

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 565

SP 038 688

AUTHOR Stoloff, David L.
TITLE Lessons Learned from a State Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (ACTE) on Shaping and Influencing Future Policy. Symposium presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington, DC, February 24-27, 1999).
PUB DATE 1999-02-00
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Educational Legislation; Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Politics of Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; State Government; State Legislation; Statewide Planning; *Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS Connecticut; *State Associations; *State Policy

ABSTRACT

This presentation discusses the influence of the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities for Teacher Education (CACUTE) on state policy making. It provides a historical analysis of the CACUTE through an overview of the political and economic forces that have resulted in current teacher education policy in Connecticut. The presentation attempts to predict how coordinated, proactive efforts by a wider range of educational professionals might prove to be more effective in reaching the CACUTE's goals. It compares and contracts the CACUTE's experiences, offering papers by several members of the CACUTE that present their perspectives on the evolving influences of the state association on state policy. The papers are "The History of the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities in Teacher Education since 1983" (Walter B. Bernstein); "What Role Does CACUTE Play in Improving Teacher Education Curriculum in CT?" (Susan J. Hillman); and "The Educational Reform Process: The State, Institutions of Higher Education, and the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities for Teacher Education" (Ronald J. Moss). (SM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Lessons Learned from
 a State Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (ACTE)
 on Shaping and Influencing Future Policy
 A Symposium for Strand 4: Shaping and Influencing Policy
 For the 1999 AACTE Annual Meeting in Washington, DC – 2/24-27/99

Statement of the Problem

What are the roles of state associations of colleges and universities for teacher education in shaping and influencing policy within their member institutions, in state departments of education, in state legislative bodies and governors' offices, and in national forums? How are these roles in turn shaped by economic and political forces within the state and the profession? How do institutional tensions between public and private colleges and between smaller and larger programs impact on the effectiveness of the state association to present a common policy agenda? How will the association develop a greater proactive influence on policy for teacher education in the future?

Background The state teacher education association, the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities for Teacher Education (CACUTE) to be discussed as a case study is a 30-year-old association of teacher education programs. It was originally constituted "to improve teacher education in [the State] and to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and discussion of relevant issues." According to its 1987 Constitution, the association has also served as

- "the effective voice for the institutions which prepare teachers in [the State],"
- "a liaison organization between the national AACTE and the State,"
- "a forum for the State's teacher preparation institutions and other agencies concerned with the education of teachers," and
- "a clearinghouse for teacher education institutions within the State."

Literature Review The role of state association may be placed in the broader academic context of SCDE leadership (Zimpher and Sherrill, 1996) and of the process of creating state-level action plans to pursue a teacher development agenda linked to other school reforms (Darling-Hammond, 1997). As an attempt to increase coordination of teacher education programs in the State, the history of this association parallels the missed opportunities described in *The Rise and Stall of Teacher Education Reform* in Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, and Watson (1998). In the future, state associations will need to accommodate to the fundamental shifts in institutional arrangements that have provided the core for teacher preparation programs discussed by Ducharme and Ducharme (1998).

Contributions This presentation will provide an historical analysis of one state association, through an overview of the political and economic forces that have resulted in current teacher education policy in one state. Attempts will be made to predict how coordinated, proactive efforts by a wider range of educational professionals might prove to be more effective in reaching the association's goals. This study will advance the lessons learned by this state

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
 DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
 BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Stoloff

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

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 the position or policy.

association to provide a foundation for more effective strategies to shape policy in the future locally and to learn from other symposium participants on lessons learned nationally to achieve greater influence for other state organizations.

Conclusions CACUTE has had difficulty achieving focus and subsequent influence on state policy making. Internal tensions between private and public schools, differences in the key foci of the state association participants' roles as deans, certification officers, and teacher education faculty, and the ATE and AACTE perspectives has made it difficult for the state association to achieve consensus or an political action plan. The symposium will confirm that these conditions are not unique to one state and that they should be addressed on a national level if teacher educators are enabled to collaborate on common goals and agendas.

Outcomes and Methods

Outcomes Participants in this session will compare and contrast the experiences of their state associations for teacher education and of the association in this case study. Comments will be requested on the range of forces impacting teacher education in their states and on their own strategic planning for enhancing the influence of the state association on policy. Participants will seek implications from the discussion for AACTE's outreach and development strategies for state associations for teacher education.

A summary of the discussion at this symposium will be developed for submission to ERIC and further refined as an article submission to the *Journal of Teacher Education* and a monograph for the state association.

Methods During this symposium, the members of this state association will present short papers from their particular perspectives on the evolving influences of the state association on state policy.

Following an overview by the session organizer, two of the longest members of the state association – a director of a secondary education program at a private college and a dean from a public university – will give a ten minute overview on how the state association has evolved in the last two decades, with particular focus on its relationships with the State Department of Education.

This overview will lead into three case studies on the role of the state association in influencing local and statewide policy. Faculty members from public and private universities will discuss the influences of the state association on curriculum development in PK-12 schools, on teacher education program approval, and on shaping policy towards Professional Development Schools. These three papers should be presented in less than one half-hour.

The symposium discussant, a coordinator of the Educator Preparation Program Approval process for the State Department of Education (SDE) will provide insight on the influence of the state association on policy-making in the SDE and in the Legislature.

These ten-minute remarks by the discussant should lead into the session participants' comments and discussion for at least 15 minutes. The session organizer will facilitate discussion on

1. the proactive or reactive position of associations for teacher education in the participants' home states,

2. a brief historical review on the changes in the influence of individual associations on teacher education policy in their states,
3. a brief discussion of internal and external points of tension for associations,
4. current strategies used to enhance the associations' influence on shaping statewide policy on teacher education, and
5. planning for enhancing the associations' involvement in shaping policy in the future.

The symposium will be designed to facilitate the sharing of "best practices" among state association leaders for strengthening the roles of their organizations in shaping policy in their states. It will close with the sharing of addresses, including email addresses, by the participants will so that state associations can work together to resolve the issues of concern which this session identifies.

Additional Information on Presenters and Other Participants in this Session:

<p>Dr. David L. Stoloff, Education Department Chair Eastern Connecticut State University 83 Windham Street, New Class Building Room 124 Willimantic, CT 06226 tel. no. (860) 465 - 5501 email: stoloffd@ecsu.ctstateu.edu ECSU fax. no. (860) 465 - 4538 WWW:http://www.ecsu.ctstateu.edu/depts/edu/stoloff.html</p>	<p>Dr. Hilary E. Freedman Bureau of Certification and Professional Development State Department of Education P.O. Box 2219 Hartford, CT 06145 (860) 566-7258 SDE fax: (860) 566 - 8929 email: hilary.freedman@po.state.ct.us</p>
<p>Dr. Edith MacMullen, Director Teacher Preparation Program Yale University Box 20824, New Haven, CT 06520-8241 (203) 432-1896 Edith.MacMullen@yale.edu fax (203) 432-1906</p>	<p>Dr. Walter Bernstein, Dean School of Professional Studies Western Connecticut State University 181 White Street Danbury, CT 06810 (203) 837-9500 bernstein@wcsu.ctstateu.edu</p>
<p>Dr. Allen P. Cook School of Education University of Bridgeport Bridgeport, CT 06601-2449 203-576-4192, - 4206 Fax: 203-576-4200 acook@bridgeport.edu</p>	<p>Dr. Ronald J. Moss, Assistant Dean School of Education and Professional Studies Central Connecticut State University 1615 Stanley Street New Britain, CT 06050 (860) 832-2125; moss@ccsu.ctstateu.edu CCSU School of Ed. fax: (860) 832 - 2109</p>
<p>Dr. Susan J. Hillman, Chair Child Study/Education/Special Education St. Joseph College 1678 Asylum Avenue West Hartford, CT 06117-2700 (860) 232-4571, ext. 342 Fax: (860) 231-1691 email: shillman@mercy.sjc.edu</p>	<p>Dr. Anna Forlenza-Bailey Coordinator of Teacher Education University of Hartford - H 252 200 Bloomfield Ave. West Hartford, CT 06117-1599 860-768-5259 FAX 860-768-5043 E-mail - bailey@mail.hartford.edu</p>
<p>Dr. Cynthia McDaniels, Director of Programs and Special Projects Southern Connecticut State University 501 Crescent Street New Haven, CT 06515 (203) 392-5905 FAX: (203) 392 - 5908 email: McDaniels@SCSU.CTSTATEU.EDU</p>	

The History of the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities in Teacher Education since 1983

The year 1983 was a watershed moment for education in the State of Connecticut and the Nation. The report, *A Nation at Risk* had been published and called for massive revitalization of America's public schools and educational system.

The State Legislature in Connecticut had recently passed the Education Enhancement Act (EEA) that provided for sweeping changes in teacher standards, salaries, school and curriculum reform, and statewide testing. The legislation focused on the preparation of teachers with special emphasis on entrance requirements to programs, exit exams for licensing and teacher preparation approval standards.

All of this reform activity in Connecticut meant that the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities in Teacher Education (CACUTE) had a new role to play in working with the State Department of Education, the Department of Higher Education and other key constituencies. Historically, CACUTE had been a forum for teacher education institutions to meet regularly and discuss issues of interest among members. With the passing of EEA Legislation in Connecticut, CACUTE destiny was to become more proactive, more involved in *determining* policy rather than simply reacting to developments that were occurring quite rapidly.

The State implemented critical changes in standards for teacher preparation programs, teacher preparation curriculum (including matters of technology, health issues, diversity and special education) as well as new testing criteria for admission to programs and teacher licensing. Critical to the change agenda was Connecticut's adoption of new testing protocol and CACUTE became integrally involved in developing and piloting these tests with students in education programs.

Many of the decisions made regarding the proposed reforms were the result of task groups or working committees formed by the State Department of Education. In the early years of this reform movement (1983-89), CACUTE had to work very hard to ensure representation on these various groups. Over time, however, CACUTE representation became a central component of many of these important policy-recommending groups.

One interesting by-product of these reform efforts was a greater sense of "partnership" between the institutions and state policy makers. On almost every issue, the universities and the State Department of Education worked together to create policy that ensured quality, respect for institutional autonomy and the political realities of reforming education. These were not easy times and often there was great disagreement and disenchantment with the process. Yet, a sense of partnership grew and before long CACUTE was working closely with State cooperating teachers, area service centers, principal and superintendent groups, Board of Education members and staff at the Department of Higher Education.

Today, CACUTE is regularly consulted *prior* to the setting of policy and is a major player in most policy decisions involving teacher education. Members of CACUTE have served on every imaginable task force; committee and Blue Ribbon Commission created over the last decade. Two years ago, CACUTE and the State Department of Education conducted a yearlong feasibility study to determine the value of becoming an NCATE partnership State that has since become a reality. The State will adopt national NCATE Standards for all teacher preparation programs in 2003.

Almost fifteen years after EEA legislation in Connecticut, there is solid evidence of increased quality of teacher preparation programs in the State. School districts report that graduates know more about classroom pedagogy, have a deeper intellectual and academic foundation and perform admirably in student teaching experiences. Evaluation studies have begun to suggest that some of these reform efforts may be linked to higher levels of student achievement. CACUTE is a true partner in the evolution of education reform in Connecticut.

Walter B. Bernstein
February 1999

What role does CACUTE play in improving teacher education curriculum in CT?

- I. Explicit Role [defined as those issues CACUTE identifies and deliberates on at meetings]
 - A. Reactive
Example—The interpretation of a regulation may be in question such as what happened in the case of child development courses. A letter or verbal communication to the SDE will occur stating our concerns and asking for a possible resolution.
 - B. Proactive
Example—An issue may be identified and part of a meeting might be allotted to share what is happening in the field. One year technology was a concern and several colleges volunteered to host an information session on an aspect of using technology.
- II. Implicit Role
 - A. Reactive
Example—A regulation or statement may be released from the SDE, not an emergency. Over coffee prior to a CACUTE meeting or at the break, members will discuss how their college is reacting. This informal gathering prior to the meeting provides a forum to share ideas and at times may foster colleges linking forces. Specifically, this is what occurred when SJC joined with University of Hartford and CCSU to provide cooperating teacher training together.
 - B. Proactive
This feeling has changed over time, but having CACUTE as a formal structure provides a ready avenue, which the SDE can utilize or approach with issues or possibilities.
 - C. General implicit benefits
 1. Provides a common language
 2. Provides camaraderie and reduces isolation
 3. Fosters an awareness among all private and public colleges of the programs offered throughout the state (e.g., I may recommend another program and a person to contact if a prospective student comes to me and we do not have that program.)
 4. Less friction (I believe) between private and public institutions.

ABSTRACT

The Educational Reform Process: The State, Institutions of Higher Education, and the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities for Teacher Education

by Ronald J. Moss

Central Connecticut State University

Around the world, the education of a country's children has been seen as one of the most important duties of government. In the United States, the responsibility for education of the young has been largely a local one, and the supervision of the preparation of new teachers has rested with the states. State legislatures set specific regulations by law. State Departments of Education enforce these laws and provide implementation regulations. Throughout this process, there has been a constant level of tension between institutions of higher education that prepare teachers and the state administration that supervises the process. This process can lead to constructive dialog or to conflict between these bodies. Organizations like AACTE and its state affiliates can serve as a conduit for communication and the sharing of ideas between the state and its institutions that prepare teachers. It can help facilitate cooperation and mutual understanding among all parties interested in teacher education.

In Connecticut, the regulation of teacher education programs has relied on the use of process standards and, for a number of decades, on a close cooperative relationship between the Institutions of Higher Education [IHEs] and the Connecticut State Department of Education [SDE]. While this often involved individual relationships among state officials and college deans, chairs, and directors, this process worked often in the latter 1970s and 1980s through the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities for Teacher Education [CACUTE]. Both CACUTE and the SDE would discuss potential changes in regulations, problems involving the educational and teacher education processes, and other issues involved in the preparation of teachers. While there

must have been some intrinsic tensions between the IHEs and the SDE, the close working relationship seemed to mute potential tensions in those years.

With the passage of the Teacher Enhancement Act of 1986, the state of Connecticut made commitments concerning the improvement of education. It toughened the requirements for the preparation of teachers and also created a state guided induction program for beginning teachers. The State Department of Education, following the mandates of the legislation, set up particular testing requirements for entry to and exit from teacher education programs. In addition, various course requirements, such as a mandated special education course and an academic major requirement, became part of state regulations. These were, as a rule, process standards that spelled out requirements in terms of coursework completed. The state involved itself by making curricular requirements in various fields, often based on advice from consultants employed by the state, guidelines from national organizations, and requests from local administrative and teaching pressure groups.

The state has mandated other changes in certification over the past decade. Many of these changes are important, such as the special education requirement for all teachers, the academic major requirement for elementary education teacher candidates, state testing requirements, the changes in grade levels for various certifications, and the revision of middle school and early childhood education requirements. Changes have occurred in 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 1998. A major change in the nature and structure of regulations will again occur in 2003; these upcoming changes are aimed at making the preparation of teachers performance based. But, at the same time, there are still requirements that are course specific. Additionally, the state intensely supervises colleges that have passed state accreditation requirements based on voluminous self-studies and team visit reports.

The state must decide whether it will be willing to move out of the detailed course requirements approach to the preparation of teachers and trust in the evaluation process that utilizes national standards such as NCATE and INTASC Standards. It must also

decide whether to rely on the evaluation of new teachers produced in state utilizing the reports from the Beginning Educator Support and Training program, the Praxis II exams, and the portfolios prepared by new teachers. If the state makes these changes, it will have to change a tradition of intense scrutiny of Institutions of Higher Education that has served the state for years. The State Department of Education must decide, in cooperation with the state legislature and other state wide bodies, whether it can best meet its commonly accepted obligations in a more cost efficient and effective manner. This might include cooperation with Institutions of Higher Education and the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities for Teacher Education.

a:Abstract.doc

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**The Educational Reform Process: The State, Institutions of Higher Education,
and the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities for Teacher
Education¹**

by Ronald J. Moss

Central Connecticut State University

Around the world, the education of a country's children has been seen as one of the most important duties of government. In most countries, the governance of education and the preparation of teachers has been seen as being so important that a national ministry of education has maintained responsibility and control over programs designed to prepare new teachers. However, in the United States, the responsibility for education of the young has been largely a local one, and the supervision of the preparation of new teachers has rested with the states. State legislatures set specific regulations by law. State Departments of Education enforce these laws and provide implementation regulations. In the latter half of the twentieth century, with the creation of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and with the subsequent creation of the Department of Education, greater national attention has been paid to education and the means by which teachers are prepared. Still a great deal of the responsibility and initiative still rests at the state level. Throughout this process, there has been a constant level of tension between institutions of higher education that prepare teachers and the state administration that supervises the process. This process can lead to constructive dialog or to conflict between these bodies. Organizations like AACTE and its state affiliates can serve as a conduit for communication and the sharing of ideas between the state and its institutions that prepare teachers. It can help facilitate cooperation and mutual understanding among all parties interested in teacher education.

¹ I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Richard I. Arends and Roger Zieger in reading the drafts of this paper and for providing wise counsel and advice. The glum reality is that the defects of this paper are mine.

In Connecticut, the regulation of teacher education programs has relied on the use of process standards and, for a number of decades, on a close cooperative relationship between the Institutions of Higher Education [IHEs] and the Connecticut State Department of Education [SDE]. While this relationship often involved individual relationships among state officials and college deans, chairs, and directors, this process worked often in the latter 1970s and 1980s through the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities for Teacher Education [CACUTE]. Both CACUTE and the SDE would discuss potential changes in regulations, problems involving the educational and teacher education processes, and other issues involved in the preparation of teachers. While there must have been some intrinsic tensions between the IHEs and the SDE, the close working relationship seemed to mute potential tensions in those years.

With the passage of the Teacher Enhancement Act of 1986, the state of Connecticut made commitments concerning the improvement of education. It increased teachers' salaries, gave teachers more input in decision making, and toughened the requirements for the preparation of teachers. The law also created a state guided induction program for beginning teachers. The State Department of Education, following the mandates of the legislation, set up particular testing requirements for entry to and exit from teacher education programs. In addition, various course requirements, such as a mandated special education course and an academic major requirement, became part of state regulations. These were, as a rule, process standards that spelled out requirements in terms of coursework completed. The state involved itself by making curricular requirements in various fields, often based on advice from consultants employed by the state, guidelines from national organizations, and requests from local administrative and teaching pressure groups. Even local newspapers have had an impact on state policy by publishing articles, as the influential *Hartford Courant* did on January 29, 1999 on the lack of teaching majors. Nationally recognized journals, such as the bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, *Academe*, devoted issues to "Educating our Teachers" [Volume 8, Number 1, January-February 1999] and journals such as Phi Delta Kappa's *Kappan* are concerned with teacher preparation and educational reform in general. These journals, among others, also inform the local debate. The State Department of Education evaluates

college programs by a state review and approval process that now use NCATE Standards. These can have a significant impact on the structure and academic programs of colleges and universities that prepare teachers.

Beginning in 1986, Connecticut modified its regulations for teacher certification in radical and important ways. It was one of the first states to tie additional authority and pay for teachers with demands for tighter control over the quality of teachers and the performance of students. The state also created a series of regulations that required potential candidates for admission to Professional Programs in Education to meet certain academic standards. These standards include a "B- average" for all college work attempted prior to admission to the Professional Program and satisfactory completion of a series of literacy tests in reading, writing, and mathematics. The first tests of basic skills involved a state-developed test called "CONNCEPT" which was replaced, in 1995, with ETS's Praxis I CBT exam.

Exit tests were also mandated by state code. Elementary education graduates completed a multifaceted state-constructed exam called "CONNECT," subsequently replaced by two tests in Elementary Education in the Praxis II series. Secondary education and special subject teachers (art, music, physical education, special education, and technology education) have had to complete tests in the NTE series and subsequently in the Praxis II battery related to the candidate's specialty. Over the years, the Praxis II tests have changed, and the passing scores have been raised, requiring higher achievement by teacher candidates.

The state initially maintained that it had the responsibility to monitor outcomes and so made the Praxis II testing an arrangement between the student and the state. Praxis II scores were sent directly by the Educational Testing Service to the State Department of Education. The state determined whether a student met the state's requirement prior to issuing certification. Recently, however, the state has unilaterally changed the Praxis II management requirement; the teacher education institutions must now certify that the student has passed the appropriate Praxis II exams prior to providing an institutional

recommendation for certification. The state passed this responsibility on to the colleges, arguably where it belongs. In this case, however, the state might have consulted CACUTE about the nature and timing of the transfer of responsibility, but instead chose to announce it, as a *fait accompli*, at a state certification meeting attended by the IHEs' certification officers. This decision seems to exemplify the decrease in close prior consultation between the state and CACUTE over potential certification and policy changes in recent years. The decrease in cooperative decision making may be a source of additional tension between the state and IHEs.

The state also has mandated other changes in certification over the past decade. Many of these changes are important, such as the special education requirement for all teachers, the academic major requirement for elementary education teacher candidates, state testing requirements, the changes in grade levels for various certifications, and the revision of middle school and early childhood education requirements. However, from the perspective of IHE personnel, these changes have occurred rapidly and not always in manageable time frames. Changes have occurred in 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 1998. A complete major change in the nature and structure of regulations will again occur in 2003; these upcoming changes are aimed at making the preparation of teachers performance based. When the earlier changes were initially put into the code, the state did not take into account that colleges might have students in two or three different program cohorts or following different sets of requirements simultaneously. The nature of these requirements, along with timing, involved the SDE.

Certainly, the requirements of course work in special education and the completion of a major by all students, including elementary education and early childhood education students, are fine ideas. However, one might justifiably ask how far the requirements should go. Does the state need to involve itself in the details of the nature and content of the subject matter majors? Should the state or the college approve the content of majors? Currently, the State Department of Education determines which majors are acceptable for elementary and middle school teaching candidates. If certification is to be truly outcomes based, should not this academic issue be left to IHEs? The IHEs should be best qualified

to determine how to prepare their unique clientele to meet professional and state requirements. Not all colleges have the same kinds of students with the same kinds of goals, backgrounds, and educational needs. They do not offer the same liberal arts or academic major structures. Other important reforms suggested by nationally respected bodies include the use of Professional Development Schools (for which NCATE has a set of draft standards), the use of developmental portfolios by students to show incremental growth over time, and the INTASC Standards can help in the preparation of new teachers. In some cases, such as portfolios and Professional Development Schools, there are neither clear consensus on nature and structure of these reforms. There is still lively debate going on over the issues involving quality control and assessment for these reform ideas. While these efforts are currently experimental, Connecticut seems to be moving quickly to develop standards for them. While the SDE devoted one year's certification committee sessions with IHE representatives on the nature of portfolios, one must hope that Connecticut will not quickly develop ironbound requirements that may not meet national requirements or allow sufficiently for institutional and individual differences. It would be useful to have continued discussions on this topic with CACUTE. This will lead to more successful results and decrease the inevitable tensions that can exist between IHEs and the SDE.

In Connecticut, state accreditation teams and, in some cases, joint state-NCATE teams provide rigorous reviews of teacher education institutions. Intense visitations take place. Voluminous self-studies and visitation team reports are reviewed by a state Program Review and Approval Committee composed of non-voting state representatives, individuals from the educational and business communities, and representatives from colleges and universities. Having served on this committee for three years, this writer can attest to the rigor of the reviews and the intense questioning of IHE representatives who are allowed to make presentations to the committee. The committee votes on a recommendation concerning the continuation or approval of an IHE's program for the Commissioner of Education. Renewal recommendations range from full five-year approval through interim approval to recommendation for discontinuation of a program or an IHE's entire teacher education operation. It is clearly a very important function of

state oversight to insure that IHEs do not succumb to temptations to run weak programs or programs insufficiently planned or funded. The state provides assistance to colleges found to be deficient, both through its highly regarded and respected Program Review supervisor and through its recommendations of non-state affiliated experts.

IHEs that receive full five year approval and those who receive interim approval due to noted weaknesses not involving the certification process still have their students' certification applications audited by state evaluators. One would normally expect that if an IHE has been judged as following state regulations, it would not require close monitoring. Yet, in Connecticut, the state not only audits all colleges rigorously, but also seeks to make determinations about what courses should be approved for certain certification requirements. The state involves itself intensely in these minutiae; the question is whether these matters merit tight state oversight.

This is an odd issue since Connecticut is moving to outcomes-based program approval -- also using NCATE Standards, certification and assessment. In addition to Praxis II testing requirements, the teaching performance of the graduate is evaluated using clearly defined and thoughtfully constructed expectations involving videotaped or real time class presentations, classroom produced student materials, and teacher assessments of student progress checked by state approved assessors. This program, the Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) program for new teachers provides mentoring and initiation into the profession by local teachers and administrators and state trained and appointed assessors. While details vary for differing certifications, the goal is to help the novice teacher more easily and effectively become a strong professional teacher in a relatively short time span of two to three years. The BEST program is part of a professional development continuum that includes further study and professional development as part of the process leading, ultimately to a professional certificate.

Praxis II and BEST can provide information about college preparation programs and serve as hammers for reform when an IHE's students do not do well on exams or as

beginning teachers. Yet the state continues to look at individual courses and make detailed course requirements.

The state may be changing from process standards to outcomes based regulations, given the revisions of the regulations slated for July 1, 2003 implementation which call for "demonstrated competence" in various areas. It is not completely clear, however, that the state is moving in the direction of dropping all individual course mandates and leaving behind its cookbook approach to the preparation of teachers. Connecticut has made progress in this direction, but it seems that it can do more. The SDE should hold a series of conversations with CACUTE to clarify its intentions. It must also, when using "demonstrated competencies" in its regulations, work carefully with the IHEs, perhaps through CACUTE, to determine what kinds of evidence will be acceptable to document that a competence has been satisfactorily demonstrated. In a state with rigorous regulations and a history of active state involvement, it is not reasonable to leave the definition of a "demonstrated competence" totally in the hands of the colleges. This may be particularly so since some institutions may not know how to assess. There are many ways to document skills and attainment of ability, and there is no single right way to prove that a student has achieved a level of performance. It is possible that the state could damage programs and stultify experimentation by mandating uniformity. At the same time, a lack of definition of "demonstrated competence" creates major risks that what a college believes, in good faith, is sufficient evidence may suddenly not be sufficient when the state visitation team arrives. Colleges that value their full accreditation may feel compelled to require excessive evidence or resort to requiring courses for all requirements to protect their reputations and accreditation. If that is so, then nothing will have changed, despite cosmetic changes to the regulations. Clear and open cooperation among Institutions of Higher Education, CACUTE, and state regulators, utilizing nationally accepted practices and styles of assessment is the only way to avoid this risk.

As indicated above, the State Department of Education has a legal obligation to provide assistance and supervision to colleges and universities that have been shown to have significant flaws in their teacher education programs. The state clearly has obligations --

and profound influence -- over education programs shown to have difficulties. At the same time, CACUTE can help new IHE program administrators become acclimatized to state processes, certification procedures used by other institutions, and the general environment in which teacher education functions in Connecticut.

The state must decide whether it will be willing to move out of the detailed supervision of IHE programs that pass state and national review and, instead, evaluate IHE teacher education programs by the quality of the product produced: the new teachers in the schools. It must decide whether to trust tests, teacher portfolios, INTASC Standards, and the national accreditation agencies, such as NCATE, to insure that high quality programs exist. The decision to move out of costly and detailed management of institutional teacher preparation programs that are otherwise vigorously and successfully assessed are policy, economic, and political issues that state officials will sooner or later have to face. It must spend time assisting IHEs found to have profound difficulties in their teacher education programs. Giving up old established practices of detailed supervision is a difficult decision to make. Working with influential groups, the legislature, and the executive branch of state government to make changes in the system is a must and will take time. It is time for the State Department of Education to decide not only how much detailed supervision is required. SDE must also determine how it can best work with Institutions of Higher Education and the Connecticut Association of Colleges of Teacher Education to meet commonly accepted goals and obligations in a more cost efficient and effective manner, while still fulfilling its lawful oversight obligations.

a:AACTE.doc

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Notes on a Presentation at the
1999 AACTE Annual Meeting
Friday, February 26, 1999, 5-6:15 pm, Virginia Suite C, Lobby Level
Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel**

- 1. Title of Presentation** Lessons Learned from a State Teacher Education Association on Shaping and Influencing Future Policy
- 2. Description of the Proposal Session** This symposium by members of an ACTE will discuss its influence on state policy-making and the challenges, success stories, and strategic planning of its association and those of session participants.

3. List of Presenters:

Session Organizer Dr. David L. Stoloff
Institution Eastern Connecticut State University
City/State Willimantic, CT 06226
Paper Title **Shaping Future Policy by One ACTE**

Names Dr. Edith MacMullen & Dean Walter Bernstein
Institution Yale University Western CT State University
City/State New Haven, CT Danbury, CT
Paper Title **A Historical Review of an ACTE and State Policy**

Names Dr. Allen P. Cook & Dr. Ronald J. Moss
Institution University of Bridgeport Central CT State University
City/State Bridgeport, CT New Britain, CT
Paper Title **The ACTE's Influence on Program Approval**

Names Dr. Susan Hillman
Institution Saint Joseph College
City/State West Hartford, CT
Paper Title **The ACTE's Influence on Curriculum**

Names Dr. Anna Forlenza-Bailey & Dr. Cynthia MacDaniels
Institution University of Hartford Southern CT State University
City/State West Hartford, CT New Haven, CT
Paper Title **The ACTE's Influence on PDS Policy**

Discussant Dr. Hilary Freedman
Institution Connecticut State Department of Education (SDE)
City/State Hartford, CT
Paper Title **The ACTE's Influence of SDE's Policy-Making**



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: <i>Lessons Learned from a State Teacher Education Association on Shaping and Influencing Future Policy</i>	
Author(s): <i>Stoloff, David L.; Bernstein, Walter B.; Hillman, Susan J.; Moss, Ronald J.</i>	
Corporate Source: <i>Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities for Teacher Education</i>	Publication Date: <i>February 1999</i>

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

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

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

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

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

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

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 1

Level 2A

Level 2B



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

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

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, please →

Signature: <i>David L. Stoloff</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>David L. Stoloff</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>Education Dept. Eastern Connecticut State University, Willimantic, CT 06226</i>	Telephone: <i>(860) 465-5501</i>	FAX: <i>(860) 465-4538</i>
	E-Mail Address: <i>stoloff@ecsu.</i>	Date: <i>7/14/99</i>

ctstateu.edu

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHERS AND TEACHER EDUCATION 1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20005-4701
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>