



SPECIAL PRESENTATION

**“MEASURING WHAT MATTERS:
HOLDING TEACHER PREPARATION
PROGRAMS ACCOUNTABLE FOR RESULTS”**

MODERATED BY:

**CYNTHIA G. BROWN, VICE PRESIDENT FOR EDUCATION
POLICY, CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

FEATURED PANELISTS:

EDWARD CROWE, INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT

**JANE E. WEST, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR POLICY,
PROGRAMS AND PROFESSIONAL ISSUES, AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION**

**KATE WALSH, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON TEACHER
QUALITY**

**9:30 AM – 11:00 AM
THURSDAY, JULY 29, 2010**

**TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY
DC TRANSCRIPTION – WWW.DCTMR.COM**

MS. CYNTHIA BROWN: Good morning. Great to see you all. I know a lot of you, but for those I don't know, I'm Cindy Brown, the vice president for education policy here at the Center for American Progress. And I want to thank you all for joining us this morning for a discussion about holding teacher preparation programs accountable for results. Good day to be talking about it. We know the president has either finished speaking or is speaking right now to the National Urban League. And we know he's talking about teachers and accountability. So I think this fits in with today's theme nationally.

So let me set some context. It has become quite clear that today too many students don't have the teacher they need to help them learn to high levels. And the federal, state, and district policy all need to change to get more effective teachers into the profession and to the schools that need them most. Yet the issues around how best to recruit, prepare, evaluate, continually support, reward, and retain a much more effective teaching force are complex and multifaceted.

One of the most important phases of that process is what happens in the beginning, before a teacher gets into the classroom, in other words, what happens in teacher preparation programs.

The Center has been working to help develop a highly effective teaching force, particularly for students in poverty since the beginning of our education program, over six years ago. In the area of teacher preparation, we have concentrated on encouraging the expansion of innovative and high quality alternative certification programs. Yet what traditional teacher training programs do is in many ways more important since they prepare most of our nation's teachers.

So our discussion today will focus on how states can hold both traditional and alternative teacher education programs accountable for preparing effective teachers. This conversation is timely and important while today only three states, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, incorporate teacher effectiveness into preparation program oversight. Thirty six states have proposed plans for improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs as part of their phase two Race to the Top applications. And a few others did so in round one. Delaware and Tennessee will build teacher effectiveness data into their accountability system as they proposed in their winning phase one Race to the Top applications.

So after many years of very little progress on this issue, a large group of states will begin working to strengthen their accountability systems for teacher and principal preparation programs.

This work is so critical today because most states don't track what happens with the teachers they produce. Few states require the teacher preparation programs report on

their graduates' impact on student growth or even their teaching skills. They also pay little attention to where their graduates go on to teach and how long they remain in the profession. Moreover, states rarely take action to ensure that weak teacher preparation programs improve or are shut down.

This lack of state accountability would not matter so much if these programs were consistently producing excellent teachers, but they are not. Many teacher education programs are not selective about who they admit, lack a rigorous curriculum, and don't give teachers sufficient clinical practice.

An important question I want to raise with our panel and the discussion after the presentations is why universities have failed so long to address the quality of their teacher preparation programs.

Today, we will be talking about what a better accountability system for teacher preparation programs might look like. We are releasing a report that outlines one promising model for stronger state oversight. The report is entitled "Measuring What Matters. A Stronger Accountability Model for Teacher Education," and is written by Edward Crowe, who will launch our discussion today with a presentation of his paper.

Let me tell you a bit about who's with us today. Ed Crowe is a consultant on teacher quality policy for several organizations and projects, including the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. He previously worked as a senior consultant for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and was the first director of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Program for the U.S. Department of Education.

Following Ed's presentation, we will hear from Jane West, senior vice president for policy, programs and professional issues at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Kate Walsh, president of the National Council on Teacher Quality.

Jane joined the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 2006, where she directs the department of policy, programs, and professional issues. She brings over 30 years of education and public policy experience to the organization as a former teacher, education administrator, PTA officer – must be apparent – researcher, and university faculty member.

Kate Walsh has served as president of the National Council on Teacher Quality since 2002. Before coming to NCTQ, she worked for the Core Knowledge Foundation, the Baltimore City Public Schools, and the Abell Foundation in Baltimore, Maryland.

So let's get started. We're going to hear first from Ed Crowe and then all of us will take a seat up here and we'll have presentations from Jane and Kate, and engage in a conversation before we open it to all of you. So thank you very much.

MR. EDWARD CROWE: Thanks, Cindy. Good morning everyone. Thank you for coming. This is quite a group and I think it maybe shows that we're ready for some serious discussion about accountability for teacher education. I want to start by thanking the Center for commissioning the paper and I'm especially grateful to Robin Chait for working with me from the beginning, making many improvements to what you now see and can read today. It's been a pleasure working with her.

I appreciate the panelists today and looking forward to hearing what they have to say. And it'll be fun to have a dialogue on this issue.

I want to thank, as well, the reviewers who read and made really fabulous comments and I hope improve the quality – I think improve the quality of what you see, and again, those of you who are here today.

So I have three main things I want to talk about since you have the paper. And they'll explore sort of at a more surface level the issues that the paper discusses in more detail. First, the failure of accountability policies for teacher education programs. Secondly, I'd like to briefly describe the components of the system that is proposed in the paper, and then finally explain the value of a stronger system, including the importance of its adoption by every state, why that matters for teacher preparation quality, and for teaching quality.

So first, I think it is clear to all of us, and maybe this also explains the size of our audience this morning, the current policies are not working. It's ironic, I think, that the most important features of current policies also explain why they failed to hold programs, all programs accountable for high quality teacher education. Even though teacher education programs have a direct impact on K-12 students, on their schools, and on teachers themselves, the accountability system in most states includes nothing that directly captures the impact and the quality of that impact. And I think that helps explain the disconnect between what we do in accountability and what results.

Secondly, current policies are all about process and they largely ignore teaching and learning outcomes. And the value of recent data, system developments, and a greater focus on what children are learning and how teachers are teaching gives us an opportunity to change that and move away from process and towards substance.

Also the way the current system works in practice shows that it's not a credible form of accountability. There are no sanctions and few consequences for weak programs. There's no feedback loop of useful information for programs striving to improve. And many are working hard to improve. And I think there are no clear signals of quality for the public to understand.

Finally, in terms of weaknesses of what we have, every state operates its own set of accountability policy and procedures, even though, for example, thousands and thousands of teachers are trained in one state and employed in another. And there're other issues that I think explain why state by state accountability in very different ways

across the states is not helping us get where we want to go in teaching quality and in student outcomes.

So that's the problem that we're trying to solve through this report by building a stronger system of accountability for all teacher education programs.

The accountability system described in the paper has five indicators of program quality. They measure important outcomes that affect the welfare of students and schools and also of teachers.

To be effective and fair this system must apply to every teacher preparation program in a state and in the country, whether we call it traditional or alternative and whether and regardless of the organization that sponsors or runs the program.

So this report is not about bashing universities or celebrating non-university programs. It's about accountability for all programs and organizations that prepare teachers.

Every state should adopt the same set of indicators, the same teacher tests, and identical passing scores. We do this already in other professions and it works well and there's no reason we can't do the same thing for teaching.

So what are the components of the system? First, a program should be judged based on the impact their graduates have on the teaching quality of the young people that they prepare in classrooms. Every state accountability system ought to have a teacher effectiveness measure that reports the extent to which program graduates help their K-12 students to learn. Several systems, several states are already or have already implemented a measure like that. Louisiana's probably being most well known. Texas is moving in this direction. And Florida now publishes information on the learning outcomes of students taught by program graduates.

However, knowing that the results of K-12 tests is not enough to understand why teachers are strong or why programs are strong, and so I think the classroom teaching performance for program graduates ought to be assessed through high quality classroom observation instruments, some of which have already been developed, some of which are now being tested in large national trials, observing and videotaping thousands of practicing teachers to understand what it is about their teaching that leads to positive student learning outcomes.

Third, we need public disclosure of persistence in teaching by graduates of every program. The teacher turnover problem is not entirely the responsibility of preparation programs, but we can't solve it without their involvement. Schools, in many places, are already being held accountable for high turnover rates through the impact that turnover has on student learning outcomes, through the integration of school working conditions surveys into school accountability models, and universities and other preparation programs can be part of that solution and have a lot to offer.

Fourth, it would be helpful to have feedback surveys from program graduates and from their employers. Like the other measures, this one can't stand alone. As a viable measure of program accountability, both working with the others, it provides good information that programs can act on that the public needs to understand and it says something positive about the profession of preparing teachers that we ask those who hire them how good they are. And that feedback loop I think can be useful.

And finally, a new system of teacher licensure tests ought to be designed and implemented. The number of tests now in use should be cut by 90 percent and every state ought to use the same tests and the same passing scores. Again, as I've said already, is done in other professions with valuable results for the quality of the practitioner and the status of the profession.

So let me say a little more about teacher testing. The problem is not testing itself. I want to make it clear that I support testing teacher to gauge their content knowledge and their professional knowledge. The problem with teacher testing today is the tests we use. They're unconnected to what teachers actually do on the classroom. They have no predictive validity. And passing scores are set so low in many states that 96 percent of all test takers in the United States pass all those tests. That's not a viable measure of accountability, nor is it a coherent system of accountability.

As the paper notes, states are now using more than 11,000 different tests for teachers and for teacher candidates, including over 800 content knowledge tests. We can imagine maybe 800 different subjects being taught in public schools, but it would take some serious imaginative thinking to get that far. This structure makes no sense and does nothing really to ensure the production of high quality teachers. And so to deal with this problem, the report proposes a radically redesigned system of testing.

I want to emphasize again that we recommend the same rules for every program. No one should be able to escape accountability if they're preparing teachers for American schools. As a result of concern about teaching quality and worries that universities are not moving fast enough to improve their own programs, there's lots of innovation right now in the teacher ed world, some of it in fact happening in universities, not all somewhere else. We have new providers. We have new strategies for recruiting, selecting, preparing, and supporting teachers. And these are welcomed developments. But these newer models owe stewardship for results to the public to schools and to students, just as the traditional providers must be held the much higher standards of performance and quality.

We ought to have the same teacher preparation accountability policies in every state. A key part of the system redesign proposed in the report is that every state should adopt the same set of indicators and the same teacher tests passing scores. It really makes no sense in this century and not much in the last one that every state has its own definition of program quality. It means the teaching quality has 58, however many states, territories, and the District of Columbia, 58 or so definitions.

Other professions have arrived at this already – nursing, medicine, accounting, engineering. And this can be done also with a single set of accountability criteria across all states that does not undermine the principle of federalism, nor does the paper call for a national system of accountability.

So here is why every state should adopt the same accountability policies for teacher education. First, a large number of teachers complete the preparation program in one state and obtain their initial teaching license in a different state. Twenty percent of initial licenses fit this description: prepared in state A, employed in state B, 20 percent or more in 32 states. And 40 percent of the initially certified teachers in D.C. and in 12 states are prepared in a different state. So raised, if you will, under one set of rules, employed and held accountable under a different set of rules.

Student mobility is a fact of life in the United States. About eight million Americans move each year from one state to another. But students who make these moves with their families are vulnerable to widely differing teacher quality yardsticks.

Third, successful adoption of the common core standards by 48 states and the proposed multi-state K-12 assessments that are linked to the standards demand stronger and universal program quality policies.

If states can agree on content standards across state lines, reflecting the fact that addition or algebra really are the same in Montana and in New Hampshire, they also can agree on quality standards for programs that prepare the teachers who will teach to those standards.

And finally, as I've said, the states have done this already in other fields regarded as higher status professions, establishing the same set of accountability policies in every one of the states.

So finally, why should you support a stronger accountability system for teacher education? First because accountability measures capture important teaching and learning outcomes. They replace a failed system that few people respect and believe in. And beyond accountability, program leaders and faculty who are committed to high quality programs and to ongoing program improvement can use the new system's quality indicators. Those who care about the quality of their own programs need better tools than we're now giving them.

There're good examples right now where programs are working hard to make the best use of available data, just like these indicators. For example, at New York University, the program works closely with the city Department of Education to analyze the impact of its graduates on pupil learning outcomes and attracts the persistence rates of NYU teacher ed graduates back for years in the New York City schools.

Michigan State is taking significant steps to bring greater rigor to the assessment of classroom teaching performance, playing off the second indicator, what are teachers doing in the classroom that results in learning.

The University of California, Santa Barbara, already respected for its use of assessment data to understand outcomes and use information for program improvement and despite that the faculty are working to develop additional rigorous measures of program impact on student learning, classroom teaching performance, and impact on local schools.

The University of Colorado, Denver, taking advantage of state policy developments, including Colorado's work on Race to the Top, closely working with state and local officials to improve that systems and outcome indicators so that faculty can understand what's happening with their graduates and how the program affects schools.

Cal State Northridge, one of the largest university teacher providers in the country, collaborating with LA school district to conduct studies about school outcomes and student challenges and using these findings both to help the district and for program improvement.

And there're plenty of non-university preparation programs doing similar things, assembling and using rich sources of data about their program enrollees and their graduates, how they're doing in school, how long they stay in the profession.

In every case, the point I want to make here, besides giving you these examples, in every case these programs are doing more than their states require, in every case. So others can do the same and we need to raise the bar to make it possible for them to do that. And these programs are doing more than their state requires because state accountability processes and national accreditation standards are not useful tools for this work.

Deans, faculty, and other leaders of these programs want data that tells them things that really matter about their program and their graduates. In fact, the indicators proposed in the paper could also help NCATE refocus its accreditation system on powerful outcomes that are directly tied to teaching and learning.

So the system proposed here would replace a failed set of policies and practices. It uses empirical indicators of important outcomes and it can and should be adopted by every state.

Thanks and I look forward to the conversation. (Applause.)

MS. BROWN: Okay. Ed got us off to a terrific start here. As soon as we get seated, we'll continue the conversation. Really important points that he made and I'm so glad that at the Center we've had the change now to get into this issue. So let me turn to two people who deal with this issue all the time, Jane especially. Her organization

represents schools of education and I believe she has a lot of insight into where her community is going. So I will turn it over to her.

MS. JANE WEST: Great. Thank you, Cindy. And thanks to the Center for American progress for sponsoring this study. Ed, thanks for your hard work. I think what you've done has made a very complex, messy system – you have brought clarity to the mess. We can see that there are – Kate and I were noticing all the legs on this table and thinking, “you know, that's sort of like the system you described.” That's probably a little more organized and results in a nice flat table, but I think that you really have captured something very important and we really appreciate that.

I think one thing that it points out is that people often think of schools and colleges of education as autonomous entities who have the control and power over everything they do to change and to move in a different direction. And you can certainly see by this work that that is not the case. They're far from autonomous.

One of the players that you didn't mention in here is the state legislatures. They're often very involved and for example in Florida, I know they passed a law requiring a certain number of courses to prepare English language learners. So this adds to the disparity of what goes on out there.

I'd just like to really – five quick points I want to make. First of all, this report is timely. Understanding and improving teacher preparation is central to our agenda at AACTE. One of our goals is to unify our members around accountability. And this document will certainly be a stimulus to move us forward in that area.

We know that insufficient data exists for us to really understand which teacher preparation approaches yield teachers whose students are more successful than others. If you haven't seen the National Research Council's report that was issued a couple of months ago, called “Preparing Teachers,” I really urge you to look at that. That was a five-year study mandated by Congress that has gathered up in one place what the research tells us about effective teacher preparation.

Okay, my quick five points. Number one, data. We absolutely need more data about our graduates to follow them, to understand their impact on student learning, to understand their persistence rate et cetera. I can tell you that our members – I probably get a phone call once a month from one of our members saying “I want to follow my graduates. I cannot get the data. The state says the district owns it. The district says the state owns. There are privacy issues. What can I do?” We even went to Congressman Miller and he assisted us in having an amendment put in the Higher Education Act that says, “if a college of education asks a state or a district for their data, they must give it to them assuming there's no violation of the law.” We've got a lot of FERPA issues there. Hopefully, the state data systems, as they unroll, we'll begin to resolve those. Louisiana certainly resolved them as have other states.

So – but I think that we are just at the beginning of encountering a number of obstacles like that with these data systems, which we will need to persist to figure out.

So we have to know not only who is doing well and who isn't, but why. It's not enough, as you point out, Ed, to know who are the high performers and who aren't. The only way we can improve those programs is by connecting that to features of preparation. And we need certainly more research in that area.

Another point is that over half of our teachers today – there is no statewide student achievement data for them. So we have to work to develop those measures for those individuals which will take an investment.

That leads me to my second point about teacher performance assessments. Excuse me. We have been working at AACTE with our partners, the Chief State School Officers, and Stanford University, for a couple of years now to develop a national teacher performance assessment. We began with the work done in California, the PACT, the performance assessment of California teachers, which is now a requirement both to complete the preparation program and to become certified. At the center of this performance assessment are several teaching events, where teachers are actually scored upon their effectiveness in teaching students. Imagine that. And these are recorded. The evidence has to be shown that the student has moved from A to B. What I'm particularly excited about is that the candidate must demonstrate that they can differentiate instruction. We simply don't have classrooms anymore that don't include students with disabilities and English language learners. And it's very important that our teachers are prepared there.

So I certainly am happy to talk more about that. This is an assessment that can be used by all routes, alternate routes, university routes, any kind of routes, and it should become the porthole for entrance into the profession for everyone. It is a performance based measure and teaching is a performance based activity. So we need to know that before someone stands before the class as the teacher of record, they know what they're doing.

Point number three, the notion about a level playing field. Again, I think that's extremely important. The same standards need to apply to all programs. And I was very happy to hear you say that. The National Research Council's report really articulates that there in fact is more difference within what's called traditional program and alternate route programs than there is between these two groups. Over half of alternate route programs are based in universities. Others have partnerships with universities. It's hard to find a university these days that doesn't offer four or five, six different kinds of pathways – online program, a part-time program, residency program, all different sorts of configuration. So things are changing in higher education and I do think it is a hallmark of a profession to have one set of standards. So that's very important.

The fourth point is around clinical preparation. One of the things that the National Research Council's study said is that there are three areas of program features

that hold the most promise for having a direct relationship to student achievement. And one of those is clinical preparation. And we – I think that the Teacher Quality Partnership grants in the Higher Education Act are a real reflection of the critical nature of that clinical preparation, very tight partnership between higher education and high need K-12 school districts. There're many examples of this. Cal State, Long Beach in the Long Beach School District is one that I've had the opportunity to visit, which is just a wonderful thing to see. You really can barely tell the difference between the school of ed faculty and the faculty in the school district. They go back and forth. There is no shortage there because the mission of the university is to prepare the teachers for that district that's a big part of it.

So those partnerships, I think, hold a lot of promise with a focus on clinical preparation. I just want to point out that in terms of state requirements and the disparity between alternate routes and traditional routes 39 states require some amount of clinical preparation for traditional routes. Only five states require any amount of clinical preparation for alternate routes. So right there you've got a big, a big question looming.

The last point I want to close with is capacity building. I think that the vision that Ed puts forward with the elements are very compelling and really provide a strong picture and a vision for us to move there. So the question is how do we get there from here? And I think there is first of all a lot of capacity building and investment that needs to be done.

The notion of following graduates, utilizing data for program improvement, data that's never been available before that is slowly coming online, is a new role. It's a new role for higher education. It's a new role for states. And as we develop these new roles, just as we've done in K-12, where we're all about a data driven decision making, these are new skills that everyone has to learn, how to get the data, how to use the data, how to analyze the data, most importantly for us how to translate that data into program improvement. We do see that beginning to happen, particularly in Louisiana. I think they've done a very good job of designing an initial system that does in fact provide program improvement. Florida's got a way to go and I think that they can learn a lot from Louisiana.

Just one quick example. One of the colleges there because of the data they received about their graduates' performance saw that the language arts performance of the students they were teaching was not very good. Because they got this data, they went back to their program to investigate what was going on. This had been an alternate route program that they had designed. And in an effort to make it quick, they did not have a language arts preparation for these students. So they have added that back. That's a simple example, but again powerful. And that's the kind of thing you don't know unless you follow your graduates.

So we need to invest in building the capacity there in higher education and add states. We need to develop a system that is both transparent and meaningful in terms of accountability. A lot of effort, a lot of money, a lot of time goes into gathering all this

information that you described and it doesn't yield very much. So it really is about turning that ship around.

And one final comment on political will. You talked about how few programs are closed down et cetera. That really is a state decision and in any decision like that there has to be the political will to do it. I think if we devise an accountability system that is fair, that is transparent, that is owned by the profession as being meaningful, that the political will will begin to unfold. Right now, I don't think that level of credibility is there. But it's something else we have to pay attention to.

MS. BROWN: Great. Thank you very much, Jane.

MS. WEST: Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Kate Walsh has been working in this area pretty intensively the last few years and I think she has some thoughts about all this to share with us.

MS. KATE WALSH: Thank you, Cindy. I think it's really great you took this issue on. There aren't many Washington think tanks or policy groups that are all that interested in this issue, with folks basically having decided that Teach for America and New Teacher Project are going to take care of this problem for us all, so we don't need to worry about them.

We'd like to point out that this nation hires about 200,000 teachers every year and Teach for America and New Teacher Project bring in about 7,000 people under the profession. So you need to be very attentive to the quality of teacher preparation in this country, which is where most teachers go to become teachers, either undergraduate or graduate. And there's also something that we need to focus on that there is such a thing as high quality preparation that Teach for America and the New Teacher Project serve as somewhat workarounds to a largely dysfunctional system, but that does not mean that there isn't possible a system that would absolutely add value uniformly across the board if it were done correctly.

So I'd like to think that we could see a system in this country that one day would lead a superintendent to say, "I can't possibly hire a Teach for America teacher because I get so much value out of these highly trained teachers who are coming from traditional programs.

That being said, that's not the case right now. Most superintendents are very eager to get a hold of the bright young talented college graduates who come into Teach for America and the New Teacher Project. So that reality has to be met straight on. This is not something that – we're spending roughly about \$7 billion a year on education schools just to train new teachers. And that does not count the amount of money that we're using to get teachers to go back to school, to get their master's degree so they get a pay raise or any of the other reasons that teachers have to go back to programs.

So I think it's absolutely incumbent upon us and I applaud you guys for taking some interest in this issue. I like this paper. I thought it was great. I think Ed did a very good job of enumerating some good output measures that ought to be put in place by the states. I have to say, based on our experience, we're a little bit cynical. That doesn't mean we're right. (Laughter.) But we're a little bit cynical about a regulatory response to this problem. And I don't want to base everything on the shenanigans that have taken place on Title II reporting, but those shenanigans are well know and you acknowledge them in your paper. And I did not realize you actually had to implement it so you have a first hand look at those shenanigans. But these are all – I think these are all very important features of any good accountability system.

Our conclusion is a little bit – how should I put it? We think that there should be a regulatory response and there is absolutely a role for regulators, but there is a very cozy, tight relationship between higher ed and states. They trade staff back and forth a lot. I think a response that relies on state regulators doing the right thing; I am a little bit cynical about that happening at this point.

So we very much believe there needs to be inserted into this conversation of deep, deep performance needed in this are the market place. We absolutely believe that unless we devise ways for future teachers to make better decisions about where they go to an education school and more likely still unless we give school districts better information about the quality of the programs, for much they are hiring, that without that insertion of a market place demand or high quality programs that the regulatory response will once again disappoint. That's our theory.

So that's what we're working on. I know that the work that we've done has received a little bit of notoriety. And we were just – we just completed a study in Texas that tried to look very carefully at comprehensive features of programs down there. And we didn't discover all bad news. We found four pretty good programs. They weren't A plus programs, but they were pretty good. But we also found 15 really awful, awful programs. When I say "awful," I mean really awful. That they should not – the legislatures there should be looking very closely at the quality of what's happening in those programs. But I think that what we cannot underestimate is the power of higher education lobbyists and the pressure that they put on state governments to keep things as is.

There's a lot of money involved here and money doesn't always factor into every decision that people have to make about what's good for kids, but the reality is that this absolutely is something that we must confront. That we were surprised in our work in Texas that there was not an interest on the part of the college presidents which house these programs in what we had to say. And that was a bit of a surprise. We had lots of interest from superintendents in the state who were very eager to say, "yes, I need this information when I hire teachers." But college presidents, they surprisingly were not willing to take ownership for what we were learning about their programs. They may have done so after we turned our backs. That may have been something they felt that they needed to do within the context of their institution and not for public frenzy. But I

do think that – and this is an issue I know you wanted to talk about is why is it that the universities just do not take ownership for what is coming out of these programs.

Do we think every program should be shut down? No, but we think a lot of them should be. Do we think there are some great programs out there? Clearly we do. We've named them. But if you look at the field, what you're struck by more than anything is the chaotic nature of education schools. There is no agreement on any aspect what is delivered to future teachers in the United States.

A middle school teacher in one part of a state will take nine courses on biology to teach science and another part of state take one. Student teaching, which is supposed to be the primary reason why someone needs to go to an education program, we are coming out with a study this year that looks at whether or not anybody makes any effort to place student teachers in classrooms with effective mentors, with effective teachers. That isn't happening. That is the most fundamental role, is to provide a good role model for future teachers. Yet, right now, the situation is a school calls school district and a school district calls of principal and a principal says, "I need Ms. Jones to take these kids – to take the student teacher because she has a hard time managing her class." So that kind of thinking that goes into the clinical preparation of teachers in United States should be absolutely unacceptable. And that does not mean it's happening everywhere, but it is a preponderance of places.

So I think that those are some very serious issues that we have to tackle for – in our view, are going to require a much deeper and profound response to this problem than regulatory solutions. Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Kate. That was quite a forceful statement. And I want to give the panelists a chance to respond to each other's comments. But I want to first ask Kate to do one thing for us. Will you describe what a really weak education program looks like and why you make the judgments you do about them? I mean I know why you make the judgments, but how – what you're looking at and what a weak one looks like, just so the folks here can understand.

MS. WALSH: There is no one thing, but let's take an elementary teacher just to keep this conversation somewhat focused. So what we want to know is is that elementary teacher prepared in how to teach reading? And there is a science to reading. We do not mark down a program for taking a balanced literacy approach because a balanced literacy approach assumes you will also teach the science of reading that that is a factor in your program. But the balanced literacy approach instead, we find, means that you don't even bring up the science of reading unless you want to refer to it in very disdainful tones. So we have 40 percent of the kids in the United States who require this method of reading in order to learn how to be a reader. But the teacher is not given those tools to deliver in the classroom. To me that's malpractice.

In mathematics preparation, does the elementary teacher know how to – know conceptually how to deliver instruction? I'm not talking about having – taking even a

college level calculus course. We're talking about has a teacher been trained in how to explain to a child what a fraction actually is and what are the wrong ways to teach a fraction, what are the right ways to teach fraction, and so to have much more conceptual understanding. And I get back to the student teaching. If we're placing our student teachers in programs without regard to the quality of the school or the teacher delivering the mentoring or training, that too is a reason to call into question the quality of a program.

So special education – I feel – for me this is the issue that I feel most strongly about. And that is that we have written off not just children who are in special education, by association we've written off the teachers who are charged as to teaching those children. The quality of special education training in the United States is deplorable, just deplorable. It makes regular education look like the best program around. But what we're doing in special education depriving teachers of future curriculum that are effective or diagnostic is really something that should be of huge concern to us.

I could go on and on about the qualities of the faculty. Are they teaching an area of expertise, are they asked to teach soup to nuts? Is a teacher broadly educated so that he or she especially in two or three years, when they're going to be teaching the common core, has a broad level arts education? That's not happening, nor are the tests. And I think you make an excellent point about the tests. The tests that we have right now in place – there's too many different ones and they're not really doing a good job of testing what teachers need to know.

So we have 35 different standards, but I think that'll –

MS. BROWN: I think that was helpful. Jane, would you like to comment on some of this?

MS. WEST: Yes, I would. (Laughter.) I think, Kate, you made some really sweeping statements that simply are not supported by research. To say that the state special education preparation is deplorable is just not supported. I would point to things like responsiveness to intervention that have come out of special education that have been very effective in teaching new teacher, positive behavioral supports in fact direct instruction that much of the reading pedagogy was based on. In terms of developing evidence based preparation and evidence based strategies, I think you're really off the mark. That is my background. I've been a special education teacher. It's something I know a lot about.

I do agree with you that our special education teachers and students with disabilities have pretty much been entirely ignored by the school reform movement and are not included in general education in a way that they should be, though there certainly is progress. And I think no child left behind has really contributed to that progress.

As far as the studies that you are undertaking, there – I remember we've had a lot of problems with your work, mainly because of your methodology. Primarily what you

utilize is a syllabus review. I know you go into some places later and do more intensive work. We have had many, many concerns raised by our members and those concerns are a matter of public record and are available. And I don't want this to turn into a debate about this issue, but I do think that scrutiny is wanted in terms of the methodologies that you use and the conclusions that you draw, particularly, again, if you look at the National Research Council's report, which is something that went on for five years that tried to take a look at these issues, you just don't find the support there for what you're after.

So I again, one thing I'd like to turn our attention to is the momentum that the common core standards movement I think offers to move us in the direction of the picture that you painted. After so many, many years, we have finally because of the governors, because the federal government doesn't do federal standards, we have to remember that in our system of government the education is a state and local responsibility. And that is one of the things that I think makes this profession particularly challenging. You don't have that in nursing. Nursing is not a state and local responsibility et cetera. And I think that the fact that the governors have stepped up and that many states have stepped up and have come together to know that in fact two plus two is the same in California as it is in North Carolina, and that really needs to be reflected in how we carry out our work in the profession.

I think that very, very often teacher preparation is an afterthought in this sort of discussion. So again, I commend you for putting teacher preparation right in the center here. Our work on the teacher performance assessment, our partner, the Chief State School Officers we're working very hard to integrate those common core standards with the teacher performance assessment, so that in fact when you finish your preparation program, you will be knowledgeable and ready to work with the common core standards. We're hoping that all the 48 states who are interested in adopting them will in fact. But I do think that there is a lot of momentum there about putting forward a national standard, not a federal standard, but a national standard that is available for those who would like to adopt it. And I hope that the pressure continues to do that and that states will more and more look to integrate that adoption of those common core standards with their teacher preparation programs.

MS. BROWN: Great. Ed do you have any comment hereon?

MR. CROWE: Maybe two from the responses that Kate and Jane made. And first of, to both of you, thanks for reading it so carefully and thinking about it so much.

One is Jane mentioned political will. And the point I want to make there is that fields of study and fields of practice that have become high quality professions, political will comes from inside the profession. It isn't given as a gift by legislators who wake up someday and say, "you know what, we need better teachers?" And the two clearest examples of that are medicine – 100 years ago, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching commissioned the Flexner report. Abraham Flexner visited every medical school in the United States and Canada, wrote a devastating report on the quality of medical education. But he was not alone. This involved the medical colleges

and the AMA as cosponsors of the work. It radically changed the structure and operation of medical education.

Closer to our time, the leaders of the nursing field, for example, have made major changes in the way nursing programs operate and are regulated and in how young men and women – excuse me – who become nurses are licensed. This began inside the profession. State regulators came along and eventually, as I say in the paper, adopted the same structure in every single state, same tests, same passing scores, so that a nurse prepared in one state meets the same quality standards as a nurse prepared somewhere else.

So political will is not a gift and it's something that a field earns and I think frankly teacher education has not earned the right to say somebody else should develop this political will and hand it to us.

It's kind of ironic that at the same time the field is saying federal regulation should leave us alone because we have this decentralized structure, people want federal money to do things. And it reminds me of a saying Wallace Stegner, the writer, the western writer, described western politics in this way. He said, "the essence of western politics is send more money, and leave us alone." (Laughter.) You're not going to build the profession that way.

Secondly, the current system, I concede your point about being skeptical about whether state regulators will step up to this. It's not an accident what we have. It's determined the hard work by teacher educators, testing companies, and state regulators to get us to a point where we don't even understand what the regulatory structure is.

The agreement point on standards has largely been the lowest common denominator. We can do better and there are people already at work, the examples I gave and others, who want the common denominator for quality to be up here and not down here.

I'm optimistic because of the common core standards and because the relentless focus on results that schools are enduring and that teacher education programs are largely still immune will force the pace of change. And states, I think, will step up to the bar in a way that they haven't before. And I think because multiple states understand the value of cross state agreement on standards, on curriculum, and now on testing, they'll see that a piece of the puzzle, part of the human capital chain, if you will, is teachers who are prepared to meet those standards in every state. And I think we can't wait for money. We shouldn't wait for money. We should do it as soon as possible.

MS. BROWN: I guess my own view on this is a kind of a combination of all of yours. I believe – it's a very dynamic time in public education with the standards, with this, as you say, relentless focus on outcomes, but I to a certain extent share Kate synthesis and think the market place is going to have to play a role in this, which leads to a question I have that none of you have really addressed. If you look at high performing,

very high performing countries, like Finland and Singapore that lead on international student performance, they are very selective about who they let into the teaching profession, so selective, in fact, that a lot of the issues we have about tenure, differential pay, and all these other things that we here at the Center have felt are important drivers for change, that there's no parallel in those countries because they're so selective about who goes into the profession and what happens with those who exit their training programs. So I'm interested in this issue of selectivity and I actually think it's not so much the responsibility of the school of education. I think it's the responsibility of university presidents and the governance of the universities, our big public universities that train the vast number of teachers in this country. And frankly, a lot of the alternative certification programs are connected to university programs and are constrained in certain ways they operate, again, by the state legislators – a fair point, Jane. So – but universities are powerful and they take a lot of federal money. I don't –

MS. WEST: Not for teacher preparation.

MS. BROWN: – no, well, I'm talking about Pell grants and guaranteed student loans. That is taxpayer money from the federal government. So in elementary and secondary we've pretty well established that if you're going to take our money, our miserly little 10 percent of the cost of K-12 education, you're going to have to do certain things. And for all the ranting and raving, not one state has ever turned back Title I or – (inaudible). So – but that kind of behavior we don't see at the postsecondary level. So I'm interested in your comments about selectivity and university presidents' leadership.

MS. WEST: I think those are both very, very good points. I think universities really vary on this topic. We can look at Nancy Zimpher at the SUNY System. You'll never find a bigger advocate for teacher preparation in clinical preparation. She was the same way to University of Cincinnati. There are presidents and there are colleges and universities who see teacher preparation as part of their mission. It is not an afterthought. It is not a cash cow. Is that the norm? Probably not, but there certainly are. National Louis University in Chicago, they see that this tight connection to the community and really where you see the tightest link to the K-12 system is in teacher preparation. So I think that does happen. It doesn't happen enough.

The culture in higher ed is a very different culture from the culture in K-12. That's no surprise to anybody. And sometimes I feel like in a teacher preparation world we have one foot in the higher ed culture and one foot in the K-12 culture. And it's very challenging. It really is. K-12 is all about accountability, all about – and some of the things we do in K-12 are just a great affront to higher ed because you get into issues like academic freedom and – it's a different culture. So sort of getting over that chasm of those two different cultures is something that definitely, definitely needs some work. I do think it's changing. I think that – we participate in a council with all the presidents of the higher education associations and we're very active on teacher preparation. And they are increasingly involved. But it's – it's going to take time.

In terms of selectivity point – and I want to make a point about the market place too. First the market place, I think the market place has greater role and will continue to. One of the benefits of the proliferation of alternate routes is that it's forced higher ed to change. I think we see that. There is – you're hard pressed to find a higher ed program now with only one typical route. Some universities, in teacher prep, whatever they provide in person, they're required to provide online. So I think that the market place is changing.

Selectivity – a couple of years ago, Drew Gitomer from the Educational Testing Service did a study looking at SAT scores of entrance into higher education, comparing them over time for education majors and comparing them to other majors in the university. The good news was that in secondary education there had been a large increase in the average SAT score and in fact that SAT score really was not different from the other candidates in the university. That is not the case for elementary or special education. And there continues to be a need there.

So I do think that some of that has changed and has shifted. One of the things that the National Research Council report said when it talked about those three features that are most likely to be related to student achievement in terms of program components was the attributes of the candidate. I think that Teach for America certainly has found that out and there're measures of persistence and those measures include things like disposition, things like entrance level test scores, and things like that. So I think that is important.

I think another thing to remember is that unlike Finland and some of the other countries that you mentioned, our workforce of teachers is 3.2 million people. It's the largest public workforce that we have. And to say that we want only the top 10 percent to become teachers, the numbers just aren't there. That doesn't mean you don't have measures of selectivity, but I do think it's important to remember, as Deborah Ball the dean at the University of Michigan likes to say, is that we need to teach ordinary people to do extraordinary things. And I think that the fact that you are a genius – many of us probably know geniuses – and it doesn't mean you're a good teacher. So I think we have to really think carefully about selectivity and what does that, what does that mean, what are those attributes that need to be considered.

MS. BROWN: Kate?

MS. WEST: Well, I don't think that we need to aspire to have the top 10 percent of all teachers – of all college graduates in our classroom, but I'll settle for the top half. And right now in this country it is easier to get into an education school in any state – there are education schools that are easy enough to get into. They're so easy. It is easier to become a teacher than it is to qualify to play NCAA college football. And that is the truth. There is a – SAT score and a grad point average that's required of NCAA athletes that is often more rigorous than what some of the education schools require.

So I think that we want a huge risk when we talk about what we all know really smart people who'd be terrible teachers. One thing that Teach for America's shown us

and New Teacher Project, great point average does matter, smart does matter. Why should teaching be the only profession where we say it doesn't matter if you're smart? And I hear that – whenever I speak, I hear people say it. It shouldn't matter. What really matters is if you love kids. I don't know what that means. What does that mean to just love kids? I can't imagine going into teaching and hating kids, but that is not the attribute that we need to worry about. We need to worry about are we getting bright, talented people in the profession because I don't know about you, but my office works better for having smarter people in it and teaching should be no different.

MS. BROWN: Ed?

MR. CROWE: Well, I think there's plenty of room for improved selectivity and it's absolutely the right direction to move in. Roughly a third of graduates right now from colleges of education, teacher ed programs never go into teaching. So we have room to move up right there. The weakest – academically weakest students who aspire to be teachers are in elementary education. Over every state has an oversupply of elementary education teachers. So there's room to move there right away. And third, we see the operation of the market place. Large numbers of young people who want to become teachers and become teachers – Teach for America, the New York City Teaching Fellows et cetera – coming out of other degree programs at universities and going into teaching. They would never go to a college for education at their own institution in part of the intellectual rigor of that. That's not the only issue.

I want to say also there are plenty of programs that are selective. They deal with the issues of saying no once in a while and it makes a difference. And I think at bottom here, we can argue a lot about what qualities to select for and what impact is going to have on an individual or whatever, but I think at bottom line one of the problems in this field is we're all waiting for someone else to do it. And the fundamental question is whether I as an individual faculty members or dean for example can answer the personal question about professional ethics and professional practice. Am I willing to be associated with an endeavor that just chugs people through and makes sure that my state has low enough standards that they'll get out and they'll graduate and nobody will breathe down my neck.

With respect to the role of the university presidents, there are some, again, I think there're some good examples of university presidents who've taken real steps to get behind the high quality preparation program, others who have not. You will get their attention when there are serious consequences for poor performance. But when you have a state accountability system now, where for example the feds established through the Title II report card, 10 years ago, that every state should establish what they called criteria for low performing programs. Because of federalism supposedly, every state then set its own rules. Secretary Duncan's most recent report to Congress said that 31 out of 1,170 programs were designated by their state as low performing. That's 2.6 percent. That didn't happen by somebody else. It happened by the profession, by the regulators who are connected to the profession, and by the use of teacher tests that are structured in

ways that allow you to say that nobody's doing a bad job, when from the standpoint of schools we know we can be doing a much better jobs.

MS. WEST: I'd just add something to that. I know that – again, back to the market place notion that you brought up, Kate – there have been some schools and colleges of education that have closed simply because they don't have any business. And I think part of that is – probably the economy is part of it. Part of it, though, I think is market place options. And I think as this transparent system of data and accountability comes online increasingly that there will be more that will not be able to sustain themselves.

MS. BROWN: Okay. I want to open this up to all of you – this – got a lot of comments here. We have mikes. I want you to announce who you are. But I want to see – are there any members of the press who want to ask questions first? Okay. Woman right here.

Q: Hi. My name is Heather Harding and I work for Teach for America. I do research there and I cannot imagine a world where Teach for America was just a workaround. (Laughter.) But I think I have a question about – so one of the things about leveraging selectivity and also inspiring recent college graduates to come to the profession when they hadn't considered it during their undergraduate experience, there's something to be said for differentiation for the pre-service candidates. And what I haven't heard from this panel yet is about – so if you're going to leverage selectivity, what does the program look like? Is it different? What does it emphasize? So I'm wondering about, given that we're in this place where there are a lot of out routes that set in a lot of different places and are run by various organizations, what does differentiation in the program look like that doesn't compromise a common standard of quality?

MR. CROWE: Well, there's so much variation to begin with in the nature and structure of teacher education programs. I think the problem really with answering is that there is no answer. The National Research Council spent two million dollars in five years to say, "you know, guess what, we don't know much." (Laughter.) And Lee Shulman, who's one of the giants of this field says, "there's no such thing as teacher education because we do things campus by campus, program by program," which is why I think we need strong measures of outcomes and performance. That will drive internal structural changes as people respond to the results of that accountability, for those who want to respond. For those who don't, they should be doing other work.

MS. BROWN: Woman in pink.

Q: Hi, I'm Vicki Meyers from the U.S. Department of Education. My question is given that – this is kind of to Kate – given that we know there are a lot of professors who maybe don't know the science of reading because they've never been prepared in that, how would you suggest that we provide maybe professional development so that they can learn that?

MS. WALSH: Well, there's a couple of different answers to that question. Certainly I don't believe No Child Left Behind accommodated the fact that ed schools didn't have that expertise to deliver it, which is a shame. But that should be something that's tackled. Or you could just take the approach that – what we say to states who are concerned about this issue – in Texas, they have very explicit, explicit regulations on what must be taught in ed schools vis-à-vis the science of reading. And we found that it was about 20 to 25 – I can't remember exactly – 20 to 25 percent of the institutions in the state are even paying attention to those regs. So the only way we think the regs can be enforced is for states to put in a good science test – good reading test that all graduates must take. And that's what Massachusetts has done. That's what Connecticut has done, Virginia and California to a certain extent. And that will drive ed schools to make sure and colleges and universities to make sure that that instruction is actually occurring.

Right now, most states have a very general test and reading – the science of reading only constitutes a few questions on the test. So it's possible to pass and still fail. So you need to have a stand alone reading test.

Q: But how – (off mike) – to get that?

MS. WALSH: Well, you either retrain those professors or you hire adjuncts who do know it. You don't have much choice because these guys have tenure. So that's part of the problem in transitioning to new programs is when these are tenured faculty and there's also a great amount of ideological resistance.

MS. BROWN: Michael? Wait for your mike.

Q: Thank you. Michael Dannenberg with the Department of Education as well. I have two questions. First is on accountability system. As you mention, we don't have a lot of outcome indicators yet. In the interim, should there be input indicators? What should they be and for that matter, if not in the interim, in the long term should those be coupled with outcome indicators?

And my second question is with respect to any more rigorous accountability that a state or states may adopt. Would you expect there to be a disparate impact when it comes to institutions that prepare a vast majority of minority teachers? What are the implications of that and what can we do about it?

MS. BROWN: Good questions.

MR. CROWE: Well, from the standpoint of what do we do in the meantime, the paper talks a little bit about this. I think enough of the state data systems are coming online that we can generate in fact student learning results for more and more programs and more and more teachers from those programs. The same thing for the observation of classroom instruction – there are instruments that already exist and are being validated that can be used by states and by programs themselves. Certainly it's possible, although very few programs do it, to track their graduates into the classroom and how long they

stay in teaching. The one – the indicator that will, I am sure, take the longest time to respond to adequately is the issue of a testing system that makes sense for teachers and for students.

I would not be a fan of trying to develop process indicators, in part because of what I'd said before that it's hard to know what the process is because it varies so much. And I'm not saying that to denigrate what people are trying to do, but there's so little consistency across programs and what happens. As another example, if you were to take one of those radio frequency ID things that they use at Wal-Mart and places like that and programs have tracked their own candidates through the program, looking at the sequence of courses and experiences they have. No two students virtually in most programs have the same experience. So how would you know what the impact of a process is on them?

So I'd be reluctant to construct another system while we wait for a real system, I guess is maybe not an easy answer when you're trying to make practical decisions. But I think it would force us to get to a real system to not think about the development of process indicators.

MS. WEST: I just wanted to add to that that I do think this is an area that I do think this is an area where more research is wanted. The federal government has done virtually no research on teacher preparation and what makes for an effective program and how do you link those program elements to student achievement. I hope that the Institute of Education Sciences would take this on and pick up where the National Research Council report left off and look at those three areas of promising program features that at least at this point appear to be related to student success. And I do – I think we need to know that like what are – we can sort the good teachers from the bad teachers, but what made them good and what made them bad in terms of the preparation? And we really need to dig a lot deeper in that area.

MS. WALSH: Well, obviously I would disagree. I think that we absolutely know many ingredients to what makes a competent first year teacher, that they know something about their subject matter. So if an institution isn't preparing their high school teachers or their middle school teachers to teach chemistry by actually providing the chemistry course, then that's reason to be concerned.

I think there's a long list of do they learn anything about assessment. In this era it's unconscionable to put teachers in a classroom who've not had a strong grounding, a foundation knowledge in how to deliver assessment, classroom management, cognitive psychology, reading instruction, mathematics, special education. I can obviously go on and on because I have the proof. But I just think that we very much know and we're willing to take that leap of faith that there are some things that we can all agree are important and essential to becoming a competent teacher.

MS. WEST: I agree with that. I don't – I agree with that. I think the point I was trying to make is the specific program features – how long should the clinical preparation

be, for example? We don't really know. What are the specific selectivity measures that we should be looking at in terms of candidates, obviously a level of content knowledge, indicator through SAT or whatever, but beyond that – so –

MS. WALSH: But can't we all agree – like we could do a lot of research, but can't we all agree it's better to be selective about who gets under the profession than not be selective?

MS. WEST: – absolutely.

MS. WALSH: And to – we've thrown out – our standard is that you should come from the top half of your college obtaining high school class. That's not – that's not really our – I guess you could say it's arbitrary, but it's not a standard that is unachievable. Yet when we apply to many education schools in the United States, they can't meet it.

I think that there are some things that they do that appear arbitrary because we can't wait any longer. I think – what we've done is to try to be quite reasonable about what it is a competent first year teacher needs. So I would – I welcome the conversation whether we have the right, but I think – and I'm just not prepared to wait 10, 15, 20 years and I'm sure you aren't either to figure out – to figure this out. I just think that the answers are more obvious than they otherwise appear.

MR. CROWE: And Michael, that maybe brings us back around to your second question.

MS. BROWN: Yes, I was going to say.

MR. CROWE: And the impact of higher standards on who gets to become a teacher. I would say, I guess, in response to that that the core issue is that all K-12 students should have well prepared and academically talented teachers. And what in fact happens and we should be concerned about the fact that poor and minority kids are more likely to have the weakest teachers academically and in other ways, and to raise standards would be to the benefit of those young people. It will affect all kinds of institutions and all kinds of college students who think it would be a good idea if I became a teacher. But if we have higher standards for them, they'll either reach higher or they'll choose another field. And –

MS. WALSH: And – I'm sorry –

MS. WEST: Go ahead.

MS. WALSH: – I think that yes, we shouldn't ignore that question. One thing we've found in Texas is there was no – we did not find that the bottom 15 schools that I cited earlier were schools that were necessarily serving poor and minority children.

MS. BROWN: What do you mean?

(Cross talk.)

MS. WALSH: – they were not necessarily – they weren't necessary the schools that was all minorities, preparing teacher to go into the inner city of Houston. That there was no particular pattern that suggested that they were –

MS. BROWN: Or a pattern in who – the teachers they produced.

MS. WALSH: – right, the demographics. There was no particular pattern. And I also think that when you look at – this is a very, very sensitive issue – one of the things we're really grappling with is if you use test scores to decide who could go into teaching and the disproportionate impact of that – such a ruling on minority populations because African-Americans and Hispanics tend to score lower on these tests. And Dan Goldhaber's done some really interesting work showing that teachers in North Carolina, black teachers who'd scored lower on their entrance tests, were in fact more effective than white teachers who were 25 percent higher points above the black teachers' performance. So I think that that – for us that raises some really profound issues that we absolutely must come to terms with. And I don't have any easy answers to it, but I think it's something we need to – certainly need to talk about.

MS. WEST: I do think, too, just one point about capacity building as using – our (HPC ?) uses an example. I think they will say that they need more investment in their teacher preparation programs and they acknowledge a need to scale them up and improve. And again, I do think that's a place where since the vast majority of our minority teachers come from either some sort of predominantly minority serving institution, it's a very important question to pay attention to because as our demographics increasingly shift and we're more and more diverse, our workforce looks less and less like our students.

MS. BROWN: So we're out of time. I'm going to take two more questions. I'll run over. The woman in the purple top.

Q: Hi Jane Liebbrand, NCATE. Continuing on selectivity, on international tests our fourth graders in science score in the middle or slightly above average, but yet by the time our students – and our elementary teachers, on their SATs, as Jane pointed out, score just slightly below average, just slightly below. Our high school teachers, as Jane pointed out, score as well as all college graduates on the SAT, yet our 15-year olds on international tests are at the bottom of the barrel in math and science. So there seems to be an inverse relationship between academic qualifications and – I'm certainly not advocating for and I want the panel's comments on this inverse relationship. I'm questioning why is this. And then the – maybe our high schools are not as developmentally oriented as elementary schools. And I'm certainly not advocating for elementary teachers who score below average on the SAT, but the fact is that our fourth graders score pretty darn well, and our 15 and 16-year olds don't and yet their teachers

have higher academic – (audio break) – one other comment that’s unrelated. NCATE’s president commissioned a blue ribbon panel on clinical preparation. And the report is in process now. And we will be releasing it in the fall or in January.

MS. BROWN: That’s good to know. I don’t think American student performance internationally is very good in elementary schools or high schools.

MS. WALSH: Well, you’ve drawn a very simple correlation. It’s kind of massive aggregation bias. You’re not controlling for all sorts of other factors. So I’m not sure quite to how respond to that other than to say any study that’s looked at those attributes of a teacher in isolation and controlling for those other factors finds that teachers who come from more selective colleges or who have higher SAT or verbal ability have higher student achievement.

MS. WEST: I think one thing to remember, too, is there’s so much out of field placement in secondary. There’s math that’s just rampant in middle school. And also there is such a shortage there. It’s like you’re looking at the graduates, which is quite different from who’s actually in those schools. The other thing is there’s a cumulative effect. It’s year after year, after year. It’s – you know.

MS. BROWN: The last question, the woman right here.

Q: Emily Feistritz, the National Center for Education Information. In some ways I feel like I’m in a time warp because so many of these issues have been being discussed for a very, very long time. (Laughter.)

MS. BROWN: We’ve been around a long time, too.

Q: Yes. I think that the – I’ve been following what’s going on in teacher education and certification for longer than I would like to admit. And I don’t think there’s been a time in American history where I’m more optimistic about the direction of the quality of the quality of the teaching force improving, and it’s because of people like Ed Crowe who’s been around for a while, too, coming out with reports like this. But the fact to the matter is is that I think at every level of this country there has been a considerable increase and attention given to the quality of the teaching force. And that is happening in colleges and universities that prepare teachers, the fact that there are a third of all new teachers coming through so-called – (off mike) – mechanism is really pointing to the fact that we have many, many ways of preparing tomorrow’s teachers than we are preparing today’s teachers.

Kate, I’m particularly concerned at about 50 statements you made today that I would really like to see references for. We are – this country is not hiring 200,000 new teachers a year. I was just looking at NCES data from the most recent SASS report and we’re hiring about 95,000 and two thirds of those are recent college graduates at both the undergraduate and the graduate level. So I think it’s important to put into perspective when we’re talking about preparation of teachers who these people are, where they’re

coming from. A third of them are post-baccalaureate people for sure. The means by which colleges and universities are going to be held accountable for teacher quality I think is going to be very much a factor of the kinds of people who prepare to teach and will be teaching going forward.

But I really would, Kate, like to caution you about many statements you make that my analyses of research over the years and currently really does not support and in many ways is adversarial to what you say.

MS. WALSH: Well, I'm certainly happy to give you the cite on 200,000. That's pretty standard – 200,000, I'm happy to send that to you, Emily.

Q: (Off mike.)

MS. WALSH: Two hundred thousand teachers are hired each year.

Q: (Off mike.)

MS. WALSH: I don't – do you think this is worth spend your time on –

MS. BROWN: I'll tell you what. Why don't you guys have a discussion of this after this? And we're happy to put up the information. This woman will have the really last question.

Q: I'm Mitzi Wertheim with the Naval Postgraduate School. John Dewey was my godfather, so I have a very specific view of education and learning. I wanted to tell a quick story about the issue with college and university presidents. When Charles Eliot was president of Harvard and it only took 18 months to get a medical degree and you only had to pass five out of 11 courses that were being given and he sat in on all the medical meetings for years to get them to basically train the standards for basically developing doctors. I guess my question is I think turning teaching in elementary and high schools into a profession is a brilliant idea and the question is how do you do it, so that you make sure you bring in some of these outliers as well. And I think this ought to be a national discussion. I think you ought to get it in *Time* and *Newsweek* and all the talk shows about – no, I'm serious –

MS. WEST: We're ready.

Q: – well, but you have to make the effort to do that. You have to go to them and say this really matters. And – because if the nation doesn't get behind it, you get the common response of schools are terrible except mine.

MS. WEST: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Right.

MS. BROWN: We agree with you and that's why we held this – commissioned this paper and held this session. We had 200 people RSVP for this event. Now, many of them, I think – (off mike) – simultaneously. And I think many of the people who RSVP decided to watch it online. This is how you start building a national conversation. So with that, we hope you all will continue to engage in this conversation and welcome talking to –

(END)