NORMES

Standards and Accountability Implementation, Why, How, Where: Teachers' Perceptions

E. Jane Irons, Nancy L. Carlson, Hollis Lowery-Moore, and Vicky R. Farrow
Lamar University

Abstract
With current considerations for reauthorization of the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, national attention remains focused upon public education student outcomes. The purpose of this manuscript was threefold: to review the historical background of the standards reform movement; to discuss a research project to redesign program content and align standards in an EC-12 Special Education certification preparation program; and to discuss survey results concerning pre-service and experienced teacher perceptions about standards and accountability. Results suggest that standards-based accountability may be impacting teacher behavior with respect to student learning. University preparation programs are aligning state, NCATE, and professional association standards in teacher preparation programs. Both pre-service and experienced teachers appear to comprehend the purpose and implementation of standards within curriculum lesson planning and practice. Further research appears warranted to follow up on the impact of standards-based accountability training on pre-service teachers after they have entered the teaching profession. Further, empirical research appears warranted to investigate full implementation of standards-based accountability in field settings.

Introduction

Standards-based accountability emerged as a major school reform agenda during the 1990s. The underlying consideration forming the philosophy for policy was that educators would change their behavior as a result of federal and state mandates focusing upon the requirements for establishing higher

standards and greater accountability for student achievement (Cuban, 2007; Hoff & Manzo, 2007). Currently, standards form the essential underlying framework for teacher preparation programs. Teacher educators and public school teachers hold pivotal positions in implementing standards in program development, program implementation, and in program evaluation as well (Byrd & Adamy, 2002; Selke & Alouf, 2004; Wise & Leibbrand, 2002).

With current public attention focused upon the 2007 reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), there have been suggestions about increasing the rigor of state standards and testing by linking the state standards to standards set at the national level (Olson, 2007). A number of strategies were offered for implementing state standards. Three appeared pertinent for school district implementation. Instructional planning time was needed for teachers to develop learning activities associated with state standards. Benchmark testing was considered important to assess formative progress, and professional development was considered necessary for both faculty and staff (O'Shea, 2005).

This manuscript reviews the history of the standards-based reform movement. A research study for the purpose of redesigning an early childhood through 12th grade special education teacher certification program demonstrated standards alignment in teacher preparation. Additionally, survey results identified current teacher candidate and public school teacher perceptions concerning the implications of integrating the required state and local district standards-based accountability policies.

Literature Review

Teaching Standards: Historical Overview

According to Gratz (2000), standards had two purposes. First, there was the national concern that America was losing economic competitiveness because of higher international student achievement levels, particularly in the areas of science and mathematics. Second, there was national concern about the growing student achievement gap between white middle and upper class students and disadvantaged students. Consequently, state standards have been developed to increase achievement level expectations for all students.

The history of standards began as early as 1954 with the formulation of the National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE). Early

teacher accreditation standards focused upon process requirements such as the number of students assigned to a laboratory school or upon completion of state required forms. Although no student learning outcomes were required, NCATE collected information describing teaching methods and strategies used by student teachers (Wise & Leibbrand, 2002).

According to Wise and Leibbrand (2002), in the 1970s NCATE focused upon curricula for beginning and advanced teacher preparation. Professional organizations provided subject matter content guidelines. Teacher evaluation was required at the end of the preparation program and after entering the teaching profession. However, no collaboration between teacher preparation programs and the public schools was required (Wise & Leibbrand, 2002).

After 1987, NCATE redesigned standards. Colleges of education were required to show that their teacher preparation programs were based upon current research and best practices. NCATE accredited institutions were expected to use program standards from professional associations for content and delivery methods. Diversity was addressed only for student and faculty qualifications (NCATE, 1990).

In the 1990s, NCATE standards for teacher preparation were strengthened to align with the current focus upon achievement outcomes. In 1993 NCATE outlined a continuum that linked teacher preparation with professional development requirements. In 1995 NCATE shifted their focus to student teacher candidate performance outcomes. This shift forced collaboration among institutions of higher education, state departments of education standards boards, and the teaching field. In 2000, NCATE ratified a performance-based accreditation system and standards. Teacher candidates were now expected to demonstrate mastery of both content knowledge and pedagogy (NCATE, 2001).

Standards-Evaluation and Accountability

Currently, the standards movement focuses upon evaluation and accountability for institutions of higher education. NCATE requires universities and colleges to implement a system for evaluation of teacher candidates at entry, during their program, and again at exit. Benchmarks and evaluations most clearly denote acceptable and unacceptable performance levels. Teacher educators are expected to demonstrate a variety of teaching methods in addition to lecture (Wise & Liebbrand, 2002).

To further align teacher preparation accountability with student outcomes, the 19 member Commission on Higher Education Reform has recommended development of a student database. This database, to be known as a "unit record," would track individual student progress. It would allow comparisons to be made among institutions of higher education teacher preparation programs (Marklein, 2006).

Mixed reviews about implementing standards-based accountability have surfaced. Authors have expressed concerns about the wide disparity found among states in judging student proficiency. Cavanagh (2007) suggested that states develop tests and set achievement levels based upon where the majority of their students were likely to score rather than establishing higher goals for all students. In contrast, Hoff (2007) reported that test scores were on the rise in most states after researchers examined three years of data. While there was no definitive connection to the current No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, Hoff and Manzo (2007) suggested that some individuals were beginning to notice that educators were changing their behavior as a result of policies that began in the 1990s requiring higher standards and greater accountability in education.

Aligning Standards in Teacher Preparation: A Research Study

An example of program redesign to align standards and obtain community input follows.

Purpose and Process for Research Project

The purpose of this research was to redesign an EC-12 special education teacher certification program. State, NCATE, and the Council of Exceptional Children (CEC) standards were addressed. The process for this project followed a research model and included the following components: instrument development, respondents and data collection, data analysis and findings, and program redesign.

Instrument Development

Content from three different university special education degree programs for teacher preparation was reviewed and the core content was utilized to develop a needs survey. A Likert-type scale was used to ask participants to

rate each content item as (1) least important to (5) most important. A sample of Part II of the survey may be found in the Appendix. Two open-ended questions solicited participant concerns and recommendations for program improvement.

Respondents and Data Collection

To ensure community participation, the local education service center was asked to partner with the university and a senior faculty member from the Department of Education Leadership served as the principal investigator. Service center personnel disseminated the needs survey to all 32 districts in their area. All of the 150 schools were invited to participate. Two hundred twenty-three individuals responded. Most of the responses were received from middle schools (49%). Twenty-four percent responded from elementary schools and 15% from high schools. Over 41% of the respondents were general education teachers, while 32% were special education teachers. School administrators comprised 27% of the respondents. Eighty-four percent of the respondents were Caucasian females.

Data Analysis

A factor analysis was used to identify patterns of intercorrelations among items to identify common strands (Kachigan, 1986). The total amount of variance was accounted for in five strands. A correlation analysis was used to determine total instrument reliability as well as the reliability of each of the five strands. Table 1 shows each of the specific strands with their associated Cronbach's alpha reliability quotient. Total instrument reliability was .92. Strand 1, titled Child Development/Classroom Management had a weak reliability of .65. This may be explained by the varied content that was placed together in this strand because it did not fit into other strands and the content had to be included in the program. Strand 2, Communication and Community, also shows a very moderate reliability of .74. Similar to Strand 1, content not necessarily alike such as library and supplemental material was placed with content focusing on direct communication and community content. All other strands had higher reliabilities.

Survey findings were reported where responses clustered around common themes, called strands. The strand rated most important by respondents was child development and classroom management, while the strand with the least important

Table 1
Survey Instrument and Strands with Reliability

Strands	Reliability
Strand 1 – Child Development/Classroom Management Content included: learning theories, child development, adolescent development, integrating technology, classroom environment and management, classroom assessment methods, discipline theory and management, behavior management-special education	.65
Strand 2 – Communication and Community Content included: child guidance, parent communication, diversity in contemporary families, library and supplemental material.	.74
Strand 3 – Special Education Applications Content included: student teaching in special education, role of special education teacher, instructional strategies – special education, assessing learning disabilities students – TAKS, assessing behavior disordered students – TAKS, characteristics of mental retardation and severe physical handicap, characteristics of learning disabilities, characteristics of behavior disorder, transition – all levels, low incidence disabilities – deaf, blind, multi, and autism, implementing behavior plans, IEPS, and accommodations, lesson planning for special education.	.86
Strand 4 – Content and Assessment Content included: role of general education teacher with special education students, early childhood content, reading, math, science, social studies, PE/health, fine arts, music, art, tests and measurements theory, statistical applications.	.88
Strand 5 – Legal Issues Content included: state and federal special education mandates, ethics concerning idea implementation, health and safety issues in special education, confidentiality issues, and FERPA.	.87
Total Instrument Reliability	.92

rating was communication and community. Forty-four districts responded to the open-ended questions. Content areas deemed critical by special education teachers were the need for special education candidates to have experiences at a variety of campuses with different age groups and special education settings before student teaching (34%). Twenty-seven percent of respondents stated that university faculty needed more collaboration with site-based personnel, particularly with principals and supervising teachers. In addition, 23% stated that special education candidates needed more hands-on experiences in inclusion classrooms. Recommendations made by the respondents for program improvement suggested more training for general education teachers in special education areas (23%). Additionally, student teaching experiences needed to be longer, at least one full semester (16%).

A focus group was held so that representatives from stakeholder groups could discuss their recommendations for EC-12 special education preparation. The focus group included sixteen participants representing special education directors, principals, general education and special education teachers, an educational diagnostician, and a counselor. Additionally, university professors representing Pedagogy, Special Education, and Educational Leadership preparation programs attended.

Focus group responses were unanimous among all 16 participants. Emerging trends indicated a changing role for special education teachers. Training issues supported the literature in that special education teachers must be highly qualified through training, experience, and certification in both content and pedagogy areas. Collaboration and relationships emerged as components for success in today's classrooms. Table 2 shows the questions used for discussion and the responses provided by the focus group members.

Program Redesign Standards Alignment

A four member program development committee was appointed by the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development. The charge given to this committee was fourfold: 1) to review feedback from the survey and focus group meeting; 2) to study EC-12 Special Education program standards from the state as well as Praxis and Council for Exceptional children (CEC) standards for all level special education; 3) to develop a matrix incorporating NCATE, CEC, and state standards for current courses; and 4) to identify gaps and design new courses needed. The program committee met on several

Table 2

Focus Group Questions and Summary of Results

Question 1: What is the role of the mentor teachers during student teaching in field-based settings?

Results summary:
- School principals need more direction in selecting mentors.
- Major role of mentor is building trusting relationships.
- Mentor teachers need training on how to mentor.
- Need for current laws and strategies.
- More supervision from university faculty for both mentor and mentee.

Question 2: Are you familiar with the MAST training? Tell us what you see happening in successful student teaching.

Results summary:
- A different kind of mentor training for teachers with alternative certification is needed.
- MAST training addresses issues of mentor training and should be implemented throughout all field experience programs.

Question 3: Tell us about general education content areas necessary for special education teachers. What would be the areas and levels of emphasis?

Results summary:
- General education teachers must have course work to deal with special needs students. Special education teachers should have the most emphasis on low incidence and students with behavior disorders.
- Reading, math, and classroom management is essential for all teachers.
- NCLB highly qualified requirements versus special education certification must be addressed.
- Special education teacher must have the ability to align IEPs with grade level Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) through various instructional activities and be able to communicate this to the general education teacher.
- General education teachers must recognize their responsibility for educating students with disabilities.

Question 4: What special education experiences are <u>critical</u> for special education teachers?

Results summary:
- How to keep good data collection and documentation.
- Knowledge of various handicapping conditions and their characteristics.
- Knowledge of IEP meeting procedures and paperwork requirements.
- How to orchestrate multiple subjects/IEPs at same time.
- How to develop and follow BIPs with appropriate strategies and positive behavior supports.
- Awareness of legal mandates and issues.
- On-going formative assessment and how assessment drives instruction.
- Familiarity with research-based methodologies and practices.

Table 2 (continued)

Question 5: What background is needed in tests and measurements for instructional support of students in regular classrooms by special education teachers?

Results summary:
- How to interpret informal test data, documentation and other information.
- Writing useable assessment results that measure IEP progress.
- How to interpret interventions to determine if a special education referral is required.
- Know and utilize basic statistical terminology.
- Awareness of what data is available, how to interpret and use it, and to be able to disaggregate data.

Question 6: What background is needed in legal issues and state/federal mandates for successful Special Education Teachers?

Results summary:
- Need working knowledge of state/federal mandates and where to go to keep current.
- Have knowledge of due process, grievance procedures, parent rights, and mediation.
- Knowledge of student discipline procedures and issues.
- Knowledge of transition planning.
- Recognizing that the role of a special education teacher is changing to more collaborative with general education teachers rather than only a content teacher. Must sell idea of inclusion and accepts a change role.
- There is a need for practical experience throughout entire teacher preparation program.

---

occasions to complete this charge. Community feedback on program content and field-based applications were incorporated. A matrix was developed aligning state, NCATE, and professional standards (CEC) for course requirements. See foundations course example provided in Table 3. Content for each of the newly redesigned courses was aligned with the required standards and NCATE requirements. Course prerequisites were denoted. Examples of content for two core courses may be found in Table 4.

An important part of the program redesign was to examine course descriptions, expectations, assignments, instructional activities, and various assessments contained in existing course syllabi. These previous course syllabi were compared with the expectations of the newly designed program. Pedagogy faculty familiar with and assigned to teach the special education courses met to examine the content of the previous course syllabi. Based on this examination, the newly designed course descriptions and standards requirements were incorporated. The course syllabi were rewritten for the

Table 3

Aligning Standards: Corresponding CEC Content Standards and State Content Standards (Example Standard 1 only)

CEC Standards[1]	State Standards SpEd[2] (EC-12)	TExES Domains[3]	SPED EC-12 Core Course
1. Foundations • Philosophies: evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, historical and future influence on special education and treatment of individuals with ELN in school and society. • Professional practice: assessment, instructional planning, implementation, and program evaluation. • Human diversity: impacts on families, cultures, and schools; delivery of special education services. • Relationships: Sp Ed organizations to organizations and functions of schools, school systems, and other agencies.	*Standard I.* The special education teacher understands and applies knowledge of the philosophical, historical, and legal foundations of special education.	*Domain IV Foundations and Professional Roles and Responsibilities (estimate 20% of test)* *Standards Assessed:* Special Education EC–12 Standard I: Special education teacher understands and applies knowledge of the philosophical, historical, and legal foundations of special education.	1 Sp Ed Foundations 4 Assessment 6 Role of the Special Educator

Note. [1] Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills and appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge & Skills for which the program is preparing candidates.

Source. [1] Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). (2003). *What every special educator should know: Ethics, standards, and guidelines for special educators,* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: Author.
[2] State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC). (2001). *Special Education Standards.* Austin, TX: Author. Retrieved September 1, 2006, from the World Wide Web: http://sbec.state.tx.us/SBEConline/stantest/standards/allspeced.pdf.
[3] State Board for Educator Certification (2005). *TExES: Texas Examinations of Educator Standards: Preparation Manual 161 Special Education EC-12.* Austin, TX: Author. Retrieved September 1, 2006, from the World Wide Web: http://sbec.state.tx.us.

Table 4

Core Courses EC- 12 Special Education Certification (only two courses shown)

3372 Behavior Modification and Classroom Management for the Student with Exceptionalities	4308 Appraisal Processes in Programming for the Exceptional Learner
3 semester hours	3 semester hours
Course Description: Principles of normal and abnormal child and adolescent development; Nature and causes of behavior problems. Basic techniques for classroom discipline and management; Principles of behavior assessment and implementation of Behavior Improvement Plans.	Course Description: Formal and informal assessment types, functions and legal implications. Introduction to tests and measurement techniques, data collection, and report writing; interpretation to prescribe appropriate curriculum modification, instructional materials, teaching strategies, classroom management, functional behavior assessments, and behavior improvement plans.
CEC Standards 2, 3, 7, 8	CEC Standards 1, 6, 7, 8, 9
State Standards: IV, V, VI, VII, X	State Standards: I, II, V, VII, VIII, X, IX
TExES Domains: I, II , III, IV	TExES Domains: I, II, III, IV
NCATE Assessments Dispositions, Lesson Plan, Classroom Management Plan, BIP/FBA	NCATE Assessments Dispositions, FBA/BIP
Prerequisites: Accepted Teacher Ed Program; 2.5 GPA, PEDG 2371, 3310	Prerequisites: Accepted Teacher Ed Program; 2.5 GPA, PEDG 2371, 3310

Note. 18 hours core course content; 6 hours field based experience; 24 total hours.
Source: [1] Council for Exceptional Children (2003)
[2] State Board of Educator Certification (2001)
[3] State Board of Educator Certification (2005)

new courses so that the syllabi now reflected the new course content, the matching required standards, state examination requirements, and required prerequisites and co-requisites. Degree plans for the special education programs were redesigned to incorporate the new requirements for certification.

Experienced Teacher Perceptions about Standards

A teacher survey was designed to investigate teacher understanding of standards. The survey was administered to seven public school teachers with five or more years of experience. Survey questions were clustered into the following categories for experienced teachers: knowledge and importance of standards, lesson planning and instruction, accountability, benchmark and teacher certification testing. Survey responses submitted by the seven experienced teachers were analyzed using qualitative methods. Responses were grouped with respect to respondent consensus.

Knowledge and Importance of Standards

All respondents expressed knowledge about the state (Texas) standards and where to retrieve them on the state agency website. Some respondents stated that use of the Texas standards was non-negotiable. Teacher respondents stated that standards provided the framework for what students should know and be able to do at various levels in each area of study. The teachers acknowledged that additional standards had been developed by various professional organizations but these standards were not considered as important as the state standards. These teacher respondents considered the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) standards the most important because these standards were incorporated into state student assessment for accountability.

Lesson Planning and Instruction

The teacher respondents discussed a variety of ways to incorporate standards into their lesson planning. Teacher suggestions included use of commercial textbooks that now include a list of identified state standards applicable for each content unit. Other participants reported using the Texas Education Agency Webpage site for state standards lesson plan ideas. School curriculum guides, scope and sequence charts and curriculum maps were aligned with state standards. One teacher wrote: "These teaching standards

determine the curriculum taught in my lessons. I follow the requirements set forth in curriculum maps which are based on TEKS."

Accountability

The teacher participants agreed that teachers are now held accountable for student learning. Students must pass the state tests to graduate from high school. School administrators review lesson plans to ensure alignment with state standards. In some schools, administrators review teachers' lesson plans created on computer software specifically designed to incorporate appropriate standards using TEKS curriculum guides.

Benchmark and Teacher Certification Testing

Teacher respondents were asked about benchmark testing during their teaching preparation and about their certification test. One teacher responded, "I do not recall because I tested for certification so long ago. However, I did not study teaching standards and I passed!" Another respondent replied, "I received my certification prior to certification testing; however, it does help to assure quality control over academic departments." The respondents agreed that individuals preparing to become teachers should be keenly aware of all standards required by governing authorities and state policy.

Teacher responses suggest an understanding of the use and importance of standards within the teaching profession. Awareness of standards and state policy concerning planning and instruction appears to have altered teacher behavior. Teachers appear keenly aware of their responsibility for student learning outcomes.

Pre-Service Teacher Perceptions about Standards

Twenty-two students enrolled in a post-baccalaureate course on curriculum and instruction methods were asked to respond to a survey. Survey questions were clustered into four areas: understanding of the importance of using standards, benchmark and certification testing during preparation program, standards covered in lesson planning, and standards with respect to accountability. Survey responses were analyzed using qualitative methods. Responses were grouped around the major themes.

Understanding the Importance of Standards

Pre-service students agreed that standards formed the framework for curriculum content. One student stated that "standards provide uniformity. If a student moves they are not behind." Another student stated "without standards we cannot consistently control quality and expectations in our profession."

Benchmark and Certification Testing

The pre-service participants were at different levels in their preparation program. Comments concerning evaluation during their training varied. One student commented, "I have met every core standard for teaching in my content area and in knowledge of pedagogy in the content area." Another student stated: "These assessments – benchmark testing – are not authentic and rarely accurately measure knowledge." Finally, one student acknowledged, "Tests are part of our program. We must pass in order to get certified."

Lesson Planning and Accountability

The pre-service teachers acknowledged an emphasis upon lesson planning throughout their preparation program. One student stated, "We make sure the lesson follows TEKS standards because they are the points of importance." Another student stated, "We must make sure that we meet the learning needs of each student by planning a lesson that includes an activity, a discussion, and ensuring that children learn the lesson in different ways."

Concerning accountability, one student wrote, "Standards help teachers ensure that they are accountable for all the material that needs to be taught." Another student commented that "If you have followed the standards then the accountability of your teaching has been met."

This small sample of pre-service teachers appeared to understand that state standards formed the basis for content and that standards were important in lesson planning. Diversity in children's learning needs appeared to have meaning for these pre-service students. These students appeared to accept benchmark and TExES (state certification) testing as part of their program, although there are always those who do not value testing as a learning experience. As expected, these pre-service students have not gained deep understanding of the concepts of standards-based accountability that may be associated with years of teaching experience.

Summary and Conclusions

The first NCATE teaching standards were initiated over a half century ago. With the impetus of education reform policy making of the 1990s that focused upon student learning outcomes, standards have assumed a central position in changing the behavior of educators. At the university teacher preparation level, programs are being revisited to ensure the inclusion of NCATE, state, and professional association standards. Accountability testing is required to ensure content and pedagogy quality as well as program preparation continuity. Both pre-service and experienced teacher participants documented an awareness of the importance of standards in lesson planning and delivery. Student diversity and differing learning needs are being recognized and considered important by teachers as a result of implementing standards.

A negative side of the standards movement must be recognized. High stakes testing associated with standards may limit content taught to content tested, narrowing the depth and breadth of content area options because of stringent state standards associated with them. Additionally, professional development content must be encouraged to address trends and issues beyond local and state standards if teachers are going to be prepared to practice in today's global society.

At the present time the NCLB Act is being considered for reauthorization. Persistent challenges in raising student test scores, raising graduation rates, and school funding issues continue to focus public attention upon the nation's schools. Standards-based accountability appears to have the potential to change the content and practice of teaching, as P-12 education merges into P-16 and more university programs come under the scrutiny of high stakes testing associated with standards.

Based on the limited sample in this study, further research is warranted to examine pre-service teacher effectiveness after entry into the teaching profession. An empirical study of experienced teacher behavior to examine the impact of standards upon teacher leadership for learning also appears warranted. This research may also have implications for P-16 teaching applications.

References

Byrd, D. M., & Adamy, P. (2002). Overview and framework. In E. M. Guyton and J. D. Rainer (Eds.). *Research on meeting and using standards in the preparation of teachers: Teacher Education Yearbook X* (pp. 59–65). Association of Teacher Educators. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Cavanagh, S. (2007, June 13). Study casts doubt on states' NCLB proficiency standards. *Education Week, 26*(41), 1, 23.

Cuban, L. (2007, March 28). The never-ending quest: Lessons learned from urban school reform. *Education Week, 26*(29), 28-29.

Gratz, D. B. (2000, May). High standards for whom? *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(9), 681-687.

Hoff, D. J. (2007, June 6). State tests show gains since NCLB. *Education Week, 26*(39), 1, 20.

Hoff, D. J., & Manzo, K. K. (2007, March 14). Bush claims about NCLB questioned. *Education Week, 26*(27), 1, 26-27.

Kachigan, S. K. (1986). *Statistical analysis: An interdisciplinary introduction to univariate and multivariate method*s. New York: Radius Press.

Marklein, M. B. (2006, September 27). College overhaul called 'overdue.' *USA Today*. 1A.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1990). *Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2001). *Professional standards for the accreditation of school, colleges, and department of education.* Washington, DC: Author.

Olson, L. (2007, January 17). Standards get boost on the hill. *Education Week, 26*(19), 1, 25.

O'Shea, M. R. (2005). *From standards to success*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Selke, M., & Alouf, J. (2004). *Position framework: ATE*. Retrieved June 8, 2006, http://www.ate1.org/pubs/ATE_Position/Frame.cfm

Wise, A. E., & Leibbrand, J. A. (2002). The evolution of standards for teacher preparation. In E. M. Guyton & J. D. Ranier (Eds.), *Research on meeting and using standards in the preparation of teachers: Teacher Education Yearbook X* (pp. 197-209). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Appendix

Survey Instrument

Participant ratings of the importance of content areas needed to become an effective special education teacher in today's public schools.

Directions: Rate each statement based upon its importance for the success of special education teachers. Rate **1** as least important; **5** most important. Indicate your rating by circling **one** appropriate rating number for each item.

Item	Importance				
	least			most	
1. Learning Theories	1	2	3	4	5
2. Child Development	1	2	3	4	5
3. Adolescent Development	1	2	3	4	5
4. Integrating Technology	1	2	3	4	5
5. Classroom Environment/Management	1	2	3	4	5
6. Classroom Assessment Methods	1	2	3	4	5
7. Discipline Theory and Management	1	2	3	4	5
8. Student Teaching Students with Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
9. Roles of Special Education Teacher	1	2	3	4	5
10. Role of General Education Teacher-Students w/Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
11. Behavior Management Strategies-Students w/Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
12. Inst. Strategies for Students w/Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
13. Assessment of Students w/Learning Disabilities & TAKS	1	2	3	4	5
14. Assessment of Students w/Behavior Disorders & TAKS	1	2	3	4	5
15. Characteristics of Students w/Multiple Developmental disabilities (MR and Severe and Profound Handicap)	1	2	3	4	5
16. Characteristics of Students w/Learning Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
17. Characteristics of Students w/Behavior Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
18. Transition of Students w/Disabilities-Elementary to Middle School, Middle School to H.S., H.S. to Adult Community	1	2	3	4	5
19. Introduction to Learners with exceptionalities & low Incidence Disabilities, Deaf-Blind, Autism, Multiple Handicaps	1	2	3	4	5
20. Implementing Behavior Plans, IEPs & Accommodations	1	2	3	4	5
21. Lesson Planning for Students w/Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
22. Early Childhood Content	1	2	3	4	5
23. Reading Content	1	2	3	4	5
24. Science Content	1	2	3	4	5
25. Mathematics Content	1	2	3	4	5
26. Social Studies Content	1	2	3	4	5
27. Physical Education/Health Content	1	2	3	4	5
28. Fine Arts e.g. Music & Art	1	2	3	4	5
29. Child Guidance/Parent Communication	1	2	3	4	5
30. Diversity in Contemporary Families	1	2	3	4	5
31. Library and Supplementary Material	1	2	3	4	5
32. Tests and Measurement Theories Statistical Applications	1	2	3	4	5
33. State/Federal Mandates Concerning Students with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
34. Ethics Concerning Implementing IDEA	1	2	3	4	5
35. Health & Safety Issues Concerning Students w/Disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
36. Confidentiality Issues and FERPA	1	2	3	4	5

37. List any additional content areas you feel are needed for the success of Special Education teachers:

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

<u>Directions</u>: We invite participant input for improving our special Education Teacher Preparation Program. Please list any recommendations that you have. In particular, please address student teaching and university faculty collaboration and communication with field-based school.

Thank you for your assistance in completing this needs survey.