

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 926

SP 039 162

AUTHOR Harris, Larry B.; Salzman, Stephanie; Frantz, Alan; Newsome, Jack; Martin, Martha

TITLE Using Accountability Measures in the Preparation of Preservice Teachers To Make a Difference in the Learning of All Students.

PUB DATE 2000-02-27

NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (52nd, Chicago, IL, February 26-29, 2000). Supported by a grant from the J.A. & Kathryn Albertson Foundation.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; College Admission; College School Cooperation; Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *National Standards; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; *State Standards; *Student Teacher Evaluation; Student Teachers; *Teacher Competencies; Teaching Skills

IDENTIFIERS Idaho State University

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the transformation of Idaho State University's teacher education program in response to various initiatives regarding educational change. The transformation process involved framing a standards-based preparation program. Developers created a Core Standards for Beginning Teachers that established exit outcomes for prospective teachers. The transformation process incorporated a multifaceted assessment system linking teacher candidate performance to P-12 student learning. It was based on the concept of assessment as learning. The assessment approach incorporates traditional testing plus performance tasks and self-assessments completed in simulated and authentic contexts, emphasizing externality. An important part of the assessment is program assessment involving both practice and scholarship to support ongoing improvement and demonstrate accountability. This paper describes the teacher education program admission interview and discusses adaptation of the Teacher Work Sample Methodology for assessing teacher candidates' effectiveness in fostering student learning and for evaluating the teacher education program. It explains how the assessment links to program coursework, and describes the development of close ties with regional public schools and teachers. Finally, it highlights the creation of the teachers-in-residence program to assist in the transformation of teacher education. Challenging aspects of the transformation process are discussed. (Contains 13 references.) (SM)

Using Accountability Measures in the Preparation of
Preservice Teachers to Make a Difference in the Learning of All Students

Idaho State University

Larry B. Harris
Stephanie Salzman
Alan Frantz
Jack Newsome
Martha Martin

A Symposium Presented at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Chicago, IL

February 27, 2000

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

L. B. Harris

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This symposium supported in part by a grant from the J.A. & Kathryn Albertson Foundation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP039162

Using Accountability Measures in the Preparation of Preservice Teachers to Make a Difference in the Learning of All Students

During the previous decade probably no topic in education has received more discussion and debate than the preparation of teachers. Proponents of one argument have advocated for increased accountability for teacher preparation through the closing of colleges of education (Fordham Foundation, 1999). Another argument has demanded greater accountability for teacher preparation programs through assessments that demonstrate the impact of graduates on P-12 student learning (Darling-Hammond & Loewenberg-Ball, 1997; McConney & Schalock, 1997; Sanders & Horn, 1998). Adding increased complexity and interest to the debate have been the national and state mandates for schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) to address new academic standards for P-12 students, to prepare individuals to teach in classrooms of diverse learners, and to report the results of qualitative assessments of their graduates.

The transformation of educator preparation at Idaho State University has been, in part, a response to the initiatives promulgated by the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). In addition, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future through the report, *What Matters Most*, has provided an imperative for the re-creation of educator preparation. All of these initiatives have contributed to our understanding of the necessity for change and for developing relevant and appropriate methods for our programs. As we have worked to transform our programs, we have kept in mind the purpose of our work, "to establish high and rigorous standards for what teachers should know and be able to do. . . and to advance related education reforms for the purpose of improving student learning in American schools" (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994, 1).

The most critical element in the transformation process was the framing of a standards-based preparation program. To do this we first had to develop a set of standards that included knowledge, skills, and dispositions which we wanted graduates to possess. The development of standards then necessitated that we closely examine the curriculum, including field-based components, and articulate it in an interconnected fashion that would lead to the achievement of the standards. We also had to examine our own instructional practices and modify those such that we were demonstrating and modeling the very standards we were expecting of our students. If beginning teachers are to connect their own practice to the learning of their students, they must have the opportunity to make these connections during their preparation program. These learning opportunities must begin with a rethinking of teacher preparation, making it a process in which prospective teachers analyze the teaching context and learner characteristics; plan, deliver, and assess instruction; collect evidence of their students' performances, and then reflect on the impact of their practice on the learning of students (Teacher Education Faculty, 1999).

As our first step in transforming our teacher education program, we developed our Core Standards for Beginning Teachers that set forth the exit outcomes for our prospective teachers in terms of desired knowledge, dispositions, and performances. Like the INTASC (1992) standards, our standards present the teacher as reflective, inquiry oriented, cognizant of cultural diversity, adept in his or her subject matter, and able to select from a wealth of instructional

strategies the one best suited to the students and to the educational context. The generation of our Core Standards for Beginning Teachers was based on statements of what teachers should know and be able to do, involving widespread discussion with opportunities for input from diverse groups of our stakeholders, and culminated in an institutional decision to support the standards. As we worked on the standards, they became, as Darling-Hammond (1994) envisioned, a lens for assessing teaching in schools and teacher education, for examining practices and programs, and for questioning what we are doing and how it is working.

Given the developmental nature of our teacher education program, it has become vitally important that our assessment system closely reflects the complex nature of our core standards and the complexities inherent in the preparation of effective beginning teachers. In addition, the assessment system must lead to measures of accountability both internal and external to the profession. More and more, we are being called upon to demonstrate that our graduates can be truly effective in the classroom.

Teacher Education Assessment System

Anticipating the call for accountability in teacher preparation (Pankratz, 1999; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2000), the transformation of our teacher education program incorporated a multifaceted assessment system linking the performance of our teacher candidates to P-12 student learning. We based our assessment system on the concept of *assessment-as-learning* (Alverno College Faculty, 1994). As such, we envisioned assessment as a process integral to learning that involves observing performances of the candidate in context, judging those performances on the basis of our core standards, connecting teacher work to P-12 student performance, and then providing the resulting feedback to the candidate. Our gradual development of the meaning of assessment was part of designing a process that would assure candidates of direction, resources, and coherence of instruction throughout the teacher education program.

The complex nature of our Core Standards for Beginning Teachers demands an assessment approach that is multiple in mode and context. Therefore, our assessment system incorporates traditional forms of testing as well as performance tasks and self-assessments that are completed in both simulated and authentic contexts through the course work and field experience components of our teacher education program. The cornerstone of our assessment system requires candidates to complete teacher work samples and demonstrate their abilities relative to the core standards by assembling evidence in a portfolio that they develop over the course of the teacher education program.

Our assessment system rests on the assumption that assessment should be developmental and continuous. That is, candidates should have the opportunity to learn by building on knowledge, dispositions, and skills to expanded and more complex uses. Within this framework, through assessments at each level of the professional education program, students are expected to demonstrate at increasingly higher levels of performance and complexity, the knowledge, dispositions, and performances set forth in the core standards.

The concepts of self-assessment and reflection on one's own practice as desired outcomes

of our teacher education program are inherent in both our core standards and assessment system. Candidates are expected to assess their own learning and performance and to reflect on the implications of their performance for P-12 student learning. As candidates progress through the teacher education program, they engage in multiple assessment activities designed to develop the ability to judge what has been achieved, how it was achieved, and what could be done to improve.

Our assessment system emphasizes *externality*, the element that enables the candidate to obtain feedback regarding his or her performance from multiple sources outside the College of Education. Candidates are regularly assessed in classrooms and schools by practicing educators who provide feedback regarding performance in authentic contexts. Throughout the teacher education program, candidates are provided with multiple opportunities to develop their learning and receive feedback regarding their professional practice so that both they and we can gradually discern the level to which they have integrated the core standards of our program.

An important part of our assessment system is program assessment involving both practice and scholarship to support ongoing improvement and demonstrate accountability. Critical elements at the heart of our assessment system include explicit standards, assessment for the sake of learning, and engaging in an interactive process through which assessment is tied to ongoing revision of both the teacher education program and the core standards. Two major components of our assessment system, the Teacher Education Program Admission Interview and the Teacher Work Sample, represent our response to the calls for accountability in teacher education.

Teacher Education Program Admission Interview

Our teacher education program admission process focuses on who should be the teachers of the future and how we can enhance our ability to attract and retain high quality and diverse candidates to the profession. In our view, the challenges for the future create the demand for teacher education admission processes that shift from *screening out* candidates to *selecting in* candidates based on multiple and defensible standards-based criteria. Moreover, we believe that it is not sufficient to select in candidates who possess academic capabilities unless they also display the dispositions embodied in our Core Standards for Beginning Teachers.

Consistent with our belief that we must select in candidates who meet both academic and dispositional standards, our teacher education program admission process includes an interview component. The interview component brings together faculty from education and arts and sciences, senior-level teacher education students, and practicing educators to make recommendations regarding the selection of qualified candidates for admission to the teacher education program.

As part of the interview, applicants respond to standard questions taken from an interview protocol developed by College of Education faculty with input from diverse groups of stakeholders. Applicants must prepare a 3-5 minute video showing them interacting with students and then reflect on the evidence the video provides relative to their abilities as a teacher. In addition, applicants must demonstrate their problem-solving abilities by responding to a "problem-based prompt" posed by the interview panel. These problem-based prompts focus on

issues and decisions the applicant will encounter in the teacher education program and P-12 classrooms including handling classroom management problems, involving families in the child's learning, ensuring fair and non-biased classroom interactions, and meeting the diverse needs of students.

The interview panelists judge each applicant on five dimensions taken from our Core Standards for Beginning Teachers: verbal communication, attitudes, professionalism, thinking skills, and judgment. Particular attention is given to each applicant's ability to demonstrate the professional dispositions of responsibility, cooperation, initiative, concern for the well-being of students, tolerance, commitment to the profession, flexible thinking, and openness to new ideas.

Through the Teacher Education Program Admission Interview, we hold ourselves and our potential candidates accountable for those teacher behaviors that support student learning. As candidates progress through the program, we gather further evidence of their abilities relative to our core standards across multiple modes and contexts. The Teacher Work Sample comprises an additional component of our teacher education assessment system through which we capture evidence of candidate performances.

Teacher Work Samples

Building on the work of Western Oregon University (McConney & Schalock, 1996; McConney, Schalock, & Schalock, 1997), we adapted the Teacher Work Sample Methodology as a method for assessing teacher candidates' effectiveness in fostering student learning and for evaluating our teacher education program. Our adaptation of the Oregon Teacher Work Sample Methodology emphasizes the alignment of achievement targets, instruction, and assessment; provides for specific consideration of the context in which teaching and learning occur; and requires the use of diverse instructional and assessment strategies. As such, the teacher work sample serves as critical evidence of candidate performance relative to our Core Standards for Beginning Teachers.

Teacher candidates complete two teacher work samples during the teacher education program. The first work sample is completed as a requirement for a junior-level course, EDUC 309 Planning, Delivery, and Assessment, that includes a semester-long half-day pre-internship in a P-12 classroom. As they complete the first work sample, candidates are given intensive mentoring and instruction in the knowledge and skills required for successful completion of the teacher work sample. The second teacher work sample is completed during a senior-level course, EDUC 402 Adaptations for Diversity, taken in conjunction with the 18-week student teaching internship. Unlike the first work sample, the second work sample is completed independently by the candidates.

The teacher work sample requires candidates to consider what they want to teach; how they want to teach; what contextual factors may affect their teaching; and what insights they gain in the process of planning, adapting, implementing, and assessing instruction (Schalock & Myton, 1988). While developing their work samples, candidates complete nine steps demonstrating their planning and implementation of a teaching-learning sequence:

- Define the sample of teaching and learning to be described
- Describe the context in which teaching and learning are to occur
- Identify the achievement targets (learning outcomes) to be accomplished within the instructional sequence;
- Provide a rationale for the selection of achievement targets and learning activities;
- Assess the status of student learning prior to instruction with respect to the achievement targets;
- Align instruction and assessment with achievement targets through development of instructional and assessment plans;
- Implement the instructional sequence;
- Assess the learning of students and determine on a student-by-student basis the progress in learning achieved;
- Summarize, interpret, and reflect on student growth in learning.

For the teacher work sample, candidates develop a written product that includes the following components: description of the teaching-learning context, list of the achievement targets, rationale for the selection of the achievement targets and learning activities, assessment plan, instructional plans, evidence of student learning, and interpretation and reflection on the success of the teaching-learning sequence with regard to future practice and professional development.

Candidates receive feedback on the completeness and quality of each of the components of the teacher work sample, and candidate performance on the teacher work sample is also evaluated relative to our Core Standards for Beginning Teachers. Both the feedback form and the scoring rubric are completed by the course instructor and cooperating teacher (i.e., the teacher in the classroom where the candidate is completing the pre-internship or internship).

All completed teacher work samples are submitted to the College of Education Associate Dean's Office where a *pupil growth index* (Schalock, Schalock, & Millman, 1997) is calculated for each teacher work sample. The pupil growth index is a method to achieve comparability of results from various teacher-developed student assessments by calculating a ratio of "actual growth" from pre- to post-assessment to "potential growth" from pre- to post-assessment. Calculation of pupil growth indexes for all students represented in an individual teacher work sample and development of profiles of pupil growth indexes across multiple teacher work samples yield documentation connecting the performance of our teacher candidates to P-12 student learning.

As our teacher education candidates document their planning and delivery of instruction and the learning of their students, they become accountable for student performance. And, as we document the performance of both our candidates and their students, we become accountable for connecting our Core Standards for Beginning teachers and our teacher education program to P-12 student learning. This level of accountability demands intensive and continuous attention to the alignment between our Core Standards for Beginning teachers, components of our assessment system, and program coursework and field experiences.

Assessment Links to Program Coursework

Teacher Education at Idaho State University includes program coursework, field-based experiences, and assessment practices that are all aligned to the Core Standards for Beginning Teachers (table 1). All candidates (elementary, secondary, special education) are required to complete a sequence of core courses which provide opportunities for mastery of standards. The curriculum is clearly articulated and developmental. Students do not have the option of changing the order in which courses may be taken.

Such is the basic structure of the program, however, it does not show the truly important aspect of this program that makes it unique: the program design is assessment-driven, and *assessments, tied to our 12 Core Standards for Beginning Teachers, are embedded in the coursework*. Each course syllabus lists the standards which apply to the course, with some standards being addressed by multiple courses. The specific courses and standards are articulated with our assessment system and field experiences. Table 2 provides a visual representation of the alignment between the courses, the standards, and the components of the assessment system.

In addition to the course-based assessments, the teacher work sample and portfolio entries show how the students have met the core standards. Thus, through both course-based and external assessments, the students and faculty are able to evaluate the effectiveness of each of the courses as it relates to the core standards. Moreover, the tie between assessments and coursework yields accountability evidence regarding the program.

Through the coursework and assessments, from the beginning, candidates are required to link knowledge and performance to the learning of P-12 students. For example, in EDUC 201 candidates must write a profile of an actual student and provide an analysis of the teacher behaviors that impact the learning of the student. In EDUC 204 candidates develop a complete description of the teaching-learning context and the characteristics of the school environment, community, and culture that impact student learning. These experiences in the preparatory courses provide the basis for the more complex analyses that candidates must complete in the Teacher Work Sample.

Relationships with the Field

The development of effective and appropriate placements within the P-12 schools is a vital component of the transformation process. No longer can teacher preparation programs afford to place candidates in settings that do not reflect the high standards and expectations we have for our graduates. It has become incumbent upon the College of Education to develop close ties with regional public schools and teachers that will yield exemplary classroom sites for candidates to make the transition between theoretical understandings and practical experiences. Field placements must be carefully selected and appropriately developed to provide candidates with experiences that allow for the reflection of the standards-based program. As such, professional development schools have become a norm for this approach. However, in rural regions which have a wide diversity of schools, the implementation of professional development schools can only be one possible method for creating exemplary sites. The use of National Board Certified

Teachers and other models of excellence can provide another avenue for this piece of the transformation process. No matter the models chosen it is imperative that the clinical faculty (cooperating teachers) understand and support the transformation process. They must be fully aware of the new directions undertaken in the teacher preparation program and must provide an appropriate setting for beginning teachers to learn and develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions relative to working with P-12 students.

Too often, cooperating teachers are unprepared to supervise students teachers and to work with students who are learning the science and art of teaching. Few have had any professional development for effective supervision and mentoring other than their own personal experiences. Cooperating teachers in our 55 school districts have expressed this concern. Based on suggestions from our partners, the College of Education developed a course for cooperating teachers that addresses these needs.

In the first year of the our redesigned field experiences program, approximately 35% of the interns in the College of Education were placed with cooperating teachers who attended the new course. The course addresses the Core Standards for Beginning Teachers, the evaluation of interns based on the 12 standards, and the accountability for student learning of the candidates, the university, and the cooperating teachers. The implementation of a course for Cooperating Teachers has not only improved the quality of the placement but has provided professional development for teachers. Teachers have become aware of the standards, assessment process, and the accountability that is necessary in our program. The evaluations indicate that the course was greatly needed, appreciated, and valuable.

One of the challenges facing our implementation of the course for cooperating teachers is the unbalanced involvement of teachers from secondary and elementary schools. Graduates from our program are somewhat disproportionate with approximately 57% of our students in the elementary program and 43% in secondary. However, the majority of teachers who have taken the cooperating teacher course are elementary school teachers (74.4%). Therefore, placements of interns with cooperating teachers who have participated in our program are far more likely at the elementary level than at the secondary level.

Partner schools have changed their perception of the College of Education since the implementation of the new program. Several of the teachers have commented on the how the new program, based on standards, has better prepared our students to become teachers in the 21st century. Interviews with teachers have revealed that not only has the program instilled accountability in our students but also with the cooperating teachers.

- Maria, 3rd grade teacher, stated; "I feel inspired by Karlie (intern) because if there are things I am not doing, I feel now is the time to change. I get a different perspective of how to handle certain issues, to have her in my classroom is a complement to my teaching."
- Susanne, a teacher in Idaho Falls, related some similar thoughts relative to the improvement of her teaching due to the intern. When asked what interns from ISU bring to a master teacher she stated, "Learning some of the new information because even though I am constantly taking classes, it's great to hear of the new philosophy. I think most of all it helps me to remember why and how I teach."

The teachers are not alone in the belief that the new program has created a positive learning environment. A principal commented on the transfer of new knowledge and role from student to educator. Dave, an elementary principal, stated, "The transition from being a student to being an educator is a complete change in mindset. If a person came in from outside and saw our student teachers they would have a hard time identifying the student. They look and act like part of the teaching staff."

These comments from teachers and a building principal are not uncommon reflections of the teacher preparation program. It has become apparent that the transformation process has created a better prepared student to become the educators of the future. As we continue to work and develop our program with the field, we will continue to observe a positive growth in the abilities of our graduates to impact the learning of P-12 students significantly.

Teachers in Residence

The transformation process demands new faculty roles and responsibilities. One of our responses to this has been the creation of new faculty positions for practitioners or teachers-in-residence. These teachers-in-residence have taken a one-year leave of absence from a public school to work at the university. There are two teachers-in-residence employed each year to assist in the transformation of teacher education, but what they do expands far beyond that. They make connections and develop relationships, and they work closely with the faculty and students at ISU as well as administrators and teachers in area schools. Educators at all levels respond well to the teachers-in-residence. Their years of experience in public school classrooms are well respected.

As classroom teachers directly from the field, the primary charge of the teachers-in-residence is to bring practical experience to the classes taught in the College of Education, essentially helping bridge the gap between theory and practice. Teachers-in-residence are continually asked to apply educational theory and research to real classroom situations with real students, in terms of content, teaching methodology, and issues of student behavior. Their other main responsibility is to serve as a resource for candidates in their field experience. Candidates often request assistance in developing learning activities, advice on classroom management techniques, and suggestions for working collaboratively with cooperating teachers, administrators, and other interns. Candidates connect easily because they see the wealth of experience as something they do not have but desperately need. They want to hear what works and what doesn't. They are delighted by anecdotal accounts of interesting things that have happened in classrooms over the years. The candidates are amazed at the repertoire of ideas, impressed with the energy, and eager to talk to somebody who has been where they want to go.

Cooperating teachers and administrators in area schools also connect with the teachers in residence in large part because they have such recent classroom experience. Teachers-in-residence know what life is like in a school and can be empathetic to many issues that educators deal with on a daily basis. They take great measures to let teachers know that the College of Education wishes to form a three-way partnership which includes the school faculty, administration, and students; the ISU interns; and faculty and staff within the College of

Education. Teachers-in-Residence are available to offer support to both cooperating teachers and interns. Important bonds of trust are formed. They have a deep appreciation for P-12 teachers because, again, they have been there. A teacher-in-residence can honestly say that "I have been an intern myself, had several working in my classroom, taught them on a university level, and supervised them in their field experience."

The most significant result of this partnership is the effect it has on the children in the classroom. After working at the university for one year, the teacher-in-residence will return to the classroom with a deeper understanding of the process it takes to prepare someone to be an effective teacher. Public school educators often view the university and the public school system as two completely separate entities, very disconnected from each other. Through a year's service at the university, teachers-in-residence realize that we really all want the same thing, a better education for P-12 students in Idaho. In order for that to happen, we must all work together to help prepare pre-service teachers to enter the profession. We must make our schools and classrooms places where university interns can learn good teaching practices through exposure and immersion in a variety of classroom situations. We must let them experience what a learning community is all about. All of this will benefit P-12 students and improve the educational experience for everyone.

Significant challenges and criticisms

While the faculty and the constituents at Idaho State University have accomplished a great deal in terms of the transformation of educator preparation, significant challenges remain to be addressed. Perhaps the most telling of these challenges is the time required for accomplishing reform. Faculty are already committed to the traditional responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service. In order to maintain a high quality in the evolving process of teacher preparation reform faculty have had to demonstrate a strong commitment to students and to improving the profession. They have had to dedicate time in already busy schedules to make this transformation a reality.

The development of trust, agreement, and consensus building has been vital to the process. Maintaining these when conflicts arise, as they invariably do, is the task of the leaders in the College. As the process continues to evolve, it will have to be built on the agreement of all persons involved.

While our curriculum remains course centered, but standards-driven, it is necessary that all of the various aspects of the program be carefully aligned. The developmental nature of the curriculum necessitates that faculty who teach in upper level classes be fully cognizant of the material presented in the lower level classes. Field based experiences must closely mirror the concepts being presented in the on-campus courses. Assessment must drive all aspects of the learning community. The assessments must provide both information for the candidate as well as for the program.

Unique relationships are ever present between Colleges of Education, Colleges of Arts and Sciences, and the P-12 schools. It is incumbent upon the faculty and leadership in the College of Education to take the primary role in ensuring that accurate and effective communication channels are maintained. Given a service area that encompasses 55 separate and diverse school

districts and a large and disparate College of Arts and Sciences this is continually a challenge. The development of appropriate communications and an open exchange of ideas is vital to the transformation process.

For years faculty and students have been relatively comfortable in their roles. As the transformation of educator preparation takes place it is essential that this culture of comfort be replaced with a culture that understands and accepts ambiguity. Change is a process that entails uprooting the old and replacing it with the new. When this happens, the culture must change. In addition to the internal ambiguity in a College of Education, it is important that the university leadership (president and vice president) are kept informed and are supportive of the new directions.

One of the most challenging aspects of the transformation process has been the tension that exists between issues of academic freedom and the movement to a standards-driven program. While faculty are afforded the opportunity for academic freedom in terms of presentation style and methodologies, they are also accountable for ensuring that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable them to meet the standards. When standards are fully integrated into the curriculum and aligned to courses, faculty have achieved a new level of responsibility that creates opportunities for renewing and reflecting on their own practice.

Resource development to support the transformation process is a key issue for the leadership in the College. Faculty planning and development, new curriculum, new relationships with P-12 schools mean nothing if the resources are not present to support these. In some cases a reallocation of existing resources is appropriate. In other situations, new resources must be secured from external funding. Technology, faculty time, travel opportunities, and other factors all impact on the wise use of the resources.

Perhaps the most telling of all the challenges is that the transformation process is no longer the creation of a new program that will last for the next 10 years or so. The transformation process must be perceived as work in progress. If we as teacher educators are to become responsive and accountable to both our critics and our charge of preparing excellent educators who can help all children achieve to high levels, we must be constantly aware of the need for adaptations and change.

Throughout the history of teacher preparation we have been largely concerned with developing candidates who would enter the profession with the abilities to be effective at a beginning level. As a profession, we have looked at lesson planning, classroom management, integration of technology, and other areas. While these remain highly important, we are seeing an increased concern with the learning of P-12 students. As such, we must add accountability for student learning to the repertoire of the beginning teacher. Our charge, as teacher educators, then becomes one of preparing teachers who have the tools to be effective and who can significantly impact the learning of all students. We have to provide beginning teachers with appropriate teaching techniques and with assessment approaches that provide for the meeting of this accountability mandate.

References

Alverno College Faculty. (1994). *Assessment-as-learning at Alverno College*. Milwaukee: WI: Author.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Loewenberg-Ball, D. (1997). *Teaching higher standards: What policy makers need to know and be able to do*. [on line]. //www.negp.gov/reports/highstds.htm.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). (1992). *Model standards for beginning teacher licensing and development: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Author.

McConney, A., & Schalock, M. (1996). Teacher work sample methodology: Promise for program and personnel appraisal? *AASPA Report*, 3(8), 16-17.

McConney, A., Schalock, M., & Schalock, H. (1997). Focusing improvement and quality assurance: Teacher work samples as authentic performance measures of prospective teachers' effectiveness. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11, 343-363.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1994). *What teachers should and be able to do*. Detroit, MI: Author.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching and America's Future*. Washington, D.C.: Author

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1999). *Draft standards for the accreditation of teacher education*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Pankratz, R. (February 24, 1999). *Becoming accountable for the impact of graduates on students and schools: Making the shift from teaching to learning operational*. Symposium presented to the annual meeting of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

Sanders, W. L.; Horn, S. P.. (1998). Research Findings from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) Database: Implications for Educational Evaluation and Research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*; 12 (3), 247-256.

Schalock, M., & Myton, D. (1988). A new paradigm for teacher licensure: Oregon's demand for evidence of success in fostering learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 8-16.

Schalock, M., Schalock, M., & Girod, G. (1997). Teacher work sample methodology as used at Western Oregon State College. In J. Millman (Ed.), *Grading teachers, grading schools: Is student achievement a valid evaluation measure?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Teacher Education Faculty. (1999). *By teaching we learn: Teacher education assessment*. Pocatello, ID: College of Education, Idaho State University.

Table 1: Core Standards for Beginning Teachers

Standard 1: Subject Matter Knowledge	The teacher understands the central concepts and processes of inquiry of the subject matter her or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make subject matter meaningful to students.
Standard 2: Professional Studies and Research	The teacher uses alternative theoretical perspectives and research to guide instructional decision-making and reflection on practice.
Standard 3: Student Individual Differences	The teacher uses knowledge about student individual differences to plan, deliver, and analyze instruction.
Standard 4: Planning for Instruction	The teacher plans meaningful learning experiences that promote student achievement and active engagement in learning.
Standard 5: Instructional Delivery	The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to promote student achievement and active engagement in learning.
Standard 6: Assessment	The teacher uses a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate learning and teaching.
Standard 7: Management of the Learning Environment	The teacher creates and maintains a safe and effective learning environment.
Standard 8: Technology	The teacher uses technology in the planning, delivery, analysis, and assessment of learning and instruction.
Standard 9: Literacy/Communication	The teacher supports and expands student literacy skills and models effective communication.
Standard 10: School to Work	The teacher understands the central philosophical principles and processes of the school-to-work concept and creates learning experiences that enable student career awareness, exploration, and decision-making.
Standard 11: Family, School, and Community Relationships and Resources	The teacher fosters relationships with the family, school, and community to support student learning and well-being.
Standard 12: Personal Characteristics and Interpersonal Skills	The teacher displays beliefs, values, and behaviors that guide the ethical dimensions of professional practice.

Table 2: Alignment between courses, standards, and assessments

Course	Standard	Assessment
EDUC 201: Development and Individual Differences (3 Credits)	Standard 3	Course-based Assessments Portfolio Entries Admission Interview
EDUC 204: Families, Communities, and Culture (3 Credits)	Standard 3 Standard 11 Standard 12	Course-based Assessments Portfolio Entries
EDUC 301: Inquiring, Thinking and Knowing (3 Credits)	Standard 1 Standard 2 Standard 5 Standard 12	Course-based Assessments Portfolio Entries
EDUC 302: Motivation and Management (3 Credits)	Standard 7 Standard 2	Course-based Assessments Portfolio Entries
EDUC 309: Instructional Planning, Delivery, and Assessment (6 Credits)	Standard 4 Standard 5 Standard 6	Course-based Assessments Teacher Work Sample Portfolio Entries Tchg Performance Eval
EDUC 311: Instructional Technology (3 Credits)	Standard 8	Course-based Assessments Idaho Technology Portfolio Assessment
EDUC 401: Language and Literacy (3 Credits)	Standard 9	Course-based Assessments Portfolio Entries
EDUC 402: Adaptations for Diversity (3 Credits)	All Standards	Course-based Assessments Teacher Work Sample Portfolio Entries Tchg Performance Eval
EDUC 494: Student Teaching Internship (14 Credits)	All Standards	Course-based Assessments Teacher Work Sample Portfolio Entries Tchg Performance Eval Exit Interview



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Using Accountability Measures in the Preparation of Preservice Teachers to Make a Difference in the Learning of All Students	
Author(s): Larry B. Harris, Stephanie Salzman, Alan Frantz, Jack Newsome, Martha Martin	
Corporate Source: Idaho State University	Publication Date: February 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

↑

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

↑

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

↑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here →

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Larry B. Harris, Dean	
Organization/Address: College of Education, Idaho State University	Telephone: 208-236-4214	FAX: 208-236-4697
	E-Mail Address: harris@isu.edu	Date: 3/8/00