

TE982: Policy Issues in Teacher Education

Spring 2008

Tuesday 4:10-7:00
111 Erickson Hall

Robert E. Floden
116M Erickson Hall
355-3486
floden@msu.edu

Office hours by appointment

This version of TE982 is intended for doctoral students in education, particularly those with interests in policies related to teacher education. The readings in the course will be a mixture of scholarly papers about teacher education policy (or more general versions of policy tools used for teacher education), publications written to advocate for some teacher education policy, or policy documents themselves (e.g., legislation or regulations linked to teacher education). What counts as a “teacher education policy” will be construed broadly, to include policies about recruitment of prospective teachers as well as policies determining the structure and substance of teacher education programs. “Policy” itself will also be construed broadly, to include the actions non-governmental actors take to influence the shape of teacher education (e.g., the efforts of ExxonMobil to shape the preparation of mathematics and science teachers) and the efforts associations of teacher education institutions themselves (e.g., the Holmes Group) to agree on policies.

The course will be conducted as a seminar. Students are expected to complete assigned readings before coming class. For some classes, focal questions will be distributed prior to class. Students should also take notes about ideas or passages in the text that they believe would be productive focal points for seminar discussion. (Please make notes on the particular pages and passages deserving discussion.) Discussions will address the theoretical framework(s) guiding research, the particular questions studies address, the methods used to seek answers to those questions, the chains of reasoning from evidence to conclusions, and the ideas for practice, policy, and further research that studies suggest.

Toward the end of the course, class time will be devoted to student presentations and discussion.

By the end of the course, students should be familiar with the major areas of policy related to teacher education, including the arguments for and against key policies, the range of policies currently in existence, and the evidence (or lack thereof) about the effectiveness of the policy. Students will also have pursued some area in depth, either by mastering the literature related to a particular policy or by gaining an understanding of the full range of teacher education policies operating in a geographic context (US state or another country), so that they could engage in discussions of those policies in professional settings or design research connected to that policy or policy context.

Readings

Most required readings will be available on the course Angel site, either as pdf files or as links to articles through the MSU library. A few hard copy texts will be required for sessions later in the course. Information needed to purchase those texts will be provided well in advance. A tentative list of readings for the first few weeks is provided below in this syllabus. Selection of additional or substitute readings will be based in part on the course of class discussions.

Course assignments

1. Critical response to class readings

Three times during the first 12 course sessions, students will prepare a 750-1000 word critical response to the readings. By “critical response,” I mean that a short essay that goes beyond simple summary of the readings to address some substantive issue linked to the readings. Students might, for example, discuss the chain of argument linking evidence to conclusions. Or students might discuss the possible consequences of a policy that are not brought up in a paper promoting a particular policy direction. The task of writing this critical response resembles that of responding to a paper at a conference, both addressing strengths and weaknesses in the work and helping the audience (in this case, other seminar participants) connect the paper to other scholarship.

Students should come to class prepared to present the gist of their critical responses to the seminar group.

2. Written project

Students are required to prepare one written project of 5,000 to 7,000 words. The project may either take the form of either a review article about the literature (including, but not restricted to, research studies or a policy analysis of the set of teacher education policies operating in a US state or in another country. The style of the paper should conform to the APA publication manual.

Students choosing to write a review article should focus on some particular direction for teacher education policy. The review article should:

- make an argument for the policy direction’s importance in the current political climate
- describe the process used to identify the literature included in the review
- provide a summary (in text or table) of each article included in the review
- include an analytic discussion that includes some of the student’s own thinking, rather than simply listing the results of the individual articles

Students choosing to write an analysis of a teacher education policy context should prepare an analysis that:

- sketches the general background of the state or county, including information such as the number of teacher preparation institutions, the approximate number of new teachers prepared each year, and current requirements for teacher certification
- describes each of the teacher preparation policies currently operating in the context
- provides an analysis of the likely effects of the configuration of policies
- offers recommendations for policy changes that would be likely to lead to better outcomes, with accompanying rationales

To allow to opportunities for instructor feedback, students should turn in two interim products:

- 100 word abstract, describing the area for review or policy analysis, due at Class 4 (January 29)
- 250 word progress report, giving more detail about the area for review or research questions/methods, due at Class 8 (February 26)

3. Project presentation and response

Paper presentation. During the last two weeks of the seminar, each student will make a 15-20 minute presentation of his course project, be it literature review or policy analysis. Following the response (by another student), the author will comment on points raised in that response, either defending the project against criticisms raised or explaining how it could be modified to address the criticisms. The author should also respond to comments and criticisms made by other seminar members. The presenter must provide the respondent with a written text or detailed set of talking points at least one week prior to the presentation.

Presentation of response. Each student will serve as a respondent to a student seminar presentation. Respondents may either write out their response (and read it to the seminar) or speak from an outline. A copy of the text or outline should be given to the instructor immediately following the presentation.

Evaluation

Course grades will be based on the written assignments, the presentation of the project in class, and the response to another student's presentation. These components will each be assigned a grade on the MSU 4-point scale. The final grade will be an average of those components, weighted as follows:

Critical responses to readings:	30%
Written project:	50%

Project presentation:	10%
Response to presentation	10%

Tentative Weekly Schedule of Topics and Readings

1. Jan 8 Introduction to the course

Two Paths to Quality Teaching: Implications for Policymakers. Debate on teaching quality between Linda Darling-Hammond and Chester E. Finn, Jr., with analysis by staff from the Education Commission of the States.

Retrieved from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/12/92/1292.htm>

2. Jan 15 Overview of policy areas – Special issue Educational Policy on teacher education reform policies, with a focus on Doing What Matters Most, a report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF)

Educational Policy, 2000, Vol. 14, No. 6

3. Jan 22 Alternatives – providers, routes, certification

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teaching and knowledge: Policy issues posed by alternate certification for teachers. Peabody Journal of Education, 67(3), 23-154.

Hawley, W. D. (1990). The theory and practice of alternative certification: implications for the improvement of teaching. Peabody Journal of Education, 67(3), 3-34.

Hess, F. (2001). Tear down the wall: The case for a radical overhaul of teacher certification. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.

Mayer, D. P., Decker, P. T., Glazerman, S., & Silva, T. W. (2003). Identifying Alternative Certification Programs for an Impact Evaluation of Teacher Preparation. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

4. Jan 29 Early entry approaches

Decker, P. T., Mayer, D. P., & Glazerman, S. (2004). *The effects of Teach For America on students: Findings from a national evaluation*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Boyd, D., Grossman, P. L., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2006). How changes in entry requirements alter the teacher workforce and affect student achievement. *Education Finance and Policy*, 1(2), 176-216.

Laczko-Kerr, I., & Berliner, D. C. (2002). The effectiveness of "Teach for America" and other under-certified teachers on student academic Achievement: A

case of harmful public policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(37). Retrieved from Retrieved June 1, 2008 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n37/>

Raymond, M., Fletcher, S., & Luque, J. (2001). *Teach For America: An Evaluation of Teacher Differences and Student Outcomes In Houston, Texas*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution.

Mitchell, D. E., Scott-Hendrick, L., Parrish, T., Crowley, J., Karam, R., Boyns, D., et al. (2007). *California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment and Intern Alternative Certification Evaluation Study: Technical Report*. Riverside, CA: University of California - Riverside. [Read only Executive Summary. Skim section on intern study.]

5. Feb 5 Federal Policy:

Cohen-Vogel, L. (2005). Federal role in teacher quality: "Redefinition" or policy alignment? *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 18-43.

HR- 6. Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (Read Title II- Teacher Quality)

U.S. Department of Education, O. o. P. E., Office of Policy Planning and Innovation,. (2002). *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality*. Washington, DC.

Huang, S., Yi, Y., & Haycock, K. (2002). *Interpret With Caution: The First State Title II Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation*. Washington, DC: The Education Trust.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2002). Reporting on teacher quality: The politics of politics. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(5), 379-382.

U.S. Department of Education, O. o. P. E. (2006). *The Secretary's Fifth Annual Report on Teacher Quality: A Highly Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom*. Washington, DC.

Look at state Title II reports for Michigan and 4 other states of your choice; focus on Teacher Prep Program Performance
<https://title2.ed.gov/Title2DR/ChooseState.asp?Type=Map&Year=2006>

6. Feb 12 National accreditation

US Department of Education, *Accreditation in the United States*.
<http://www.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation.html#Overview>

Graham, P. A., Lyman, R. W., & Trow, M. (1995). Accountability Of Colleges And University: An Essay. Retrieved from <http://www.teac.org/literature/acu.asp>

Murray, F. B. (2005). On building a unified system of accreditation in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(4), 307-317.

Browse the TEAC Web site: <http://www.teac.org/>

Wise, A. E. (2005). Establishing teaching as a profession: The essential role of professional accreditation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(4), 318-331.

Browse the NCATE Web site: <http://www.ncate.org/>

Tamir, E., & Wilson, S. M. (2005). Who should guard the gates? Evidentiary and professional warrants for claiming jurisdiction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(4), 332-342.

7. Feb 19 State policies: I

Youngs, P., Odden, A., & Porter, A. C. (2003). State policy related to teacher licensure. *Educational Policy*, 17(2), 217-236.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence. *Journal*, 8(1). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/>

Michigan Department of Education Teacher Preparation Policy Study Group. (2007). *Recommendations to State Superintendent of Instruction Michael Flanagan*. Lansing, MI.

Go to the Web site for the CPRE [CPRE State Policy Environment reports](#) and reports for Michigan, California, and one other state of your choice.

URL:

http://www.cpre.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=56&Itemid=76

8. Feb 26 State policies II: Institutional responses

Kornfeld, J., Grady, K., Marker, P. M., & Ruddell, M. R. (2007). Caught in the current: A self-study of state-mandated compliance in a teacher education program. *Teachers College Record*, 109(8), 1902-1930.

Prestine, N. A. (1992). The struggle for control of teacher education: The University of Wisconsin-Madison. In H. D. Gideonse (Ed.), *Teacher Education Policy: Narratives, stories, and cases* (pp. 159-180). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ishler, R. E. (1992). Teacher education policy: The Texas experience. In H. D. Gideonse (Ed.), *Teacher education policy: narratives, stories, and cases* (pp. 1-26). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Joseph, E. A., & Biddle, J. (1992). Teacher education in Ohio, 1960 to 1990. In H. D. Gideonse (Ed.), *Teacher education policy: Narratives, stories, and cases* (pp. 91-109). Albany: State University of New York Press.

9. Mar 4 Spring Break

10. Mar 11 Teacher testing

Melnick, S., & Pullin, D. (2000). Can you take dictation?: Prescribing teacher quality through testing. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(4), 262-275.

Glazerman, S., & Tuttle, C. (2006). *An Evaluation of American Board Teacher Certification: Progress and Plans*. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Pecheone, R. L., & Chung, R. R. (2006). Evidence in teacher education: The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(1), 22-36.

Mitchell, K. J., Robinson, D. Z., Plake, B. S., & T.Knowles, K. (Eds.). (2001). *Testing Teacher Candidates: The Role Of Licensure Tests In Improving Teacher Quality*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. [Read Executive Summary]

Noell, G. H., Porter, B. A., & Patt, R. M. (2007). *Value Added Assessment of Teacher Preparation in Louisiana: 2004 - 2006*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University.

Baber, A. (2008). *Teacher Certification and Licensure/Testing Requirements*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

11. Mar 18 Critical theory perspectives

Apple, M. W. (2001). Markets, standards, teaching, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(3), 182-196.

Hursh, D. (2007). Assessing No Child Left Behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 493-518.

Selwyn, D. (2007). Highly quantified teachers: NCLB and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(2), 124-137.

12. Mar 25 AERA No Class

13. Apr 1 International studies

Hartley, D. (1998). Repeat prescription: The national curriculum for initial teacher training. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 46(1), 68-83.

Furlong, J. (2002). Ideology and reform in teacher education in England: Some reflections on Cochran-Smith and Fries. *Educational Researcher*, 31(6), 23-25.

Menter, I., Brisard, E., & Smith, I. (2006). Making teachers in Britain: Professional knowledge for initial teacher education in England and Scotland. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(3), 269-286.

Dahlström, L. O. (1999). Transforming teacher education for a democratic society: The case of Namibia. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 143-155.

OECD. (2005). *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. Paris.

Schmidt, W. H., Tatto, M. T., Bankov, K., Blömeke, S., Cedillo, T., Cogan, L., et al. (2007). *The Preparation Gap: Teacher Education for Middle School Mathematics in Six Countries (MT21 Report)*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

14. Apr 8 Grass roots policy makers

Bullough, R. V., Jr. (2000). Teacher education reform as a story of possibility: lessons learned, lessons forgotten -- the American Council on Education's Commission on Teacher Education (1939-1942). *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 131-145.

Fullan, M., Galluzzo, G., Morris, P., & Watson, N. (1998). *The rise and stall of teacher education reform*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Kirby, S. N., McCombs, J. S., Barney, H., & Naftel, S. (2006). *Reforming teacher education: Something old, something new*. Arlington, VA: RAND. [Read Chapters 1,2,3,6]

Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2007). A good teacher in every classroom. *Educational Horizons*, 85(2), 111-132.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (Eds.). (2005). *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom : Preparing the Highly Qualified Teachers Our Children Deserve*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. [Last chapter only.]

Glenn, A. (1999). Reflections on renewal: The research university and teacher education. In K. A. Sirotnik & R. Soder (Eds.), *The beat of a different drummer: Essays on educational renewal in honor of John I. Goodlad* (pp. 217-230). New York: Peter Lang.

Sirotnik, K. A., & Associates. (2001). *Renewing schools and teacher education: An odyssey in educational change*. Washington, DC: AACTE. [Read chapters 2, 5.]

- 15. Apr 15 Student presentations
- 16. Apr 22 Student presentations
- 17. Apr 29 Final Exam period (content TBA)