#### REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 248

SF 000 885

BROAD POLICY CONCERNS AND DIRECTION FOR A STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION.

BY- MILLER, NORMAN A. RACKLEY, J. R.

PUB DATE APR 66

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.09 HC-\$0.64 16F.

DESCRIPTORS- \*ACCREDITATION (INSTITUTIONS), EDUCATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, \*PROGRAM EVALUATION, RESEARCH, \*STATE GOVERNMENT, \*TEACHER CERTIFICATION, \*TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHER SUPPLY AND DEMAND, STUDENT TEACHING, SUPERVISION, SEATTLE

THE FUNCTION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (TO INSURE AN APPROPRIATE EDUCATION FOR THE CHILDREN AND YOUTH OF THE STATE) IS EXAMINED IN SEVERAL AREAS. THE AUTHORS BELIEVE THAT TEACHER PREPARATION CAN BE IMPROVED NOT THROUGH MODIFYING CERTIFICATION REGULATIONS, BUT BY ACTUAL VISITS TO EACH CAMPUS, ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THEIR IMPROVEMENT, CONSIDERING ADEQUACY OF PREPARATION, PROPRIETY OF ORGANIZATION TO OBJECTIVES, APPROPRIATENESS AND SUFFICIENCY OF RESOURCES (HUMAN AND OTHERWISE) AND FLEXIBILITY. THE AUTHORS FURTHER SUGGESTED THAT THE DEPARTMENT SHOULD COORDINATE THE JOINT RESPONSIBILITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR BOTH FRESERVICE AND INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION SO THAT THE "GAP" BETWEEN THEORY AND FRACTICE CAN BE REDUCED. IMPLEMENTATION WOULD REQUIRE A NEW KIND OF PROFESSIONAL, RESPONSIBLE FOR INDUCTING NOVICE TEACHERS INTO THE PROFESSION. HE MIGHT SERVE ON A JOINT APPOINTMENT WITH BOTH THE COLLEGE AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL OR EVEN AS A FULL-TIME MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. ANOTHER METHOD FOR CLOSER TIES WOULD BE A JOINT AREA FROGRAM AND SERVICE CENTER TO ATTAIN SUCH MUTUAL OBJECTIVES AS IMPROVED CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION IN THE SCHOOLS AND, FOR HIGHER EDUCATION PERSONNEL, DATA TO TEST THEORIES AND HYPOTHESES. EXPERT SUPERVISORS COULD BE TRAINED IN THESE CENTERS. ALSO EMPHASIZED FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT ARE THE FUNDING, RESEARCH, AND RECRUITMENT FUNCTIONS. THIS PAPER WAS PRESENTED AT THE CONFERENCE ON THE ROLE OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION (SEATTLE, AFRIL 27-29, 1966). (LC)

FEB 17 1967 CUPY2 12P

BROAD POLICY CONCERNS AND DIRECTION FOR A STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

a paper prepared by

Norman A. Miller, Director, Bureau of Teacher Education, and J. R. Rackley, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction 11/200

for

The Seattle, Washington, Conference on the

Role of State Departments of Education in Teacher Education April 27-29, 1966

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# BROAD POLICY CONCERNS AND DIRECTION FOR A STATE DEFARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

#### The Setting

The state department of education (SDE) is a unit of government whose primary function is to ensure an appropriate education for the children and youth of the state. This function is established by the state constitution, acts of the state legislature, regulations of the state board of education, and procedures established by the chief state school officer. The regulation of the preparation and certification of teachers is part of it. From this setting comes the central question of this paper: What should or could be the future extent and nature of this function?

In an attempt to answer this question twelve years ago, a bulletin of the Council of Chief State School Officers identified three major responsibilities within the SDEs role in teacher education:

- 1. Education of professional school personnel.
- 2. Legal accreditation of institutions and programs for the education of teachers.
- 3. Certification of professional school personnel. 2



While this paper deals with state departments of education generally, it necessarily reflects the experiences of the authors in but one such agency. It is natural to generalize from this experience and assume that other state departments are quite similar, but, of course, this is not the case. The authors' observations and comments may tend to be limited to the situation in Pennsylvania or to the Eastern United States; therefore, the reader will have to supply appropriate limits for his own situation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Council of Chief State School Officers, Study Commission. Responsibilities of State Department of Education for Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: the Council, 1954. p. 1.

The bulletin indicated that these responsibilities "are inseparable and interdependent." If the three elements were inseparable in 1954, they appear even more so in 1966.

The 1954 bulletin did an excellent job of outlining and analyzing the many facets of the functioning of SDEs which are related to teacher education. Its many suggestions have relevance today and there would be value in reviewing them here. But the writers would rather develop the major policy concerns in teacher education faced by SDEs in the current milieux. We do recommend a review of the 1954 bulletin, however.

The concerns which follow were nearly all outlined in the bulletin. The attempt here is to analyze them in depth in light of current social and educational conditions and to examine some new problem areas.

## Broad Policy Concerns

## Improving Teacher Preparation

1. Through Certification. We do not believe the preparation of teachers can be effectively improved by modifying certification regulations. On this point we differ completely from the position stated in the 1954 bulletin.

Lucien B. Kinney has ably pointed out that "certification is a civil service operation." Its main function has been to provide a pool of persons to man the classrooms of the state. Certification standards are breeched constantly and adjusted frequently as teacher supply and demand shifts. Certification, broadly conceived, gives focus to the professional preparation of teachers but, individually applied, may go somewhat awry. Individual differences are not taken into account in blanket certification standards. We are convinced that the improvement of teacher preparation must take place largely at the point of initial preparation—in the colleges and universities, with the close coopera-

<sup>3</sup>Kinney, Lucien B. <u>Certification in Education</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964. p. 128.



tion of local school systems and with attention directed to individual needs within the context of general certification requirements.

2. Through Program Approval. Many SDEs have attempted to avoid pitfalls by using the approved-program approach to certification, in which the programs leading to certificates in each teacher preparing institution are reviewed and approved when they meet certain criteria. Unfortunately, part of this fine attempt is that in nearly every state the "criteria" that are applied are merely the credit-hour specifications of the certification regulations. Many SDE staff persons "approve" programs from their desks in the state capital simply by checking college catalogs or elaborate questionnaires filled in by college personnel. We submit that such a procedure is merely a shortcut around traditional transcript analysis and has little direct relationship to improvement of teacher education.

Program approval, as practiced by the Pennsylvania SDE and one or two others, is one way of directly affecting programs in the preparing institutions. Teams of professional educators and academicians, with some SDE personnel, visit each campus, analyze the teacher education programs, and make recommendations for their improvement. All elements of the certificate programs are examined, including general education and subject matter specialization.

The crucial questions are: Are the program objectives coherent, consistent, and complete so that graduates are adequately prepared to teach successfully in the public schools? Is the program organized and administered so that the objectives may be achieved? Are there sufficient and appropriate human, financial, and educational resources available to achieve the objectives? Does the curriculum provide all the elements necessary to achieve the objectives, and is the program flexible enough for individual students to pursue an appropriate curriculum? Are the graduates competent beginning teachers, and are only competent beginning teachers, and are only competent beginning teachers recommended for certification by the institution?

Programs that meet this kind of test are granted approval status and the graduates are automatically certified without having their transcripts analyzed.

In order to improve teacher preparation through such an activity, the SDE must have sufficient highly qualified professional staff members. We urge SDEs to establish within their structures a teacher education unit that can competently conduct the approved-program approach. Like the institutions we evaluate, we cannot carry on a worthwhile activity without adequate numbers of well-prepared personnel.

This kind of activity, like most of the concerns discussed in this paper, calls for an enlightened, cooperative, candid rapport between teacher preparing institutions and the SDE. And this rapport should include not only these two groups but public school personnel as well, as described below.

## Responsibility for Teacher Education

A second broad policy concern is the placement of responsibility for the preservice and inservice education of teachers. Preservice teacher education has traditionally been assigned to institutions of higher education. Undoubtedly it is still considered in this light by many persons. The continuing education of teachers likewise has largely been related to postbaccalaureate programs, with little attention given to it by the public schools. We propose that both preservice and inservice teacher education be the responsibility of a carefully structured partnership between higher education and the public schools. The SDE appears to us to be the logical initiator, catalyst, and supporter of this cooperative relationship.

The professional teacher educators are in the institutions of higher learning; the practicing teachers and the curriculum are in the public schools.

One reason for the much discussed gap between theory and practice is undoubtedly this separation between persons who develop theory and conduct educational re-



search and those who practice their profession in the public school classroom. This gap has been so wide as to be seldom crossed except by the boldest of educational pioneers.

Supervisor of Novice Teachers. The SDE might help reduce the gap between theory and practice and institutionalize the partnership between public schools and colleges at the point of student teaching and beginning teaching. Generally, student teaching is considered the responsibility of the college or university. Yet, this creates an attitude by public school personnel that they are doing a favor for the college when they accept student teachers. Conversely, college personnel are put in the position of soliciting help from public schools to supervise their student teachers.

By institutionalizing the role of the public school in the continuing preparation of beginning teachers, the state could tie together the preservice and inservice education of teachers. The agent for this function could be a new kind of professional—a general supervisor, a master teacher, a clinical professor, or what have you. He would be responsible for inducting the novice teacher into the profession. He might serve on a joint appointment with both the college and the public school, or even as a full-time member of the school system responsible for thorough induction of all beginning teachers to the point of full tenure and for coordinating a program of student teaching if there is one in the schools. A cadre of these supervisory specialists, perhaps one for each ten beginning teachers, could give new teachers the kind of help so frequently discussed but so infrequently achieved.

Parenthetically, it should be pointed out that larger school systems, as now generally organized throughout the nation, have been justified in part on the grounds that they could support this kind of supervisory assistance to teachers. It seems to us that these school systems should be called upon to



produce the kind of service for which they were organized. Here again, the SDE should exercise its leadership in establishing models and in securing the human and financial resources to help school systems operate effectively in this role.

The expert supervisor of teachers should be thoroughly trained in such skills as the observation and analysis of teacher and pupil behavior. Some systems of behavior analysis should be in the supervisor's professional repertoire, such as those developed by J. Whithall, N. Flanders and E. Amidon, H. Mitzel and D. Medley, A. Bellack, M. Hughes, B. Smith, and others. The expert knowledge and skill required to use these techniques properly could be acquired through training by teacher educators in the universities, extending the collaboration between higher education and the public schools, with the encouragement and sponsorship of the SDE.

Area Program and Service Center. A close association between teacher preparing institutions and the public schools could be established through an agency which we have named Area Program and Service Center, supported by the SDE, cooperating school systems, and institutions of higher learning. In strategically located centers, college and public school faculties could be drawn into close association to attain mutual objectives. For the public school participants, these objectives would relate to improved curriculum and instruction in the schools; for the higher education personnel, the objective would be feedback data to test theories and hypotheses.

Much of the training of the expert supervisors previously discussed could be conducted in these centers. They could also be the place for developing and testing new and improved teacher education programs.

The SDE might provide financial assistance to help teachers attend the Area Program and Service Centers for full-time advanced professional study. Also, support could be provided for the professors assisting the centers in



their work. The centers obviously could be places where advanced graduate students could conduct research and specialized studies. Still another service could be the development of research-based course guides and bibliographical material for the local schools. Cooperative work in the Area Program and Service Center could produce numerous rewarding outcomes for professors, public school staff members, and SDE personnel. In Pennsylvania we are studying the possibility of establishing such centers in intermediate units which are scheduled to replace the county educational offices.

## Certification and Continuing Teacher Education

The authors have a genuine concern for the continuing professional education of teachers. Presently, in many states, teachers, by law or by state board regulation, must secure additional college credit in order to continue the initial teaching certificate in force or to make it "permanent." This practice involves a type of coercion that does not lead to professional responsibility. We believe the state should require superior college-level preparation for certification, provide for expert supervision of beginning teachers for a period of three years, and then remove itself from further certification activity. Local school systems, perhaps with state financial support, the help of teacher educators associated with the Area Program and Service Centers, and the assistance of professional standards committees of the teachers organizations, should provide the stimulus, where needed, to encourage teachers to continue their education for improved competence.

The stamina and the dedication to complete three years of successful teaching, plus the optimum collegiate preparation necessary for regular initial certification, should be sufficient grounds for extending a certificate indefinitely. A regular certificate should normally be invalidated only in cases of malpractice



or of nonpractice for an extended period of time. The determination of appropriate continuing teacher education is not a function to be performed by the SDE. Such decisions can be made intelligently only at the local level. Compelling teachers to keep professionally current by means of certification regulations does not, in our view, normally solve the problems.

We believe that this approach to continuing education for competence can be properly shifted to local school systems for the same reason we expect local systems to be able to assume a larger role in supervision of novice teachers: the school systems are becoming increasingly better organized and staffed. We also believe that placing this responsibility at the local level can have a desirable effect on the problem of misassignment of teachers that has recently been so well defined by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Misassignment problems could be considerably relieved by proper kinds of inservice education. Again, with help from the Area Program and Service Center and expert supervisors, continuing education and improved teacher assignment should be possible.

# Federal Funds, SDEs, and Teacher Education

A constant concern today is the influence, or intervention, of the federal government in state and local educational activities. There are relatively few past examples of the federal government channeling funds through SDEs to support teacher education. Most federal funds related to teacher education have been distributed directly to institutions and to teachers themselves. For example, the U.S. Office of Education has provided funds directly to institutions for



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. The Assignment and Misassignment of American Teachers. Washington, D. C.: the Commission, 1965. Complete report, 68 pp.; summary, 36 pp.

teacher education programs under the National Defense Education Act. The National Science Foundation also provides direct assistance to colleges for programs of teacher education. The higher Education Act of 1965 authorizes money to go directly to institutions for Experienced Teacher Fellowships and to local school systems for the National Teacher Corps. The SDEs, except for consultation on occasion, have not been directly involved.

Federal funds appropriated under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, however, for "strengthening state departments of education," have some relevance to teacher education. Some SDEs are using part of these funds to help improve teacher education. The SDE in the State of Washington, for example, is using ESEA Title V funds for this conference on "The Role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education." The New York SDE is conducting a conference on a topic related to teacher education—"Interstate Reciprocity in Teacher Certification." The Pennsylvania SDE is conducting a ESEA Title V project to study problems connected with student teaching and to produce proposals for action.

SDEs can also be useful in connection with other federal funds. One SDE, for example, had staff members work with certain institutions to apply for and secure NDEA summer institutes that directly supported the specific teacher preparation necessary to implement curriculum development plans the SDE was introducing in the public schools. Another SDE has used a large share of the NDEA "administrative funds," which could have been used for employing more SDE staff, to pay fees to professors to conduct inservice courses for thousands of teachers each year.

## Compact for Education

It is possible, even probable, that the Compact for Education may have an impact on teacher education even though nowhere in the report of the planning



session of September 29-30, 1965, in Kansas City, is there specific mention of teacher education. The closest reference appears to be in Article IV, Item 2, of the Compact, in which it says that the governing Commission shall have authority to "encourage and foster research in all aspects of education, but with special reference to the desirable scope of instruction, organization, administration, and instructional methods and standards employed or suitable for employment in public educational systems." This reference seems to have some relationship to teacher certification and thus, perhaps, to teacher education.

The fact that the "primary purpose of this Compact is to join the political and professional and lay leadership in education into a partnership for the advancement of education," however, raises the probability that further improvement of teacher education could easily become a major concern of the Compact when it becomes operational. We believe that leaders in each SDE should study the Compact closely, keep in touch with the Compact Commission members from their own state, and possibly propose appropriate action toward improved teacher education to the commissioners. Considering the potential influence of the Compact, SDE leaders will want to be ready to suggest desirable activities and directions for teacher education.

## Teacher Supply

One broad teacher education policy concern that needs to be placed in proper perspective is the education of appropriate kinds of teachers in sufficient quantity. The concern here is not simply with supply and demand statistics but rather with the education of thousands of individuals, and the concurrent allocation of resources that go into their education for teaching, who, after completing preservice preparation, never enter active practice. This is a constant drain on the resources that preparing institutions and the state pour into teacher educa-



The time and money that could be saved on the supervision of the student-teaching experience for these persons is extensive. Perhaps better counseling would be helpful. At any rate, SDEs should be aware of the problem and do what they can to ameliorate it.

A related problem is the serious teacher shortage in some fields and oversupply in others. The most critical shortages appear to be in elementary education and special education. There seems to be an oversupply in social studies, history, and men's physical education (and possibly English and biology). While this may not be a teacher education problem per se, it is certainly related to the broad policy concerns of the SDEs and to the counseling and guidance process which must be a part of any good teacher education program. In this age of the computer we can hardly put off the task of collecting, analyzing, and disseminating information which can be used by teacher educators, students, and parents in making decisions about careers in teaching. Some persons respond to the suggestion that prospective teachers be counseled away from areas of oversupply and into areas of undersupply with the quip, "This is a free country and you can't make the student avoid preparing for overcrowded teaching fields." We say to this that the SDE cannot afford to allow such waste of resources and talent because of inadequate If more information about teaching opportunities might help to avoid this waste in teacher education, then SDEs are obligated to secure and disseminate that information and to make every effort to encourage its use.

## Research

Perhaps the most significant policy concern for SDEs at this point in the development of the education profession has to do with research in teaching and learning. Research specialists who are employed or sponsored by the SDE are in



a unique position to secure information on teachers from all the public schools and nearly all the teacher preparing institutions of the state. Teacher educators in many of the smaller colleges and in state colleges would welcome the opportunity to collaborate in significant state-wide projects managed by SDE connected research specialists. The unique position enjoyed by SDE research specialists is extended also to the schools in connection with needed research. The Area Program and Service Centers would be an ideal locus from which these specialists might serve the teacher preparing institutions, the schools, and the SDE.

#### Direction for the Future

The authors claim no special talent for predicting the future. The statements which follow are simply a projection of what we believe will happen if SDEs deal effectively with the brand policy concerns just discussed.

We see the SDE emerging as a significant influence in a unified process of preservice and continuing education of teachers, a process marked by institutionalized cooperation between teacher preparing institutions, public schools, and the SDE. Further, we see the SDE operating largely in a harmonious leadership and assistance role as it deals with schools and teacher preparing institutions.

We also see competent and outstanding teacher educators in increasing numbers on the staffs of SDEs, helping to guide the SDE in its teacher education functions.

We are aware that some SDEs have been quite influential in affecting the course of teacher education within the state. In our view, though, SDEs generally have not been very influential in the work of improving teacher education. This circumstance must be changed, and we believe that the future role of the SDE in improved teacher education will be significant and will be welcomed by both the schools and the colleges and universities.

We know that as the SDEs improve and enhance their roles in teacher education



it will be through the exercise of skill in human relations, restraint in the use of authority, and perception in the tasks they undertake. The personnel of SDEs, therefore, must be exceptional people, both in their preparation for their work and in their talent for its performance. And this is not too much to ask in terms of the responsibilities which will be theirs. We are confident that, with people of high calibre manning SDEs, progress of considerable dimension will soon be visible.