may include evidence on--~~

~~"(i) the role of teacher education within the overall mission of the institution;~~

~~"(ii) the involvement of the institution's President, Provost, or other top administrators in the teacher education program;~~

~~"(iii) the extent to which the board of trustees supports the program; and~~

~~"(iv) the financial commitment of the institution to its teacher preparation program (such as~~

information on the funding provided per student enrolled in teacher preparation, compared to the funding provided for students in other programs, or on the endowment of chairs and professorships in teacher education compared to those endowments in other areas);

"(C) the connections between the institution's teacher preparation program and its departments or schools of arts and sciences, as demonstrated through such evidence as the course requirements in arts and sciences for prospective teachers and the involvement of arts and sciences faculty members in the teacher preparation program (such as through joint development and teaching of courses, arts and sciences faculty members' supervision of student teachers, and joint faculty appointments);

"(D) the extent to which the institution operates a clinically based teacher preparation program, through which prospective teachers participate in intensive, structured clinical experiences, with extensive faculty involvement, throughout their preservice education, and the extent to which those experiences are integrated into the curriculum;

"(E) the extent to which the institution's program offers continuous assistance to its graduates during their initial years in the classroom;

"(F) the extent to which the institution maintains other connections with elementary and secondary education (particularly with urban and rural schools and school systems that serve concentrations of students from low-income families

and with the education reforms under way in the institution's State), as demonstrated through such evidence as--

"(i) strong involvement of the faculty (including the arts and sciences faculty) and the administration in elementary and secondary education;

"(ii) involvement of elementary and secondary educators in the continuing development, improvement, and implementation of the teacher preparation program; and

"(iii) institutional policies that take into account, in faculty promotion and tenure decisions, service to elementary and secondary education;

"(G) the success of the institution in preparing teachers to teach [effectively] individuals from diverse populations, such as evidence of the extent to which those graduates demonstrate the knowledge and skills to teach individuals from diverse populations effectively; and

"(H) the extent to which the institution has incorporated the use of educational technology into its teacher preparation program and is preparing teachers to use technology to teach children to high standards;

"(I) the record of the institution's teacher preparation program in attracting and graduating a diverse student body (including the recruitment and enrollment of individuals with disabilities), taking into account the diversity of the State or region served by the institution, and of employing a similarly diverse faculty;

"(J) the procedures the institution uses to measure the quality of its teacher preparation program (including the extent to which graduates improve their subject matter knowledge and teaching ability as a result of their participation in the program) and to improve its program, using information generated through those procedures;

"(K) the success of the program in graduating students who are fully qualified to teach to high standards in the State or region served by the institution;

"(L) the quality of the program's graduates, as documented through such evidence as the graduates' record of obtaining (and retaining) teaching positions and the opinions of school district officials, in the State or region, of the quality of those graduates;

"(M) if applicable, the quality of the institution's program for the preparation of school principals and other school administrators, and of the success of that program; and

"(N) involvement and leadership of the institution in national, regional, and State efforts to improve teacher education and licensure;

"(3) evidence of the extent to which--

"(A) graduates have taken teaching positions in urban and rural schools in communities with concentrations of students from low-income families; and

"(B) the institution recruits and serves students

(such as education paraprofessionals) from those communities;

"(4) evidence of the experience of the lead institution in creating or participating in networks with other institutions to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs, including networks established for the support of research-based elementary and secondary education reform strategies;

"(5) a description of how the partnership will operate a program under this part, including--

"(A) a description of the governance structure that the partnership will establish (through a written partnership agreement) for the grant, which shall include the active involvement of high-level administrators of the lead institution and representatives of--

"(i) both the teacher preparation program and the school or department of arts and sciences in the lead institution;

"(ii) the partner institutions involved with the grant;

"(iii) local educational agencies [(including teachers and other school-level officials)] served by the lead institution and one or more of the partner institutions; and

"(iv) State officials with authority over teacher licensure and teacher preparation in the States in which the lead institution and one or more of the partner institutions are located;

"(B) a description of how the partnership will

fully engage local educational agencies in the activities carried out under the grant, and of how those activities will benefit those agencies;

"(C) a description of how the partnership will use the funds it receives under the grant, [including how the partnership will use those funds to address the teacher training needs of the local educational agencies that are members of the partnership,] consistent with section 514;

~~"(D) a description of how the activities undertaken with the grant will support, and be integrated with, the educational reforms under way in the States of the lead and the partner institutions, including a description of plans for coordinating activities carried out under the grant with activities carried out under [title II, title III, and section 3132] of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act; the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;]~~

~~["(E) a description of how the institution will coordinate its activities under the grant with other Federal or State professional development programs or activities designed to improve pre- and in-service teacher training; and]~~

["(F) a description of-

"(i) the measurable goals the partnership expects to achieve through the grant, including--

"(I) goals for improvements in the teacher preparation programs of the partner institutions;

"(II) goals for improvements in the quality, and increases in the number and diversity, of the graduates of teacher preparation programs operated by members of the partnership who take teaching positions in high-poverty schools of the local educational agencies in the partnership; and

§(III) such other goals, consistent with the purposes of this part, as the partnership may select; and

§(ii) how the partnership will determine whether it is meeting those goals; and]

"(C) a description of the partnership's plan for institutionalizing the activities it is carrying out under this part, so that those activities will continue once Federal funding ceases.

"USES OF FUNDS

"SEC. 514. (a) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES. [In order to increase the quality, number, and diversity of elementary and secondary teachers it is preparing for positions in urban and rural areas with concentrations of low-income families,] each partnership selected to receive a grant under this part shall use the grant funds for each of the following purposes:

"(1) Further development, refinement, assessment of, and dissemination of information on, the teacher preparation programs operated by the lead institution, including activities

that document, for other institutions nationally and for policy-makers, effective practices in teacher preparation and that produce curricular and other materials for use by other institutions preparing teachers.

"(2) Technical assistance by the lead institution to the partner institutions in improving the partner institutions' teacher preparation programs (and, if applicable, their principal and other administrator preparation programs), based on the experience of the lead institution and the particular needs of the partners.

"(3) Making subgrants to the partner institutions for implementation of program improvements at those institutions, [through adoption or adaptation of the teacher preparation practices of the lead institution, to meet the needs of the urban and rural communities they serve.] Each partnership shall use at least 40 percent of its grant for this purpose.

"(4) Joint activities with the local educational agencies in the partnership, and with other local educational agencies, that increase the involvement of classroom teachers and school administrators in the design and implementation of teacher preparation programs operated by the lead and partner institutions (and thereby make those programs more responsive to the needs of teachers and administrators), and other activities to improve teaching and administration, [and to support new teachers,] in the schools of those local educational agencies.

"(5) Cooperation and interaction with other lighthouse

partnerships and with other institutions, organizations, and public agencies, on activities aimed at the improvement of teacher preparation nationally, including improvement of teacher licensure and relicensure requirements.

"(6) Assessment of the effectiveness of the activities carried out under the grant, including the extent to which the [partnership is achieving its goals under section 513(c)(5)(F)].

"(b) OPTIONAL ACTIVITIES. Each partnership selected to receive a grant under this part may also use the grant funds[PHRASE DELETED] for joint activities with States that promote the development and implementation of State policies to facilitate the improvement of teacher preparation programs (and, if applicable, principal and other administrator preparation programs) within the States, as a component of comprehensive education reforms.

"SELECTION OF APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 515. (a) PEER REVIEW. The Secretary shall, using a peer review process, select applicants to receive grants under this part on the basis of--

"(1) the quality of the teacher preparation program operated by the lead institution in a proposed partnership,

"(2) the quality of the partnership's plan for carrying

out activities under the grant; and

"(3) the capacity of the lead institution and its partners to carry out the proposed activities successfully.

"(b) CRITERIA AND PRIORITIES. [(1)] In selecting grantees under this part, the Secretary shall seek to ensure that--

"(A) lighthouse partnerships represent a variety of approaches to teacher preparation;

"(B) lead institutions represent a variety of institutions of higher education; and

"(C) there is an equitable geographic distribution of awards.

"(2) In addition to complying with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give priority to applications for--

"(A) projects that are likely to result in improvement of teacher preparation in the areas of mathematics and reading; and

"(B) projects that are likely to prepare a significant number of minority individuals, [including] language minority individuals, and individuals with disabilities to be teachers.

"EVALUATION

"SEC. 516. The Secretary shall provide for an evaluation of the program carried out under this part, ~~including an assessment of such issues as--~~

"(1) the extent to which the activities carried out through Lighthouse Partnerships result in significant and positive changes in the teacher preparation programs operated by partner institutions, as well as improvements in the programs operated by lead institutions;

"(2) the extent to which Lighthouse Partnership grants enhance the effectiveness, including the technological proficiency, and the diversity, of students completing teacher preparation programs in the institutions of higher education participating in the grants; and

"(3) the involvement of elementary and secondary schools and school districts serving concentrations of children from low-income families in the activities carried out under this part, and the extent to which those activities result in benefits to those schools and districts, including information on the extent to which involvement in the grants improves the instructional programs and the educational outcomes for students in those schools and districts.

"NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 517. The Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this part for any fiscal year for--

"(1) peer review of applications;

"(2) evaluation of the program under section 516, and measurement of its effectiveness in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993;

"(3) conferences [and networks] of lighthouse partnerships, and other entities, in order to facilitate the exchange of information and ideas among the participating partnerships and other institutions, agencies, and individuals, [including recipients of funds under part B,] who are interested in the improvement of teacher preparation and parallel improvements in principal and administrator preparation; and

"(4) technical assistance and other activities to enhance the success of the program carried out under this part or of teacher education more generally.

"PART B RECRUITING NEW TEACHERS FOR UNDERSERVED AREAS

"PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 521. From funds appropriated to carry out this part under section 503(2) for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make competitive grants to eligible applicants for programs that--

"(1) provide scholarships and, as necessary, support services for students, particularly minority students, [including] language minority students, and students with disabilities, seeking to complete teacher preparation programs and to teach in underserved areas; and

"(2) thereby increase the [quality.] number, [and diversity] of new teachers nationally and increase the ability of schools in underserved areas to recruit a qualified teaching staff.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 522. As used in this part, the following terms have the following meanings:

"(1) (A) The term 'eligible applicant' means a partnership of--

"(i) an institution of higher education that grants baccalaureate degrees and prepares teachers for their initial entry into the teaching profession; and

"(ii) one or more local educational agencies that are in underserved areas.

"(B) Such a partnership may also include--

"(i) two-year colleges that operate teacher preparation programs and maintain articulation agreements, with the baccalaureate-granting institution, for the transfer of credits in teacher preparation;

"(ii) State agencies that have responsibility for policies related to teacher preparation and licensure; and

"(iii) other public and private, nonprofit agencies and organizations that serve, or are located in, communities served by the local educational agencies in the partnership, and that have an interest in teacher recruitment, preparation, and induction.

"(2) The term 'support services' includes--

"(A) academic advice and counseling;

"(B) tutorial services;

§(C) mentoring; [and]

"(D) child care and transportation, if funding for those services cannot be arranged from other sources; and

"(3) The term 'underserved area' means--

["(A) the three local educational agencies in the State that have the highest numbers of children, ages 5-17, from families below the poverty level (based on data satisfactory to the Secretary); and

"(B) any other local educational agency in which the percentage of such children is at least 20 percent, or the number of such children is at least 10,000.]

§GRANT CONDITIONS

"SEC. 523. (a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.--(1) (A) The Secretary shall carry out this part by making competitive grants to eligible applicants.

"(B) Each grant under subparagraph (A) shall be for a period not to exceed five years.

"(2) The Secretary shall--

"(A) make continuation awards, for the second and succeeding years, only after determining that the grantee is making satisfactory progress in carrying out the grant; and

"(B) conduct an intensive review of the grantee's progress, with the assistance of outside experts, before making

the award for the fourth year of the grant.

"(3) No partnership may receive more than two grants under this subsection.

"(b) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.--(1) The Federal share of the cost of activities carried out under a grant made under subsection (a) shall not exceed--

"(A) 90 percent of the cost in the first year of the grant;

"(B) 80 percent in the second year;

"(C) 70 percent in the third year;

"(D) 60 percent in the fourth year; and

"(E) 50 percent in the fifth year and any succeeding year (including each year of the second grant, if any).

"(2) The non-Federal share of activities carried out with a grant under subsection (a) may be provided in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, and may be obtained from any non-Federal public or private source.

"(c) PLANNING GRANTS.--(1) The Secretary may make planning grants to eligible applicants that are not yet ready to implement programs under subsection (a).

"(2) Each planning grant shall be for a period of not more than one year, which shall be in addition to the period of any grant under subsection (a).

"(3) Any recipient of a planning grant under this

subsection that wishes to receive a grant under subsection (a) (1) shall separately apply for a competitive grant under that subsection.

"GRANT APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 524. (a) APPLICATIONS REQUIRED. Any eligible applicant desiring to receive a grant under this part shall submit an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

"(b) APPLICATION CONTENTS. Each application for a grant under section 523(a) shall include--

"(1) a designation of the institution or agency, within the partnership, that will serve as the fiscal agent for the grant;

"(2) information on the quality of the institution's teacher preparation program, which may include the types of information described in section 513(c) (2), [and how the applicant will ensure that scholarship recipients will receive high-quality preparation];

~~"(3) a description of the assessment the institution, the local educational agency partners, and other partners have undertaken--~~

~~"(A) to determine--~~

~~"(1) the most critical needs of the local educational agencies, particularly the needs of schools in high-poverty areas, for new teachers (which may include teachers in particular subject areas or at certain grade levels, including~~

the prekindergarten level, minority teachers, and teachers who are disabled who will contribute to the diversity of the local educational agency's teachers, or teachers who are fluent in languages spoken by students in the local educational agency); and

"(ii) how the project carried out under the grant will address those needs; and

"(B) that reflects the input of all significant entities in the community (including organizations representing teachers and parents) that have an interest in teacher recruitment, preparation, and induction;

"(4) a description of the project the applicant will carry out with the grant, including information on--

"(A) the recruitment and outreach efforts the applicant will undertake to publicize the availability of scholarships and other assistance under the program;

"(B) (i) the number and types of students that the applicant will serve under the program, which may include ~~education paraprofessionals seeking to achieve full teacher certification, teachers whom the partner local educational agencies have hired under 'emergency certification' procedures, or former military personnel, mid-career professionals, or AmeriCorps or Peace Corps volunteers, who desire to enter teaching; and~~

"(ii) the criteria that the applicant will use in selecting those students, ~~including criteria to determine~~

~~whether individuals have the capacity to benefit from the program and complete teacher certification requirements;~~

"(C) the activities the applicant will carry out under the grant, including a description of, and justification for, any support services the institution will offer to participating students;

"(D) the [number and funding range] of the scholarships the institution will provide to students; and

"(E) the procedures the institution will establish for entering into, and enforcing, agreements with scholarship recipients regarding their fulfillment of the service commitment described in section 529;

~~"(5) a description of how the institution will use funds provided under the grant only to increase the number of students participating in its teacher preparation programs, or in the particular type or types of preparation programs that the grant would support, or to increase the number of their graduates who are minority individuals, [including] language minority individuals, or individuals with disabilities;~~

"(6) a description of commitments, by the partner local educational agencies, to hire scholarship recipients in their schools and in the subject areas or grade levels for which the recipients will be trained, and a description of the actions the grantee institution, the local educational agencies, and the other partners will take to facilitate the successful transition of those recipients into teaching; and

"(7) a description of the applicant's plan for institutionalizing the activities it is carrying out under this part, so that those activities will continue once Federal funding ceases.

"USES OF FUNDS

"SEC. 525. IN GENERAL. Each grantee under section 523(a) [shall use the grant funds of the following:]

"(1) Scholarships to help students pay the costs of tuition, room, board, and other expenses of completing a teacher preparation program.

"(2) Support services, if needed to enable scholarship recipients to complete postsecondary education programs [PHRASE DELETED]

["(3) Follow up services provided to former scholarship recipients during their first three years of teaching.]

§(4) Payments to partner local educational agencies, if needed to enable them to permit paraprofessional staff to participate in teacher preparation programs (such as the cost of 'release time' for those staff).

"(5) If appropriate, and if no other funds are available, paying the costs of additional courses taken by former scholarship recipients during their initial three years of teaching.

"(b) PLANNING GRANTS. A recipient of a planning grant under

section 523(c) shall use the grant funds for the costs of planning for the implementation of a grant under section 523(a).

"SELECTION OF APPLICANTS

"SEC. 526. (a) PEER REVIEW. The Secretary, using a peer review process, shall select applicants to receive funding under this part on the basis of--

"(1) the quality of the teacher preparation program offered by the institution;

"(2) the quality of the program that would be carried out under the application; and

"(3) the capacity of the partnership to carry out the grant successfully.

"(b) CRITERIA AND PRIORITIES.--(1) In making selections, the Secretary shall seek to ensure that--

"(A) in the aggregate, grantees carry out a variety of approaches to preparing new teachers; and

"(B) there is an equitable geographic distribution of awards.

"(2) In addition to complying with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give [special consideration] to--

"(A) applications most likely to result in increases in the numbers of minority individuals, language minority individuals, and individuals with disabilities in the teaching force; and

§(B) applications from historically Black colleges

and universities, Hispanic-serving [institutions], and Tribal Colleges and Universities, as defined in title III of this Act.

"DURATION AND AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE; RELATION TO OTHER ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 527. (a) DURATION OF ASSISTANCE. No individual may receive scholarship assistance under this part--

§(1) for more than five years of postsecondary education; [and

§(2) unless that individual satisfies the requirements of section 484(a)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.]

"(b) AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE. No individual may receive an award under this program that exceeds the cost of attendance, as defined in section 472 of this Act, at the institution the individual is attending.

"(c) RELATION TO OTHER ASSISTANCE. A scholarship awarded under this part--

"(1) shall not be reduced on the basis of the individual's receipt of other forms of Federal student financial assistance; and

"(2) shall be regarded as other financial assistance available to the student, within the meaning of sections 471(3) and 480(1)(1) of this Act, in determining the student's eligibility for grant, loan, or work assistance under title IV of this Act.

"SCHOLARSHIP CONDITIONS

"SEC. 528. (a) In General. A recipient of a scholarship under

this part shall continue to receive that assistance only as long as he or she is--

"(1) enrolled as a full-time student and pursuing a course of study leading to teacher certification, unless he or she is working in a public school (as a paraprofessional, or as a teacher under emergency credentials) while participating in the program; and

"(2) maintaining satisfactory progress as determined by the institution.

[(b). Special Rule. The application of section 527(a) and section 528(a)(1) shall be modified by a grantee to the extent necessary to accomodate the rights of students with disabilities under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.]

§SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 529. (a) REQUIREMENT. Each partnership receiving a grant under this part shall enter into an agreement, with each student to whom it awards a scholarship under this part, providing that a scholarship recipient who completes a teacher preparation program under this part shall, within five years of completing that program, teach full time for at least three years in a school in an underserved geographic area or repay the amount of the scholarship to the Secretary.

"(b) REGULATIONS. The Secretary shall prescribe regulations relating to the requirements of subsection (a), including any provisions for waiver of those requirements.

"EVALUATION

"SEC. 530. The Secretary shall provide for an evaluation of the program carried out under this part, ~~which shall assess such issues as~~

"(1) whether institutions taking part in the partnerships are successful in preparing scholarship recipients to teach to high standards;

"(2) whether scholarship recipients are successful in completing teacher preparation programs, becoming fully certified teachers, and obtaining teaching positions in underserved areas, and whether they continue teaching in those areas over a period of years;

"(3) the [national] impact of the program in assisting local educational agencies in underserved areas to recruit, prepare, and retain diverse, high-quality teachers in the areas in which they have the greatest needs;

"(4) the long-term impact of the grants on teacher preparation programs conducted by grantees and on grantees' relationships with their partner local educational agencies and other partners; and

"(5) the relative effectiveness of different approaches for preparing new teachers to teach in underserved areas, including their effectiveness in preparing new teachers to teach to high content and performance standards.

"NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 531. The Secretary may retain up to five percent of the funds appropriated for this part for any fiscal year for--

"(1) peer review of applications;

"(2) conducting the evaluation required under section 530; and

"(3) technical assistance and other activities to facilitate the exchange of information and ideas among participating partnerships, and other activities to enhance the success of the program carried out under this part."

SHARON P. ROBINSON

July 29, 1997

Dear Mike,

It was good seeing you at the
AFT reception. The little V paper
I mentioned is enclosed. Let's talk.

Sharon

Discussion Draft — July 29, 1997

**Improving the Quality of America's Teachers:
A New Title V, HEA**

By:

**Sharon P. Robinson
Vice President, Teaching and Learning Programs
Educational Testing Service
Washington, D.C.**

-- Discussion Draft --
July 29, 1997

Improving the Quality of America's Teachers: A New Title V, HEA

Overview

At this critical juncture in education -- in the fifteenth year of reform since "*A Nation at Risk*", and facing the likelihood of falling short of our Year 2000 goals -- there is yet an untapped opportunity for change. This opportunity is in the people who matter most in education: *teachers*. As the National Commission stated, "... many of our efforts have ignored the obvious: that teachers' expertise makes the *crucial difference* in what children learn ... that student learning will improve only when we focus our efforts on improving teaching. The report spelled it out clearly: *teacher expertise* is the most important factor in student achievement, and recruiting, preparing, and retaining good teachers is *the central strategy* for improving our schools.¹

The 1997-98 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA) is a challenge for Congress to make a major impact on that crucial difference and to accelerate progress towards our goals. More than half the teachers teaching ten years from now will be hired in the next decade. Those two million new teachers will make the crucial difference in children's learning, and how they are prepared to teach will determine the nature of that difference.

The federal role in the initial, or pre-service preparation of teachers is reflected almost exclusively in Title V of HEA. Unfortunately, that title has become a hodgepodge of unconnected and unfunded programs with little impact. Congress should create a new Title V for the 21st century that is a catalyst for widespread reform of the nation's traditional system of teacher preparation and that addresses the need to distribute teacher talent more equitably among the nation's learners.

There is ample precedent for Congressional intervention in preparing personnel to serve society's critical concerns. When food was the country's greatest need in the 19th century, the Agriculture Department, and later, the Agricultural Extension Service, were created to educate America's farmers. In the 50's, to prepare for future global conflicts, we passed the National Defense Education Act, with its math, science and foreign language fellowships, and created the National Science Foundation, to prepare scientific personnel. For the last thirty years, we've targeted billions of dollars on correcting the maldistribution of doctors, nurses, and other health care personnel

¹ National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, September 1996, pp. 5-8.)

through the Public Health Service Act. And just two years ago, when the country needed safer streets, we passed the Crime Bill. We spent \$4 billion, have 57,000 new cops on the beat, and crime has gone down.

An undersupply of *teachers*, in fact, was nearly reversed in the 1970's after Congress passed the Education Professions Development Act, providing loans, scholarships, wages, the Teacher Corps, and Master of Arts in Teaching programs to develop new teachers. The effect was positive, and the hiring of unqualified teachers was almost eliminated. In the 1980's, however, most of the teacher recruitment incentives were canceled.² This led to renewed shortages which we are experiencing today, and which are projected in greater severity for the future.

This paper offers suggestions for a 21st century Title V to encourage reform of our system of teacher preparation in order to ensure training of the highest quality as well as effective ways for hiring and placing teachers. The paper focuses particularly on addressing the needs of students in high poverty schools. This proposal enters an already on-going discussion and is offered for consideration not as competitive with, but as complementary to, other ideas on the table.

A total Title V is envisioned as *focused on initial, or pre-service* teacher education, and as having four major purposes:

1. *Strengthening the capacity of teacher education institutions* to meet the highest standards. These critical and under-funded institutional programs need financial support to reinvent themselves to meet the exceedingly high demands of education reform, particularly of new student standards, frameworks, assessments, and technologies in nearly all states. [A formula grant program to state education agencies, for support of the most competitive teacher education institution reform proposals, has been outlined by an education community coalition and should be included.]

2. *Expanding our knowledge of clinical development* to promote incentives for reform through training partnerships with schools. [This concept is presented by a number of proposals, including those of the education community and the Administration. This paper extends the discussion further.]

3. *Providing incentives to reform teacher education in underserved communities.* This proposal suggests adapting a community-based medical model to create a demand for clinical partnerships through empowering schools in underserved areas. It is discussed in detail below.

² Mary R Rollefson. *Teacher Supply in the United States: Sources of Newly Hired Teachers in Public and Private Schools*. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993.)

4. *Improving systems of Recruitment and Hiring.* This proposal recommends federal support for creative statewide efforts to streamline antiquated and inefficient systems of recruiting, training, hiring, and appropriately placing teachers. An existing minority teacher recruitment program -- the only section of the existing Title V that is presently funded -- is recommended for expansion.

This paper begins with a discussion of problems of teacher supply and quality -- some of which are often misunderstood -- that are driving the need for reform of teacher education. Next, a proposal for institutional change in how teachers are prepared is presented. Two models from medical training are applied to the preparation of teachers:

- *Teaching schools* --variously called clinical partnerships or professional development schools (PDSs) and analogous to medicine's teaching hospitals -- would be expanded. These partnerships have emerged as the most highly respected, fastest-growing change agent in teacher education reform today.
- *Area Teacher Education Centers (ATECs)* -- analogous to medicine's Area Health Education Centers (AHECs) and grounded in underserved communities -- would be created to enhance teacher recruitment, preparation, and continuous improvement, extending successful training models to low income, underserved areas.

Finally, the paper addresses the question of getting good people into teaching, including improving systems to recruit, hire, and accurately place teachers who are qualified to teach, teaching in their field, and representative of their students.

In this time of balanced budgets and fiscal restraints, the federal role in teacher preparation should be that of an agent of change, not one of general revenue sharing to perpetuate the status quo. These proposals are intended to help identify the cutting edge, the frontier of creativity. Congress should invest funds at those leverage points to seed and inspire lasting change in institutions across the country that are key to what makes the crucial difference in what children learn: their teachers.

This paper is intended to stimulate discussion and ideas. The proposals presented here will benefit from a broad discussion and further refinement. Comments from any interested party are most welcome.

Teacher Supply and Quality

The term "shortage" refers to a situation where the demand for something is greater than its supply. It is widely acknowledged, even by the most conservative estimates, that the country will need to hire two million new teachers over the next decade.³ In addition to an increased overall teacher attrition rate, student enrollments will grow significantly over the next decade, and the big bulge of teachers reaching the age of sixty will likely begin to retire.⁴ There will thus be an increased demand for teachers over the next ten years. But does that mean there will be a teacher *shortage*? It depends upon the supply.

Where will the new teachers come from? The three major supply sources of newly hired teachers are: first-time teachers, transfers from other schools/districts/ states, and re-entrants who come back into teaching after a hiatus. First-time teachers, the largest and fastest growing of these sources, now constitute nearly half of new teacher hires. However, their attrition rate from the profession is higher than that of transfer and reentrant teachers.⁵

Aren't we producing enough teachers? We all know there's a teacher in every classroom, lots of teachers are looking for jobs, and non-traditional candidates can get provisional, temporary, or alternative certificates and be easily hired. The answer is in the *quality* and the *distribution* of teachers.

Quality. The nation is not yet committed to teachers of the highest caliber in every school classroom. Between 1987 and 1991 the proportion of well-qualified new teachers in public schools actually declined from about 74% to 67%.⁶ In 1993-94, 13.4% of newly hired teachers had no teaching license, and 17% were hired on the basis of temporary, provisional, or emergency licenses.⁷ If we're willing to hire untrained, uncertified, unqualified people and call them "teachers", then yes, we can always produce enough to fill our classrooms, and there will never be a shortage.

³ See National Commission, op. cit. and U. S. Department of Education. A Back to School Special Report: The Baby Boom Echo. (Washington, D. C.: author, August 21, 1996.)

⁴ Based on unpublished data provided by Mary Rollefson, NCES, May 22, 1997.

⁵ U. S. Department of Education. The Condition of Education, 1996. (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 96-304. Washington, D. C.: June 1996, p. 170.)

⁶ Mary R Rollefson. *Teacher Supply in the United States: Sources of Newly Hired Teachers in Public and Private Schools.* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993.)

⁷ Special tabulation prepared by the National Education Data Resource Center from the School and Staffing Survey(SASS), National Center for Education Statistics, on June 14, 1997.

Although no state will allow a person to fix plumbing, guard swimming pools, style hair, write wills, design a building, or practice medicine without completing training and passing an exam, more than 40 states allow school districts to hire teachers on emergency licenses who have not met these basic requirements. States pay more attention, the National Commission notes, to the qualifications of veterinarians treating the nation's cats and dogs than to those of teachers educating the nation's children and youth.⁸

Further, over the last twenty years fewer college graduates have entered the teaching profession as first-time teachers. And in the short period between 1988 to 1994, the percentage of public first-time teachers who came directly from college dropped ten percent, from 66 to 56 percent.⁹ A decreased inability to attract talented youth right out of college into careers in teaching, is a serious warning sign for the future. Better ways and means must be developed to improve the profession and its appeal as a career.

Distribution. Much of the problem of unqualified teachers, however, has to do with maldistribution, as in spite of the above data, the vast majority of public school students are taught by teachers with at least basic education and qualifications.¹⁰ Unfortunately, however, many teachers are assigned to classes in fields that do not match their educational backgrounds, resulting in substantial levels of *out-of-field teaching* in schools. In 1993-94, 36 percent of public school teachers with a main academic assignment field (e.g., English, foreign languages, math, science, social studies) had neither a major nor a minor in their main teaching field. Only three-fifths of such teachers has a major or minor and a license in their main field of teaching.¹¹

Qualified teachers, furthermore, are inequitably distributed across the country, causing a further disadvantage to the most needy students. Teachers in schools with relatively more low-income students were consistently found to be not as qualified as teachers in schools with relatively fewer such students. Similarly, teachers in public schools with larger proportions of disadvantaged or minority students are less likely

⁸ National Commission, op.cit., pp. 14-15.

⁹ U. S. Department of Education. *The Condition of Education*, 1996. (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 96-304, p. 170).

¹⁰ U. S. Department of Education. *Out-of-Field Teaching and Educational Equality*, NCES 96-040. (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1996, p. 3.)

¹¹ U. S. Department of Education. Testimony before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, presented by Daniel Kasprzyk, National Center for Education Statistics, July 8, 1997, pp. 6-10.

than teachers in other schools to have both a license to teach and a degree in their main assignment field.¹²

Quality teaching also includes the racial-ethnic match between teachers and students. Current large disparities indicate *a severe undersupply of minority teachers*. Students as well as faculty, both minority and majority, are the losers. A racially and ethnically diverse faculty provides different perspectives and life experiences, fosters the sharing of ideas across cultures, and promotes communication and appreciation among those from different backgrounds. Minority students are inspired to higher performance and persistence by ethnic role models in the classroom.¹³

By the year 2000, only five percent of the nation's teachers will be members of minority groups,¹⁴ whereas the student population will be about 35 percent minority.¹⁵ Although the number of minority undergraduate education degree recipients between 1989-1990 grew by 7.4 percent, a corresponding increase did not occur in the number of minority teachers. From 1987-88 to 1990-91 the number of minority teachers in public schools increased by only one percent, from 12.5 to 13.5 percent.

Until all classrooms in the United States are served by teachers who are licensed to teach, are trained in their field, are teaching in the field in which they are trained, and reflect the ethnic make-up of the majority of their students, *there will be a shortage of teachers in this nation because the inadequate supply does not meet the demand*.

Catalyzing Institutional Change

Extensive documentation exists of the long-standing problems of traditional institutional teacher education programs. Theory is taught separately from practice; subject matter is separate from methods; curricula lack depth; Arts & Sciences courses are watered down for education majors; outmoded lecture/recitation methods predominate; and classroom teaching practice with real students is tacked on as an

¹² Ibid., pp. 11-12.

¹³ See U. S. Department of Education. *Justifications of Appropriation Estimates to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1997*. Volume II., p. P-34.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Current Population Report Series P25-1130. *Population Projections of the U.S. by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995-2050*. (U. S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census.)

afterthought at the end of training.¹⁶ Teachers prepared under these circumstances are not ready for the education reformation of today, much less tomorrow.

Tomorrow's teachers must be prepared for the rigorous demands of the information age, for challenging new curriculum frameworks, for authentic performance assessments, for new roles as mentors, for the technologies of the 21st century. They must be quick to learn and be able to adapt to a rapidly changing world. They must themselves meet the new high-level student standards being developed by nearly all states, but must also be able to develop curricula and teach and assess students to meet those standards. Chalk boards, erasers, and text books, are giving way to word processing, CD ROMS, and the World Wide Web, and new teachers must be able to use and teach these new tools.

Since most teachers tend to teach as they were taught, using the old methods described above, the biggest challenge for effective federal policy is to identify the leverage points which will catalyze major change in the way new teachers are trained in the 1,200 some teacher preparation institutions across the country. The mold must be broken, and teacher training reborn as the key instrument of education reform that it should be. With restricted resources, the federal dollar should provide incentives for change by leveraging funds to seed promising programs and to inspire creative action.

Unquestionably the cutting edge, the most exciting catalyst for change in teacher training in the last twenty years, is the advent of clinical partnership teacher preparation programs --- often called *Professional Development Schools* (PDSs) -- across the country. Numbering now over 600, these programs, analogous to medicine's teaching hospitals, are clinical schools that link a university and its teacher education program with a school or schools.¹⁷ Following the medical model, aspiring entrants to the profession build on their theoretical knowledge through structured experiences in real schools where they are exposed to expert practice by outstanding clinical faculty-in-residence.

PDSs create a learning and research environment for current teachers as well as for teachers-in-training. Major operating principles include a student-centered approach to

¹⁶ See National Commission, op. cit., pp. 31-32, and particularly footnote 43.

¹⁷ See Linda Darling-Hammond, ed., *Professional Development Schools: Schools for Developing a Profession*. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1994); Levine, M. and Trachtman, R., eds., *Making Professional Development Schools Work: Politics, Practice, and Policy*. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1997); Richard W. Clark, *Professional Development Schools: Policy and Financing: A Guide for Policymakers*. (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1997); Wise, A. & Leibrand, J., "Profession-Based Accreditation: A Foundation for High-Quality Teaching", *Phi Delta Kappan*, November 1996, pp. 202-206.; Lee Teitel, *Professional Development Schools: A Literature Review*. (Washington, D. C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, February 1996).; The Holmes Group, *Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools*. (East Lansing, Michigan, 1990).

teaching and learning, shared responsibilities between the partnering institutions, the simultaneous renewal of school and university, and equal opportunity for all participants. These new programs and partnerships, strongly endorsed by the National Commission's report, could reinvent teacher education just as extended medical education and the creation of teaching hospitals transformed medical education following the advice of the Flexner Report in 1910.¹⁸

PDSs are rooted in the school reform movement, with initial support often provided by private foundations. These funders have been impressed with the ability of PDSs to bring multiple players to the table at the same time to attack problems at both ends: in the classroom, where teachers and students interact, and in the universities, where future teachers are being prepared. Probably their greatest appeal, however, is their potential for coherent systemic change.¹⁹

Clinical partnerships/PDSs²⁰ are often affiliated with one or more national network or organization, including The Holmes Partnership, the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching, the National Network for Educational Renewal, and the National Education Association. They are located in almost every state of the union, often clustered in consortia of several universities with their partner schools. The attached chart reflects a compilation of recent listings of clinical partner institutions by state gathered from those networks and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. [It is estimated that this list contains less than half the actual number of partnerships in existence.]

The costs of clinical training programs are not insignificant and vary greatly. \$50,000 per year for two years is considered typical for start-up costs, which have usually been borne by universities with support from private or public agency grants. In general, once PDSs have been initiated, it is considered possible to operate them for approximately the same amount as is currently spent by schools and universities on teacher education and professional development, educational inquiry, and renewal of P-12 education.²¹ However, some research suggests that such costs may increase by as much as 10 percent. The costs of two models presented for comparison purposes range from about \$3,500 to \$6,800 per FTE student.²²

¹⁸ Abraham Flexner, *The Flexner Report on Medical Education in the United States and Canada* (Washington, D. C. : The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910).

¹⁹ Teitel, op. cit., pg. 4.

²⁰ Note: the term "clinical partnerships" is sometimes used in this paper as a generic term encompassing Professional Development Schools and other school/university partnerships of varying titles established for similar purposes.

²¹ Richard W. Clark, op. cit., pp. 16.

²² Ibid., pp. 19-30.

This proposal suggests the inclusion in a new Title V, provisions that adapt medical training models to support the development of new clinical teacher training partnerships. Two medical training models are suggested: (a) the teaching hospital (of which the PDS discussed above is an analog) and (b) the community-based area health education center (discussed below) that would be targeted at assisting low-income, underserved school districts across the country.

Support would include: (1) a few large expansion grants of significant size to existing mature partnerships to extend exponentially the clinical teaching concept to more institutions; and (2) a program of "rolling planning grants" which would be relatively small in size but offered to a large and broadly distributed number of schools that are operating Title I schoolwide projects.

Substantial, highly competitive *expansion grants to exemplary clinical partnerships* could be awarded annually to a handful of higher education institutions to provide incentives for reform in teacher education. Only those institutions participating in existing, mature, state-of-the-art clinical partnerships located in schools would be eligible. Funds could be used to expand the mission of these teaching schools, or PDSs, to include research and development regarding the clinical preparation of teachers, to provide technical assistance to fledgling clinical partnerships, and to assist in the placement of teachers in high poverty schools.

These grantees would be partnerships that are currently "doing it" well and will contribute to the development of a "success set" of clinical collaborations. They must provide, as a condition of funding, documentation, protocols and successful models for use by others. These grantees would provide consultation and technical assistance to other institutions and partnerships in partnership-building as well as in the actual development and establishment of clinical teaching schools. All applicants would be expected to equal or exceed the requirements of the new standards for professional development schools developed by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

A national *network of Area Teacher Education Centers* (ATECs) could provide in-school clinical preparation for pre-service teachers in underserved areas. This would enlarge the prevalence of successful clinical training partnerships, or PDSs, extending the medical analogy even further by adapting medicine's Area Health Education Center (AHEC) concept to teacher preparation. The 140 community-based health centers comprise a national network across multiple states funded at \$28.5 million by the Bureau of Health Professions in the Department of Health & Human Services. This concept may be a promising model for scaling-up clinical education partnerships across the country and extending them to areas of greatest need.

Like their medical counterparts, the primary orientation of the ATECs would be to operate in *underserved (urban or rural) areas*. An ATEC would be a Title I school operating a schoolwide project in collaboration with a local institution of higher education committed to high quality practice and transformation of teacher education. An existing PDS could be an ATEC partner, but planning grants awarded to the school in partnership with the IHE teacher education program would put the Title I school at the table as an equity partner with a university.

The ATEC would plan, create, and implement that process, including establishing a clinical teacher preparation program at that school. The schoolwide Title I requirement would ensure applications from large schools, many of them urban, with a vast diversity of students and student learning needs. This is the kind of clinical environment that both teacher education faculty and teachers-in-training need to experience the full spectrum of real-life education conditions.

Typical functions of an ATEC would be solidifying partners; designing a plan to transform the school into a full-year clinical teaching program; defining roles, hours, and decision-making processes; describing novice teacher internships and master faculty residencies; determining evaluation criteria; and developing fund-raising strategies.

ATECs would also be charged with addressing the teacher maldistribution problem by finding ways to recruit individuals from minority and underserved populations not only to enter teacher training programs but to subsequently serve in schools and districts requiring them. ATECs should also address other features of demand such as subject matter shortages or skills in serving a specific population, such as students and families from rural or border areas. ATECs would provide services to locate, recruit, train, hire, place, support, and retain teachers in such areas and fields.

Funded through Title V, ATEC grantees would be expected to show how their plans reflect state or districts' standards for student learning and how the evaluation of novice teachers' competencies is aligned with those standards. They would also be required to comply with the emerging standards for PDSs being developed by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).²³

The ED could administer a program of "*rolling planning grants*" of modest amounts for the purpose of kick-starting clinical community-based partnerships modeled after successful, more mature ones. Funds could flow annually to the states, which would distribute them on a competitive basis to ATECs at Title I schoolwide schools that are ready to create clinical partnership programs. After the first year, a

²³ See "Professional Development School Standards Project" brochure, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and "Dear Colleague" letter entitled, "Professional Development Schools Standards Project" from Marsha Levine, Director, PDS Standards Project, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, D. C., March 1997.

second cohort of grantees could be funded simultaneously with the continuation of the first wave of grants. In the third year, a third cohort of grantees could be supported, the second cohort's planning grants could continue, and those of the first cohort could cease.

This concept is based on the assumption that after two years, the federal seed money caused roots to form, and a stable partnership has evolved. At that point, the ATEC could dissolve, replacing itself with an institutionalized PDS. The rolling planning grants could continue as described through the five years of the reauthorization.

Getting Good People Into Teaching

This country's processes for recruiting, hiring, and inducting new teachers are passive, haphazard, and extremely ineffective. Every year heavy and totally unnecessary losses of high quality teacher candidates are caused by woefully inadequate systems and administrative procedures which could and should be corrected.

The National Commission described a series of critical problems: uncoordinated recruitment, cumbersome screening processes that create bottlenecks, unprofessional treatment of applicants, hiring decisions delayed until the school year starts, teacher assignment and transfer policies, and obstacles to teacher mobility such as salary caps for veteran teachers, lack of licensing reciprocity among states, and the inability to transfer pension benefits from state to state. Such problems contribute to a national attrition rate of about 75% from the beginning of undergraduate teacher education through about the third year in teaching, much of which could be avoided by improved inept recruitment and processing systems of school districts and universities.²⁴

In this time of education reform, outstanding teacher candidates are needed more than ever. Recruitment, screening, and induction systems must find and nurture the very best people --- those capable of developing sophisticated curricula to meet the rigorous intellectual demands of challenging new student standards.

Federal support could stimulate the creation of new, streamlined leak-proof systems to get good teachers into training, trained, hired, and working in their major field with students of compatible background and location. The ED could fund a few new, highly competitive development grants for the most creative designs by SEAs (working in consortia with LEAs and IHEs) of models to create efficient statewide systems of

²⁴ National Commission, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-36.

recruitment, hiring, and induction of new highly qualified teachers. The small amount of funding would be a wise investment, likely yielding several successful models which would be widely disseminated and adopted.

The extreme shortfall of minority teachers, both now and projected for the future, calls for special attention to their recruitment. The only funded program within the current Title V, in fact, is the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program, authorized in 1993, and funded since at less than \$2.5 million per year. This is an unconscionably meager response to the very significant shortage of minority teachers and should be expanded and funded at a much higher level.

The program authorizes funds for partnerships between IHEs and one or more LEAs, an SEA or state higher education agency, or a community-based organization, to improve recruitment and training opportunities in education for minority students, to increase the number of minority teachers, and to encourage minority 7th-12th graders to prepare for teaching careers. It also supports a Teacher Placement Program for IHEs with schools of education for preparing and placing teachers in schools with large minority student populations. Because of insufficient Congressional appropriations, only about 3,700 aspiring teachers have been served and 186 students placed. The present funding level supports only seven new partnership awards and six new placement grants.

The Minority Teacher Recruitment Program should be significantly expanded to enhance coverage and service and should utilize new technologies to the greatest extent possible for the effective placement of new minority teachers in districts with the highest percentages of minority students and lowest percentages of minority teachers.

Attachment

ATTACHMENT

**CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS
FOR TEACHER DEVELOPMENT¹
from five national listings
1997**

State/Name of Institution	Source of Info
ALABAMA	
Auburn University Partnership	HOLMES
Tuskegee University	HOLMES
University of Alabama	HOLMES
University of Alabama at Birmingham	HOLMES
University of South Alabama	HOLMES
ALASKA	
University of Alaska-Fairbanks	HOLMES
ARIZONA	
Arizona State University	HOLMES
University of Arizona	HOLMES
ARKANSAS	
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville [Northwest Arkansas Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
Arkansas State University	HOLMES
CALIFORNIA	
California Polytechnic State University	NNER
California State University-Fullerton	AACTE
California State University-Northridge	AACTE; HOLMES
San Diego State University	AACTE; HOLMES
University of California-Riverside	AACTE
California State University-Los Angeles	HOLMES
California State University-Fresno	HOLMES
California State University-Sacramento	HOLMES
San Francisco State University	HOLMES
San Jose State University	HOLMES
Stanford University	HOLMES
University of California-Berkeley	HOLMES
University of California-Davis	HOLMES
University of California-Los Angeles	HOLMES
University of California-Riverside	HOLMES
University of California-San Diego	HOLMES

¹ These Partnerships were obtained from five national listings, as follows:

AACTE: Abal-Haqq, I. (Comp.) (1995). *Professional development schools: A directory of projects in the United States* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

HOLMES: "Members Status of Those Invited to Join The Holmes Partnership, 1997-98".

NEA: "Teacher Education Initiative Restructuring Sites," National Education Association, May 1996.

NCREST: Telephone consultation with Nancy Lauter, Deputy Director, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University, July 3, 1997.

NNER: "Directory of Settings, National Network for Educational Renewal", January 1997 edition, prepared by the Center for Educational Renewal and the Institute for Educational Inquiry, Seattle, Washington.

State/Name of Institution	Source of Info
University of California-Santa Barbara	HOLMES
University of Southern California	HOLMES
University of the Pacific	HOLMES
COLORADO	
The following are part of Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal:	
Colorado State University	NNER; HOLMES
Metropolitan State College of Denver	NNER
University of Colorado at Boulder	NNER; HOLMES
University of Colorado at Denver	NNER; HOLMES
University of Northern Colorado	NNER; HOLMES
CONNECTICUT	
The following is part of Connecticut School-University Partnership:	
University of Connecticut	NCREST; NNER; HOLMES
Central Connecticut State University	HOLMES
DELAWARE	
University of Delaware [The Delaware Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
Delaware State University	HOLMES
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
Catholic University of America	HOLMES
Gallaudet University	HOLMES
George Washington University	HOLMES
Howard University	HOLMES
FLORIDA	
University of South Florida	AACTE; HOLMES
Florida A&M University	HOLMES
Florida State University [Leon County Partnership for Professional Development]	HOLMES
University of Florida [Partnership-College of Education Consortium]	HOLMES
University of Miami [University of Miami Partnership]	HOLMES
GEORGIA	
Armstrong State College	AACTE
Clark Atlanta University	HOLMES
Emory University [Emory University Partnership]	HOLMES
Georgia State University	HOLMES
Morris Brown College	HOLMES
University of Georgia	HOLMES
HAWAII	
The following is part of Hawaii School-University Partnership:	
University of Hawaii at Manoa	NNER; HOLMES
IDAHO	
Boise State University	HOLMES
Idaho State University	HOLMES
University of Idaho	HOLMES
ILLINOIS	
Elmhurst College	AACTE
National Louis University	AACTE
Illinois State University	HOLMES
Loyola University of Chicago	HOLMES

State/Name of Institution	Source of Info
Northern Illinois University [Northern Illinois University Partnership]	HOLMES
Northwestern University	HOLMES
University of Chicago	HOLMES
University of Illinois at Chicago	HOLMES
University of Illinois	HOLMES
INDIANA	
De Pauw University	AACTE
Indiana State University	AACTE; HOLMES
Indiana University Northwest	AACTE
Purdue University	AACTE; HOLMES
Ball State University [Ball State University Partnership]	HOLMES
Indiana University-Bloomington	HOLMES
Indian University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne	HOLMES
IOWA	
University of Northern Iowa	AACTE; HOLMES
Drake University	AACTE; HOLMES
Iowa State University [Iowa State University Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
University of Iowa [University of Iowa Partnership]	HOLMES
KANSAS	
Emporia State University	AACTE
Fort Hays State University	AACTE
University of Kansas [University of Kansas Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
Kansas State University [USD383 Learning Laboratory Partnership]	HOLMES
Wichita State University	HOLMES
KENTUCKY	
University of Louisville [Holmes Partnership for Metropolitan Louisville]	NCREST; HOLMES
JCPS/Gheens Academy	HOLMES
University of Kentucky [University of Kentucky Partnership]	HOLMES
LOUISIANA	
University of New Orleans	AACTE
Dillard University	HOLMES
Grambling State University	HOLMES
Louisiana State University	HOLMES
Southern University	HOLMES
Xavier University	HOLMES
MAINE	
University of Southern Maine [Southern Maine Partnership]	NCREST; NNER; HOLMES; NEA
University of Maine [University of Maine Partnership]	HOLMES
MARYLAND	
Coppin State College	HOLMES
John Hopkins University	HOLMES
Morgan State University	HOLMES
University of Maryland at College Park	HOLMES
MASSACHUSETTS	
Anna Maria College	AACTE
Assumption College	AACTE
Simmons College	AACTE
University of Massachusetts-Amherst	AACTE; HOLMES

State/Name of Institution	Source of Info
University of Massachusetts-Lowell	AACTE
Wheelock College	AACTE; HOLMES
Boston College [Boston College Partnership]	HOLMES
Harvard University [Harvard University Partnership]	HOLMES
MICHIGAN	
Michigan State University	AACTE; HOLMES
University of Michigan-Dearborn	AACTE
Western Michigan University	AACTE; HOLMES
Central Michigan University	HOLMES
Eastern Michigan University	HOLMES
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	HOLMES
Wayne State University	HOLMES
MINNESOTA	
University of Minnesota	AACTE
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	HOLMES
MISSISSIPPI	
Jackson State University	HOLMES
Mississippi State University [Mississippi State University Partnership]	HOLMES
University of Mississippi-Main Campus [University of Mississippi Partnership]	HOLMES
MISSOURI	
Maryville University-St. Louis [Metropolitan St. Louis Consortium for Educational Renewal]	AACTE; NNER
Saint Louis University	AACTE; NCREST
Harris-Stowe State College [Metropolitan St. Louis Consortium for Educational Renewal]	AACTE Directory; NNER
University of Missouri-Kansas City	AACTE; HOLMES
University of Missouri-St. Louis [Partnership for Creating the 21st Century School of Education-St. Louis Metropolitan Region Holmes Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
Washington University	AACTE
University of Missouri-Columbia	HOLMES
MONTANA	
Montana State University	HOLMES
University of Montana	HOLMES
NEBRASKA	
The following are part of Nebraska Network for Educational Renewal:	
College of Saint Mary	NNER
Concordia College	NNER
Creighton University	NNER
Doane College	NNER
Hastings College	NNER
Union College	NNER
University of Nebraska at Kearney	NNER
University of Nebraska at Lincoln	NNER; HOLMES
University of Nebraska at Omaha	NNER; HOLMES
Wayne State College	NNER
NEVADA	
University of Nevada-Las Vegas	HOLMES
University of Nevada-Reno [University of Nevada-Reno Partnership]	HOLMES

State/Name of Institution	Source of Info
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
University of New Hampshire	HOLMES
NEW JERSEY	
Montclair State University [in partnership with the Newark Schools and part of NJ Network for Educational Renewal]	AACTE; NCREST; NNER; HOLMES; NEA
Rowan College of New Jersey	AACTE
Rutgers University	HOLMES
NEW MEXICO	
New Mexico State University	HOLMES
University of New Mexico [University of New Mexico Partnership Consortium]	NCREST; HOLMES
NEW YORK	
Buffalo State College	AACTE
Columbia University	AACTE
Syracuse University [Syracuse University Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
Bank Street College of Education	HOLMES
Binghamton State University	HOLMES
Columbia University/Teachers College	HOLMES
Cornell University	HOLMES
CUNY Brooklyn College	HOLMES
CUNY Graduate School	HOLMES
Fordham University	HOLMES
Hofstra University	HOLMES
New York University	HOLMES
St. John's University	HOLMES
SUNY at Albany	HOLMES
SUNY-Buffalo [SUNY Buffalo Partnership]	HOLMES
University of Rochester	HOLMES
NORTH CAROLINA	
University of North Carolina- Greensboro	AACTE
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	NCREST; HOLMES
Duke University [Duke University Partnership]	HOLMES
Appalachia State University	HOLMES
East Carolina University	HOLMES
North Carolina A&T University	HOLMES
North Carolina State University-Raleigh	HOLMES
NORTH DAKOTA	
University of North Dakota [North Dakota Holmes Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
OHIO	
The Ohio State University [OSU/Franklin County Education Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
Miami University-Oxford	NNER; HOLMES
Wright State University	NNER; HOLMES
Bowling Green State University	HOLMES
Central State University	HOLMES
Cleveland State University	HOLMES
Kent State University [Kent Educational Network for Tomorrow]	HOLMES
Ohio University [Ohio University Partnership]	HOLMES
University of Cincinnati	HOLMES
University of Dayton	HOLMES
University of Toledo [Toledo Area Partnership in Education Consortium]	HOLMES

State/Name of Institution	Source of Info
OKLAHOMA	
Oklahoma State University	HOLMES
University of Oklahoma [University of Oklahoma Partnership]	HOLMES
OREGON	
Oregon State University [Oregon State University Partnership]	HOLMES
Portland State University	HOLMES
University of Oregon	HOLMES
PENNSYLVANIA	
Bloomsburg University	AACTE
Millersville University	AACTE
Temple University [Temple University Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
Clarion University	HOLMES
Lehigh University [Lehigh University Partnership]	HOLMES
Penn State University [Central Pennsylvania Holmes Local Partnership]	HOLMES
University of Pennsylvania [University of Pennsylvania Partnership]	HOLMES
University of Pittsburgh	HOLMES
RHODE ISLAND	
University of Rhode Island [University of Rhode Island Partnership]	HOLMES
Brown University	HOLMES
SOUTH CAROLINA	
The following are part of South Carolina Network for Educational Renewal:	
Benedict College	NNER
Columbia College of South Carolina	NNER
Furman University	NNER
University of South Carolina	AACTE; NNER; HOLMES; NEA
Winthrop University	NNER
Clemson University	HOLMES
South Carolina State University [South Carolina State University Partnership]	HOLMES
TENNESSEE	
Austin Peay State University	AACTE
Memphis State University	AACTE; HOLMES; NEA
East Tennessee State University	HOLMES
Fisk University	HOLMES
Tennessee State University	HOLMES
University of Tennessee-Knoxville [University of Tennessee-Knoxville Partnership]	HOLMES
Vanderbilt University/George Peabody	HOLMES
TEXAS	
Abilene Christian University	AACTE
Baylor University [Baylor University Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
Hardin-Simmons University	AACTE
Houston Baptist University	AACTE
Howard Payne University	AACTE
University of the Incarnate Word	AACTE
Laredo Community College	AACTE
Lubbock Christian University	AACTE
McMurray University	AACTE
Our Lady of Lake University	AACTE

State/Name of Institution	Source of Info
Southwest Texas State University	AACTE; HOLMES
St. Mary's University	AACTE
Texas A&M International University	AACTE
Texas A&M University	AACTE; NNER; HOLMES; NEA
Texas Tech University	AACTE; HOLMES
Trinity University	AACTE; HOLMES; NCREST;
University of Houston	AACTE
University of Houston-Clear Lake	AACTE
University of St. Thomas	AACTE
University of Texas-El Paso	AACTE; NNER; HOLMES
University of Texas-San Antonio	AACTE
East Texas State University	HOLMES
Prairie View A&M University [Prairie View A&M Univ/Waller Independent School District Holmes Partnership]	HOLMES
Sam Houston State University	HOLMES
Stephen F. Austin State University	HOLMES
Texas A&M-Kingsville	HOLMES
Texas Southern University	HOLMES
University of North Texas [Metroplex Holmes Partnership]	HOLMES
University of Texas at Austin [Austin Independent School District/Univ. of Texas College of Education/Region XIII Education Service Center Collaborative]	HOLMES
University of Texas, Pan American	HOLMES
West Texas A&M	HOLMES
UTAH	
University of Utah	AACTE; HOLMES
Brigham-Young University [part of BYU-Public School Partnership]	AACTE; NCREST; NNER
VERMONT	
University of Vermont	NCREST; HOLMES
VIRGINIA	
University of Virginia [University of Virginia Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
Virginia Commonwealth University [Richmond Metropolitan Area Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
George Mason University	HOLMES; NEA
Hampton University	HOLMES
Norfolk State University	HOLMES
Old Dominion University [Norfolk Schools Partnership for Extraordinary Learning]	HOLMES
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	HOLMES
Virginia State University	HOLMES
WASHINGTON	
University of Washington	AACTE; NNER; HOLMES
Washington State University [Washington State University Partnership]	AACTE; HOLMES
WEST VIRGINIA	
West Virginia University	AACTE; NCREST; HOLMES
WISCONSIN	
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee [Part of the midwestern Four Cities Project]	NCREST; HOLMES
University of Wisconsin-Madison	AACTE; NNER; HOLMES
WYOMING	

State/Name of Institution	Source of Info
University of Wyoming [Wyoming School-University Partnership]	NNER; HOLMES; NEA



Copy to Mr. Cohen

September 16, 1997

The Honorable Richard W. Riley
Secretary, U.S. Department of Education
600 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Dear Secretary Riley :

I am writing on behalf of the American Association of Colleges for Teachers Education (AACTE) to request that the Administration included funding in the FY 1999 budget request for a program within the Higher Education Act to support the recruitment, induction, and initial preparation of teachers.

As you and President Clinton have pointed out on many occasions, America is facing an increasing demand for well qualified teachers and we need to support preparation programs that will provide our children with the best possible educators. Terry Dozier's work on this issue clearly reflects your commitment to a federal presence in teacher education; a perspective shared by many in the Congress.

There appears to be wide-spread support for a new Title V of the Higher Education Act and I urge you to take the first step toward ensuring an adequate supply of qualified teachers by including funding for that Title in the Department's FY 1999 budget request.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

David Imig,
Chief Executive Officer

CC: Marshall Smith
Robert Shireman
Barry White
Susan Frost
Terry Dozier