

J. Shirley

January 14, 1999

Dear Friend:

Around the country, recruiting and retaining high quality teachers is a large and growing problem.

Unfortunately, state teacher certification policies, as practiced today, actually deter many talented individuals from teaching and discourage potential teachers from mastering academic subjects they might teach. A new PPI Backgrounder, entitled *Teacher Quality is Job One: Why States Need to Revamp Teacher Certification*, offers a bold strategy to confront the issue of teacher quality. A PPI fellow, Stephanie Soler, urges states to modernize their teacher certification policies by developing assessments for new teachers through challenging state competency examinations; promoting alternative teacher education programs; reforming teacher tenure systems; and adopting incentives to recruit teachers for high poverty and subject areas with shortages.

States must redirect their focus. Hiring quality teachers and holding them accountable for classroom performance is a step in the right direction to ensure students receive the quality education they deserve. For additional information about PPI's work on education policy, please call us at 202/547-0001, or visit our Web site at: <http://www.dlcppi.org>.

Cordially,



Andy Rotherham
Director
21st Century Schools Project

Teacher Quality is Job One ***Why States Need to Revamp Teacher Certification***

Stephanie Soler

In the spring of 1998, 1800 prospective teachers in Massachusetts took the first ever Massachusetts Teacher Test, a high school level test of skills. Despite the fact that Massachusetts is home to some of the best teacher education programs in the country—including those at Harvard University, Boston College, and Boston University—59 percent of the teachers failed. Thirty percent failed a basic reading and writing test, and failure rates on subject matter tests ranged from 18 percent in physical education to 63 percent in mathematics. Spelling errors included "integraty," "serching," "corupt," and "messures." Similarly, last year only 202 out of 758 teaching applicants in a suburban New York district passed a reading comprehension test drawn from the state's high school Regents English exam. If teachers cannot pass high school level tests, how can we expect their students to do it?

Around the country, recruiting and retaining high quality teachers is becoming a major concern. As states and districts enact higher standards for promotion and graduation, it is critical for teachers to have a solid grasp of the subjects they teach. Yet just as we are expecting more from teachers, fewer and fewer of the most talented college graduates are entering the profession. There is also growing concern that schools of education are ineffective. Critics maintain that they emphasize pedagogy at the expense of rigorous academic content and lack connections to real world classrooms.

Some states no longer accept undergraduate degrees in education for teacher certification. Instead, they require a liberal arts undergraduate degree plus one or two years of additional graduate study. Although this approach ostensibly has the advantage of ensuring that teachers have both solid academic backgrounds and teaching skills, it also has the negative effect of deterring those unwilling to spend additional years and money in graduate school, especially since many education graduate programs have mediocre reputations. Even more troubling, because of low academic standards in many universities, a liberal arts college graduate may not necessarily have mastered his subject. Rather than prescribing the means of training teachers, states should demand that teachers demonstrate subject mastery through rigorous exams and hold them, and those making hiring decisions, accountable for classroom performance.

Back in 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education reported in *A Nation at Risk* that not enough "academically able" students were being attracted to teaching as a career option.¹ Student performance was clearly suffering. Fifteen years later, test results indicate the trend continues.

Teachers Can't Teach What They Haven't Studied: Teacher Training in the United States

Increasingly, students are expected to pass high-stakes tests for promotion and graduation and they must have teachers who have the knowledge and teaching skills to help them pass. Unfortunately, state teacher certification policies actually *discourage* potential teachers from studying academic subjects, so it should come as no surprise that teachers lack deep subject matter knowledge. Although requirements vary across states, there are three basic components states use to determine who is qualified to teach: formal education, student teaching, and standardized tests. In practice, states issue teacher licenses primarily based on hours of study—not demonstrated proficiency in a subject or in the classroom. The problem is not that teachers are not certified. The vast majority of public school teachers—over 90 percent—are indeed certified to teach. The problem is teacher certification simply does not translate into teacher quality, especially when it comes to subject matter mastery.

Teacher Testing: What Do Teachers Know?

The United States is one of the few countries participating in the Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS), a math and science education study of 41 countries, that does not uniformly require teachers to pass a test for certification. Testing requirements for new teachers vary greatly among states. Despite rigid certification requirements, many teacher education programs are producing graduates with poor basic skills. In general, the teaching profession loses the brightest college graduates who are lured by more lucrative careers. According to Harvard University's Richard Murnane, "College graduates with high test scores are less likely to become teachers, licensed teachers with high test scores are less likely to take teaching jobs, employed teachers with high test scores are less likely to stay, and former teachers with high test scores are less likely to return."² A bold strategy is necessary to reverse this trend.

Many states require teachers to take some type of certification test. Many states employ the Praxis tests for initial certification which were developed by the Education Testing Service (ETS) in 1993. The consensus view is that these tests are not particularly difficult. (One sample question from a Praxis general knowledge test asks prospective teachers to list the following events in chronological order: The beginning of the Great Depression, The First World War, The New Deal, and the Korean War.) In Virginia, nearly one-third of aspiring teachers did not pass the Praxis test of basic skills in reading, writing, and math this year. If the twenty other states issuing the test had used Virginia's cutoff, about one-half of the test takers would have failed.

Education school professors and others argue against testing teachers. One argument is that minority teachers tend to fail such tests at a higher rate than white teachers. In 1996, a federal judge upheld the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) after a group of minority educators claimed the test was a "discriminatory

selection device" that prevented qualified minorities from obtaining a teaching credential. As a result of the suit, state officials removed difficult geometry and algebra questions from the test. In Massachusetts, only 31 percent of African American prospective teachers passed the literacy portion of the test, compared to a 51 percent passing rate for all racial and ethnic groups.

Recruiting minority teachers has become a public policy priority, since there are far more minority students than teachers. One-third of K-12 students are black, Hispanic, or Asian, while 87 percent of teachers are white. Nearly one-half of all schools do not have a single minority teacher.³ A major barrier to recruiting more minority teachers is that minority students are less likely than white students to enroll in and graduate from college. But the story is much more complicated. As minorities have made socioeconomic gains in recent decades, they are pursuing more lucrative professional careers. The result is that fewer well-educated minorities are entering the teaching profession. In the 1940s, 79 percent of female, African American college graduates became teachers; that figure has dropped to just 23 percent.

Another criticism of teacher testing is that the research link between test scores and classroom performance has not been definitively established. Yet, there is also no evidence that teachers who graduate from accredited teacher programs are more effective than teachers who do not. Test scores in and of themselves will not ensure quality teaching; neither will rigid certification requirements. However, some measure of basic competence is necessary to prevent the grossly incompetent from teaching children. A solid foundation in basic skills and in the subject one teaches must be a prerequisite to entering a classroom. Teachers, like students, should not be "socially promoted."

Teachers Can't Teach What They Haven't Learned

A surprisingly large number of teachers have not actually studied their subjects. For example, although most social studies teachers in grades 7 through 12 are certified, only 20 percent of them majored or minored in history (which is what comprises most of "social studies" at the secondary level). Fourteen percent of these teachers hold a degree in "social studies education," and another 65 percent have an education degree unrelated to an academic discipline. Overall, the majority of today's public school teachers majored in education as undergraduates rather than any specific subject area.

Secondary school teachers are less likely to have majored in general education; only 20 percent of teachers at the secondary level majored in general education, compared with 69 percent of teachers at the elementary level.⁴ However, this is not to say that most secondary teachers hold "subject matter" majors. Prospective teachers are often segregated academically from liberal arts students. An aspiring scientist studies chemistry or biology, usually in the college of arts and sciences, while an aspiring science teacher studies "science education" in the college of education.

The phenomenon of out-of-field teaching is more common in schools with higher proportions of low-income students and minorities as well as in certain subject areas

like math and science. For example, in secondary schools where 40 percent or more of the student population is eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch, over 40 percent of students in math classes are taught by teachers without an undergraduate major in the field. Fully 73 percent of students in physics classes are taught by teachers without an undergraduate major in the field.⁵

Meanwhile, in most states professionals with strong backgrounds in an academic field are barred from the classroom. Even college professors can not teach high school students; last year, Wyoming had to actually pass new legislation to allow university and community college instructors to teach high school classes without attaining certification. Common sense dictates that a college math professor should be eligible to teach high school geometry, but in most states that is not the case.

Students taught by teachers with no undergraduate degree in the field
• 32% of students in math classes • 33% of students in biology classes • 45% of students in chemistry classes • 68% of students in physics classes
U.S. Department of Education, Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94.

As it has become clear that teachers should master the subject they intend to teach, some states have changed their policies. Ten states now require all new teachers to hold a major in a specific subject field other than education. An additional 19 states and the District of Columbia require only secondary school teachers to hold a major in an academic subject. Recent data shows that a shift is indeed taking place in teacher training. Newer teachers are more likely to have majored in academic subjects.

Education Schools: How Are Teachers Trained?

Schools of education have long been objects of criticism. In general, they are not as competitive as other professional graduate programs. For example, Columbia University Teachers College—the top-ranked school of education in the country—accepts 61 percent of all applicants to its master's program. Meanwhile, Columbia's highly ranked business school only accepts 13 percent of applicants. Many graduates of top education schools choose not to teach: overall, 25-40 percent choose not to teach, and the percentage is even higher at the top education schools.

According to a recent report from Public Agenda Foundation, the priorities of education school professors differ drastically from those of parents and the public. The majority of Americans want public schools to place more emphasis on the basics: reading, writing, math, good work habits, and discipline. Yet professors place more emphasis on developing a "love for learning" than on the basics. For example, only one-third of professors think that students should be required to know the names and locations of the fifty states before receiving a diploma. As a Los Angeles professor put it, "Why should they know [the fifty states]? They need to know how to find out where

they are. When I need to know that, I go look it up. That's the important piece, and here is what's hard to get parents to understand." There is no doubt that developing lifelong learning skills is crucial in the New Economy. However, students must master the basics before they can think critically.

The same report found that 57 percent of professors believe that it is absolutely essential for teachers to be deeply knowledgeable about the content of the specific subjects they will be teaching, while 82 percent think it is absolutely essential for teachers to be committed to teaching kids to be active learners. A mere 12 percent of professors think it is absolutely essential for teachers to expect students to be neat, on time, and polite, and only 19 percent think that stressing correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation is absolutely essential for teachers. It comes as no surprise then to find that 17 percent of education school professors have never been K-12 classroom teachers, and that 51 percent of the rest have not been K-12 teachers for over fifteen years.

Education professors themselves report serious problems. Over 80 percent say that their programs need to do a better job weeding out unsuitable teachers, 63 percent admit that education programs often fail to prepare teachers for the challenge of real-world teaching, and 75 percent find that their students have trouble writing essays free of grammar and spelling mistakes.⁶

In the past decade, teacher training practices have shifted somewhat. Several prominent reports recommended that teachers use their undergraduate years to study academics and study education in graduate school. Subsequently, several states now require one or two years of graduate level education for teacher certification. Although this is a step in the right direction, there is not one particular method of training and certification that will always guarantee teacher quality. In fact, mandatory training requirements will hinder innovation in training. Rather than regulating the *means* of educating teachers, states should concentrate instead on ensuring that students have qualified teachers in their classrooms. Student performance, not seat time in education school, must be the bottom line.

Putting Talented Teachers in the Classroom

Since school administrators simply cannot leave teaching positions vacant, some schools must scramble to put warm bodies in front of classrooms during the first week of school. In California, 21,000 of the state's 250,000 teachers are working with emergency permits in the most troubled schools. A growing student population and class size reduction will only exacerbate this problem. Facing a teacher shortage in the 1980s, New Jersey was the first state to offer prospective teachers an alternative route to certification. Unlike emergency permits, which open the doors to teaching to anyone with a college degree, alternative certification programs generally require the passage of a competency test and ongoing professional development. Now 41 states and the District of Columbia have some form of alternative certification, although the promise of such programs has not been realized because they are often designed as stopgap emergency measures, not as systemic ways to lift teacher quality.

Alternative credential programs go beyond the typical "approved college teacher education route." To qualify for many alternative teacher credential programs, applicants must have a baccalaureate degree and at least one year of work experience, demonstrate experience with children (i.e., through volunteer work), and complete an extensive number of hours in training and management. Successful completion of standardized Praxis I tests along with a minimum college GPA are additional requirements set up by alternative credential programs.⁷ The growing number of teachers entering the profession through alternative routes supports the claim that there are many college graduates interested in teaching who are deterred by traditional requirements.

California has made great use of its Teacher Internship Program since the state reduced class size to 20 in grades K-3 two years ago. The internships are the products of local partnerships between districts and universities. They offer candidates a full-salary teaching position upon completion of 120 hours of pre-service training and passage of the state's teacher assessments. The streamlined process attracts a greater number of teacher candidates who specialize in particular fields or demonstrate special skills.

One of the greatest benefits associated with alternative teacher certification programs is the practical experience and maturity that these people have gained in another job that they can then bring to the classroom. Instead of teaching immediately upon graduation from college, alternative programs attract people who have already established themselves in a previous career. Not only do these candidates have college majors in science, math, and the liberal arts, they may bring a critical perspective to students as to the necessary skills required in the workplace. The mean age for the California program is 38. Alternative certification programs also attract a higher proportion of minority teachers than traditional programs.

Alternative programs have shown high retention rates. Less than three-fourths of California's traditional teacher education graduates actually become teachers. An astonishing 75 percent of teachers with emergency permits leave after 2 years, while 88 percent of interns are still in the classroom.

While alternative certification programs bring many benefits, traditional teacher credential programs continue to overshadow alternative ones. And although they offer a streamlined entry into the profession, most states require candidates to complete course work in schools of education during the first few years of teaching.

Policy Implications

There is clearly a problem in the way teachers are certified, hired, and rewarded. States and districts will not be able to raise their standards unless they have a larger applicant pool. Maryland is a telling example. That state requires teachers to take exams in the subjects they plan to teach, but in high shortage disciplines, such as chemistry and physics, the exams are given on a "no fault" basis. That is, teachers must take the exam, but there is no requirement that they actually pass it. Meanwhile, many talented people

are barred from public classrooms because they lack education course work, choosing instead to teach in private schools or enter other professions.

Of course, someone who masters a subject area will not necessarily have the skills to teach it. Most new teachers will need training in classroom management, instruction, and other teaching skills, but states should not prescribe a particular way to do this.

Alternative routes into the teaching profession should not be reserved for the most desperate situations. The field should be open to those with traditional education training and those with a liberal arts background or relevant professional experience. To ensure teacher quality, schools should require new teachers to demonstrate mastery of the subjects they will teach, hold teachers accountable for classroom performance, dismiss poor teachers, and reward excellent teachers. Only by boosting teacher expertise can we expect students to excel.

Recommendations

To meet these policy challenges, PPI proposes the following:

- ▶ ***States should develop assessments for new teachers based on established student standards.*** Most states have developed standards for what students should know and be able to do. The next logical step is for states to create tests for new teachers that are aligned with student standards. All new teachers should be required to pass challenging state competency examinations.
- ▶ ***States should modernize teacher certification.*** States should not prescribe a particular method of teacher training. A principal should be able to hire any candidate who passes the state competency exam.
- ▶ ***States should promote alternative teacher education programs.*** Although states should not dictate teacher education, most teachers will need training. Schools of education will continue to train teachers, but government should also support other forms of teacher training. For example, public schools could follow the example of many private schools and place inexperienced teachers with a mentor as a paid assistant. More states could implement teacher internship programs, similar to the one in California, which place professionals as full-time teachers after a summer of training and provides them with ongoing professional development. In order to receive government funding and accreditation, states should require that all teacher education programs ensure that a high percentage of students pass the state competency exam.
- ▶ ***Districts should recruit teachers in shortage areas with higher pay.*** In today's society, a solid background in math and science is valuable. It is not

surprising to find that there is a nationwide shortage of math and science teachers. According to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, that state has *never* (in forty years of keeping records) filled its math and science teaching positions with fully credentialed teachers. At the same time, there are four to seven times as many social studies teachers as positions. Allowing professionals with math and science backgrounds to enter the profession more easily would help ease the situation, but the reality is that districts will have to pay math and science teachers more. Likewise, it is difficult to recruit teachers into high poverty urban and rural areas. Rather than scrambling to put warm bodies in classrooms during the first week of school and lowering teacher test score cutoffs, school districts should recruit workers like other segments of the labor market: by raising salaries.

- ▶ *Teacher-shortage districts should offer "signing bonuses" to teachers who relocate.* Some areas, especially those with many colleges and universities, have teacher surpluses. Conversely, areas without a well-educated population often have a hard time finding well-educated teachers. Teachers who relocate should, like other professionals, receive financial incentives to move.
- ▶ *The federal government should provide incentives for teachers to teach in high poverty areas.* Since high poverty areas face financial constraints, the federal government should help level the playing field by expanding loan forgiveness programs. Such programs should target teachers who pass the state competency exam and teach in high-poverty, teacher-shortage areas.
- ▶ *States should repeal teacher tenure laws.* The way to improve teacher quality is to hold teachers accountable for performance. Tenure laws prevent principals from firing incompetent teachers. Firing a teacher can take years and cost a school system thousands of dollars. Not surprisingly, schools rarely make the effort. In the 1997-1998 school year, ten of Boston's 46,000 teachers were recommended for dismissal, the largest number ever. Not a single teacher faced dismissal the prior year. As in any profession, teachers should have protection from discrimination, but they should be dismissed if they are ineffective.
- ▶ *Schools should reward educators for high performance.* When teachers and administrators succeed in boosting student performance, they should receive bonuses and other recognition. Currently, performance incentives are rare in public schools, but experiments have occurred in Kentucky, South Carolina, and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school district in North Carolina. In New York City, the business community has adopted a district in the East New York section of Brooklyn and plans to raise \$29 million to reward effective

teachers, principals, and superintendents. Compensating high performance should not be an isolated event.

- ***Schools must be attractive workplaces.*** There are deeper problems surrounding teacher recruitment and retention beyond certification and salaries (which are outside the scope of this paper). High-poverty schools face shortages in large part because they are unsafe, because bureaucratic red-tape interferes with teachers' efforts to do their jobs, and because teachers often do not have the necessary supplies and resources. Larger reform efforts that empower teachers will go a long way in making the profession more attractive. For example, Washington, DC, has a general teacher shortage, yet attracted hundreds of interested candidates to its charter school fair this spring. Although the new charter schools will serve at-risk students and are not located in the best facilities, prospective teachers were attracted to the prospect of working in an innovative, non-bureaucratic school. All teachers should work in such an environment.

Conclusion

Teacher quality is not the only component of effective schooling, however it is a crucial one. Quality teachers are as important to academic achievement as high standards, adequate resources, and accountability. It is imperative that states consider teacher quality when developing their educational strategies and teacher certification policies.

Stephanie Soler is a fellow at the Progressive Policy Institute.

For further information about PPI publications, please call the publications department at 800-546-0027, write the Progressive Policy Institute, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., Suite 400, Washington, DC, 20003, or visit PPI's web site at: <http://www.dlcppi.org>.

Endnotes

1. Findings from the Condition of Education, "America's Teachers Ten Years After a Nation at Risk."
2. Richard Murnane, et al., *Who Will Teach? Policies that Matter*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991): 10.
3. U.S. Department of Education, *Schools and Staffing in the United States: A Statistical Profile, 1993-1994* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993-1994).
4. *America's Teachers: Profile of a Profession, 1993-1994* (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1997).
5. U.S. Department of Education, *Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-1994* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994).
6. *Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Public Education*, (Washington, DC: Public Agenda Foundation, 1997).
7. Emily C. Feistritzer, "Alternative Teacher Certification—An Overview" (1998).

Five Essential Elements of Teacher Preparation Legislation

1. Scale and Scope

The 1997-98 school year saw K-12 enrollments reach a record level of 51 million students. K-12 enrollments are expected to continue to grow until the year 2007, when they may top 54 million. To accommodate these enrollment levels, and to replace teachers who will retire over the next decade, America needs 2 million additional teachers. All of these new teachers must be fully prepared to help all students achieve at the highest levels.

The scope and scale of new teacher preparation legislation must be commensurate with the scope and scale of the task. Pilot programs and demonstration projects are not enough. A large-scale systematic approach is needed. That approach must leverage other education funds—including existing federal education funds and/or non-federal matching requirements-- as well as provide new funds. Such an approach must create new avenues into teaching for well-qualified individuals, while dramatically improving the training that new teachers receive in schools of education.

2. Increase Parental Involvement

Parents must be full partners in their children's education. To carry out this responsibility parents need clear and accurate information about both schools and teachers.

New teacher preparation legislation must guarantee parents the "right to know" the professional qualifications of their children's teachers.

3. Improve Teacher Subject Matter Knowledge

You can't teach what you don't know. Yet many students are taught by teachers with very little knowledge of the subjects they are teaching. About 36% of all public school teachers do not have a college major or minor in the subject of their main teaching assignment. Moreover, between 1987 and 1991 the number of *new* teachers entering the field with a major or minor in their field *declined* from 74% to 67%.

New teacher preparation legislation can not simply increase the number of individuals going into teaching, it must also reduce the percentage of under-qualified teachers and contain a strategy to ensure that *every* student has a teacher with both strong subject area knowledge and strong teaching skills.

4. Redress the Inequitable Distribution of Well-Qualified Teachers

As it stands now, students who need the most from their schools and teachers get the least. Students in high-poverty areas $\frac{3}{4}$ both urban and rural $\frac{3}{4}$ are less likely than others to have well-qualified teachers. **In high poverty schools 40% of math teachers, 31% of English teachers, 20% of science teachers, and 18% of social studies teachers are teaching subjects in which they hold neither a college major nor minor.**

New teacher preparation legislation must focus resources on recruiting the most highly qualified individuals to teach in high-poverty schools. Generous financial incentives, such as accelerated forgiveness of student loans for individuals teaching in high poverty schools, are a critical element of such a **recruitment strategy**. Further, the legislation should provide on-going support to good teachers in high-poverty areas to increase the stability of the teaching force in such schools.

5. Increase Accountability for the Use of Federal Funds for Teacher Preparation

Federal tax payers have the right to be assured that the federal dollars devoted to teacher preparation are invested in efforts that actually produce teachers who are fully qualified and capable of teaching in their subject area.

New teacher preparation legislation must hold the institutions of higher education that receive federal funds and prepare new teachers accountable for producing teachers who meet existing state and national teacher standards. Further, new teacher legislation should hold k-12 systems which hire and place teachers and receive federal funds, responsible for ensuring that all students have equal access to highly qualified teachers.

The qualifications of teachers matter

A New York City Board of Education study comparing high achieving and low achieving elementary schools with similar student characteristics found that teacher qualifications accounted for more than 90% of the variation in student achievement in reading and mathematics.

According to US Department of Education, 8th graders whose teachers had undergraduate degrees in mathematics scored, on average, 11 points higher on the NAEP math assessment than students whose teachers did not hold a math degree.

A study by Ronald L. Ferguson, of Harvard University, estimates that each additional dollar invested in more qualified teachers nets greater gains in student performance than any other use of school resources.

Too few students have the well-qualified teachers that they need to achieve at high levels

More than 1 in 4 high school students taking mathematics are taught by a teacher who holds neither a college major nor minor in mathematics.

More than 1 in 5 in high school students are enrolled in an English class taught by someone who holds neither a college major nor minor in English.

Annually, more than 50,000 under-prepared teachers enter the field. More than 12% of all newly hired teachers enter the field without any training at all, and another 14% enter without having fully met state standards. By this calculation, more than 1 in 4 new teachers are not prepared to meet the enormous responsibilities of teaching.

Low-income students, inner city students and students of color are less likely than others to have well qualified teachers

About 1 in 3 high school English classes in high poverty high schools is taught by an under-prepared teacher.

Students in central cities high schools have only about a 50-50 chance of having a qualified teacher in math.

While more than 86% of the science teachers at predominantly white schools are certified in science, only about half of those at predominantly minority schools are so certified.

And things are getting worse...

Between 1987 and 1991 the proportion of well-qualified new public school teachers $\frac{3}{4}$ those entering teaching with a college major or minor in their

field % declined from 74% to 67%.

Return to the [HOME PAGE](#)



THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

October 7, 1998

IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND PREPARATION

"Every community should have a talented and dedicated teacher in every classroom". [We have] an enormous opportunity for ensuring teacher quality well into the 21st century, if we recruit promising people into teaching and give them the highest quality preparation and training."

--President Clinton's Call to Action
for American Education in the 21st Century

The Higher Education Amendments of 1998 respond to the Nation's critical need for high-quality teachers by enacting much of the Clinton Administration's proposal to improve the recruitment and preparation of new teachers. Our Nation's schools will need 2.2 million new teachers over the next decade, and these teachers need to be well-prepared to teach all students to the highest standards.

Title II of the new law authorizes a \$300 million investment in teacher preparation and recruitment in the upcoming fiscal year. The House's FY99 Appropriations bill allocates \$2.2 million for teacher recruitment, and the Senate's Appropriations bill allocates \$77.2 million for the following HEA initiatives:

- **Teacher Preparation Partnerships.** This new initiative will provide grants to partnerships -- based on the Administration's proposal -- between teacher preparation institutions and local school districts in high-need areas. To ensure that new teachers can meet the many challenges of today's classrooms, the partners will work to strengthen teacher education through activities such as:
 - **Implementing reforms that hold teacher education programs accountable for preparing high-quality teachers.** Improving prospective teachers' knowledge of academic content through increased collaboration between faculty at schools of education and departments of arts and sciences; Ensuring that teachers are well-prepared for the realities of the classroom by providing strong hands-on classroom experience and strengthening links between university and K-12 school faculties; Preparing prospective teachers to use technology as a tool for teaching and learning; and Preparing prospective teachers to work effectively with diverse students.
- **Recruitment Partnerships.** Modeled after the highly successful Dewitt Wallace Reader's Digest Foundation's "Pathways to Teaching" program, this new recruitment initiative will provide grants for recruiting teachers to partnerships between high-quality teacher education programs and local schools in high-need communities. Prospective teachers who agree to teach in high-need areas for a set number of years will receive scholarships and other support during their preparation and first years of teaching.
- **State Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants.** These new grants encourage states to improve the quality of their teaching force by:
 - **Strengthening their teacher certification standards** to ensure that new teachers have the necessary teaching skills and academic content knowledge; Implementing reforms that hold

institutions of higher education accountable for preparing teachers who have strong teaching skills and knowledge of their content areas; Establishing or strengthening alternative pathways into teaching for highly qualified individuals, including mid-career professionals and former military personnel; and Recruiting new high-quality teachers.

- **Accountability.** The new law helps ensure accountability in teacher education by requiring states and institutions of higher education to prepare "report cards" on the quality of teacher preparation, including their students' performance on teacher licensing examinations.

EXAMPLES OF TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND PREPARATION PARTNERSHIPS

The new HEA teacher preparation and recruitment initiatives will promote partnerships and teacher preparation activities similar to the award-winning projects described below.

Massachusetts: Samuel Mason Elementary School in Roxbury, Massachusetts, needed teachers qualified to work with children who required special education services, because 25% of these students were fully included in regular classrooms. The school solved its problem by partnering with Wheelock College to develop a teacher preparation program that provides new and experienced teachers with dual certification in special education and regular education.

Pennsylvania: In Philadelphia, Drexel University has partnered with the Philadelphia Public Schools to recruit a diverse teaching force to serve as early childhood, math, and science teachers. Also in Philadelphia, Temple University is working with the local school district to recruit and prepare returned Peace Corps volunteers to be early childhood, elementary, math, science, and ESL teachers.

Texas: The teacher preparation program at the University of Texas at El Paso is designed, implemented, and evaluated through a collaboration of elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators, university faculty, the staff of the regional Texas Education Service Center, and community members. The curriculum emphasizes bilingual and cross-cultural education to prepare students to teach effectively in predominately Hispanic elementary and secondary schools. The program also uses a strong clinical model in which students work intensively in 18 professional development schools committed to school improvement.

Virginia: Capitalizing on the nearby military base, Norfolk State University in Virginia has collaborated with Old Dominion University and Norfolk Public Schools to recruit and prepare paraprofessionals and retired military personnel to become successful teachers. The program offers both financial and academic support for prospective teachers through a grant from the Dewitt Wallace Reader's Digest Fund.

Wisconsin: Alverno College in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, works with local schools to provide an innovative, performance-based teacher preparation program. Students are expected to demonstrate their mastery of a variety of skills essential to good teaching, such as: problem solving, involving the community in education, and integrating content knowledge with classroom practice. Upon completion of their extensive student teaching experience, the clinical preparation of Alverno students is assessed by a panel of Alverno faculty, teachers and administrators at their elementary or secondary schools. Currently, faculty and administrators at the college are working with three other institutions to improve their teacher preparation programs by adopting elements of the Alverno model.

-###-

EDHOME

Last Updated -- October 9, 1998, (pjk)

The New Title I Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards

U.S. Department of Education

Chapter 1 is once again Title I. And while the name is a return to the past, the focus is on the future. The Improving America's Schools Act, signed into law by the President on October 20, 1994, fundamentally restructures all parts of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), including Title I, to support comprehensive State and local reform of teaching and learning such as carried out under Goals 2000. The emphasis is on high academic standards with aligned curriculum, assessment, and professional development. Title I's focus is on helping disadvantaged students meet the same high standards expected of all children.

Under the new Title I, States develop challenging content standards specifying what all students are expected to know and be able to do, and three standards of student performance -- advanced, proficient, and partially proficient. Standards in at least reading and math must be in place by 1997.

In order to measure whether students are meeting the performance standards, States will have to employ high quality assessments that are aligned with State content standards. Title I will use the same assessments that are used in the State for all children. There is no longer a separate system of testing required for Title I students.

New performance-based accountability requires that States define adequate progress toward State standards. Local educational agencies and schools are held accountable for improvement with corrective action taken when necessary. Incentives for success include recognizing distinguished schools and distinguished educators.

But that is not all that has changed. The new Title I distributes specific amounts of funds to schools based on the number of poor children rather than on achievement scores so successful schools will not be penalized by losing funds and so money will not be spread too thinly.

As part of its emphasis on high standards, the new law requires Title I funds to be used in different ways -- extended learning time is strongly encouraged and schools are to reduce the amount of time children are taken out of the classroom. The goal is to minimize pull-out programs, and support instructional programs of higher order thinking skills rather than rote skills, accelerated curriculum rather than drill and practice, and the use of effective strategies based on research.

Another important feature of the new Title I is greater flexibility in exchange for greater accountability for student performance. The new law makes it much easier for schools to take advantage of the schoolwide model, which allows Title I funds to be used along with other Federal, State, and local education funds, to upgrade and reform the which allows Title I funds to be used along with other Federal, State, and local education funds, to upgrade and reform the entire instructional program in the school for all students. In 1995 the poverty percentage to qualify for schoolwide programs is 60 percent, and in 1996 and thereafter it will become 50 percent. This means more schools will be de-emphasizing Title I as a separate and discrete program and working instead to fully integrate it with the school district and State reform plans.tory and regulatory requirements when requested by State educational agencies or local educational agencies (or a school in the case of Goals 2000) to improve the academic performance of children.

Equally important is a shift in responsibility for decision-making to the school building level. Teachers, administrators, parents, and other staff will decide who will be served and what form the program will

take in order to help students meet high State standards.

Parent involvement in Title I also has been strengthened. School-level parental involvement policies are to include parent/school compacts, which spell out the goals, expectations, and shared responsibilities of schools and parents as partners in student success. Among their uses, the compacts will be a helpful tool for discussions between teachers and parents about how better performance can be encouraged.

The new Title I emphasizes high quality teaching and professional development. The quality of Title I programs depends on the quality of our teachers development must be aligned with State content standards. Professional development must be continuous, sustained, and viewed as an integral part of the entire program. Funds from Title I are to be used to improve knowledge of all school staff not just Title I personnel, so Title I programs will reach the overall goal of enabling all students served to achieve high standards enabling all students served to achieve high standards.

For the first time, the new law permits consolidated applications where States and local school districts can apply for Title I and other ESEA funds with a single application. In addition to ease of administration, consolidated applications provide an exciting opportunity to improve teaching and learning through the coordination of Federal, State, and locally-funded education programs.

The new Title I, as the cornerstone of the revised ESEA, is intended to ensure that all children, whatever their backgrounds and whatever schools they attend, can acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in the 21st century.

By Mary Jean LeTendre
Director, Compensatory Education Program
U.S. Department of Education
Published in *The Title I Times*, April 1995

For more information, contact: Compensatory Education Program Office, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue S.W., Portals Building, Room 4400, Washington, DC 20202-6132, or call (202) 260-0826.

[\[Return to the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 page\]](#)



Last Updated -- Sept. 7, 1995, (pjk)