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This was a qualitative study designed to document the historical process which brought about a performance-centered accountability (or results-based) system in educator preparation in Texas as reflected in the documents of the first 17 institutions approved under the new approval process for educator preparation. The study will also serve as a historical record which used the change process in political systems to analyze the adoption of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP). Additionally, the study provided a thorough review of the literature on Michael Fullan's Change Process Model and David Easton's Political Systems Model.

The reform process was documented by utilizing an annotated timeline of the events, activities, forces and individuals that brought about the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort. Additionally, the perception of the extent and degree to which the components of educator preparation programs approved under the new approval process have been actually implemented was assessed by individuals involved in the first 17 institutions approved under the new approval process under the Center Rule. A narrative of the results of the questionnaire will also be provided. Easton's and Fullan's Models were used as theoretical frameworks to analyze the process involved in the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Periods of reform are precipitated by major societal changes. These crises range from domestic concerns, such as a rise in poverty or immigration, to international concerns, such as threats represented by Sputnik or economic competition. The past half century has marked a period in which schools have repeatedly been buffeted by social and economic change. Increasing ethnic diversity and rising rates of drug abuse, suicide, divorce and poverty in the United States are social changes that profoundly challenge schools and teachers in their efforts to influence student performance.

Although many reform efforts in education, in both public schools and institutions of higher education have occurred over the past century, the last 10 to 15 years have been marked as an era of increasing public demand for better schools and higher achievement. In addition to the public perception that schools are unable to respond to growing societal demands, technology, or the lack of technology, constitutes another challenge, a case of heightened yet unfilled expectations.

External pressures on schools, represented by numerous reports such as *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (1983), have focused media and public attention on a perception of problems with the academic performance of students. National commissions and their resulting reports, such as the *SCANS*...
Report, Goals 2000, and America 2000, have pronounced a crisis and suggested several remedies including higher standards and improved testing programs.

The national call for improved accountability places demands on both public school students and the educators who teach them. The National Council on Educational Standards and Testing (Wolf, Lenchlin, & Eresh, 1994) addressed these issues in a document entitled Raising Standards for American Children. The Council emphatically stated that it would be impossible to create quality schools with high standards for students without having equally high standards for those who teach them. If progress in the performance of our children is to be realized, according to the report of the Sid. W. Richardson Foundation Forum (1993), problems must be attacked and addressed in classrooms, where teachers and students interact, as well as the university, where future teachers are preparing for their educational careers.

Goodlad (1990) agreed and suggested that conditions are favorable for extensive reform in preparation of educators for the nation’s schools.

Congress has moved forward on legislation such as America 2000 and Goals 2000 to address education reform. Additionally, national professional organizations have collaborated on new standards for learning, testing and assessment. State governors and legislators have also responded to national calls for reform with state initiatives. Recognition of change in the nation’s social and economic structure has led to a push for systemic statewide reform for schools and teachers. Texas is only one of many states that has implemented significant change throughout the education arena.
The Texas Reform Movement

The educational reform movement in Texas over the past decade has been parallel to, and, in some instances, given leadership to national reform efforts. Like many other states, Texas continues to struggle with the necessity to prepare teachers competent to meet increased demands placed on public schools, demands including the rapid growth and diversity of student enrollment, the need to build a teaching force that better reflects the state's population, and assurance that teachers are better prepared to teach all students in Texas public schools.

The perceived failure of Texas schools to ensure a higher level of academic performance and a minimum incidence of dropouts among its diverse population of school children spurred intensive legislative response aimed at rectifying a state education system that was perceived to be in crisis. According to the document, *Academics 2000: Education Improvement Plan* (1995), policy makers in Texas have been responding to demographic and economic changes with an aggressive reform effort. The Texas reform effort purports to provide state leadership to assure local initiative and flexibility.

Legislative decisions and rule waivers have afforded educators and communities significant levels of flexibility in designing their own local education programs. Examples of reform efforts in Texas public schools include a constitutional funding system that increases equity and adequacy in school funding, site-based decision making on every campus, a state assessment system based on rigorous content standards, a campus and school district accountability system (*Academic Excellence*
Indicator System), and a long-range plan for implementation and integration of technology into the teaching and learning process, including partnerships between ISDs and educator preparation programs (*Academics 2000: Education Improvement Plan*, 1995).

A January 30, 1992 TEA draft document, entitled *A Design for Staffing the Instructional Delivery Team for Texas Public Schools*, emphasized the many requisite changes necessary to move the state of Texas toward a world class education system. To support a system which would better prepare public school students for the "real-world" than the current system, several necessary actions were identified: defining the expectations for student learning (student outcomes), allowing schools the flexibility to achieve the goals for student learning, and adopting a design for staffing schools congruent with other actions. As criticism of public schools has led to reform, criticism of teacher education programs has led to several reform efforts to prepare educators in Texas with the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to teach Texas children.

Many of the same forces which brought about reform in public schools were also instrumental in bringing about reform for teacher education. The focus of this study was the 1992 reform effort related to development of performance-based educator preparation programs in Texas. The study included a description of forces, events and people influential in this Texas reform effort, and an analysis of events using David Easton's political systems model and Michael Fullan's Change Process Model.
Political Systems Model

Since the 1992 Texas reform effort related to educator preparation was initiated by legislative action (a political system), Easton's Political Systems Model (1965) provided a tool in this study for analysis of the political system with other subsystems involved in this reform effort. Easton's model, also referred to as systems analysis, is a heuristic model effective for separating and categorizing experiences in an analytical framework.

Easton's model describes how political subsystems endure over time in a dynamic and interactive political system framework and explains how a society composed of major institutions or subsystems shares perspectives. The political system, one of the subsystems defined by Easton, differs from other subsystems because it is the sole authoritative subsystem which determines the value and allocation of resources for the society or entity impacted.

In Easton's model, environmental and societal demands and influences, both within and outside the system, are disturbances on the existing system by virtue of the stress they impinge upon it. Easton (1965) concluded that demands, influences, and supports ultimately lead to transformation or change. Since the workings of a political system indicate what is going on within the system's environment, Easton's model again appears an appropriate measure to analyze the 1992 Texas Teacher Educator reform effort.
Michael Fullan’s Change Process Model

In any reform movement, dynamic political edicts or mandates put into action outcomes in the form of reform which result in change in the affected social institutions. Such was the case with the Texas 1992 reform efforts in teacher education. These actions or outcomes result from a process of change, not simply an event of change; hence, change must be viewed as a process which occurs over time, rather than a single event. Fullan (1991) described reform efforts today as being much more complex than those in previous years, particularly educational reform.

Fullan’s (1991) change process involves four areas: initiation, implementation, continuation and outcomes. As with Easton’s systems model, each phase of change interacts with each other phase. Events at any stage of the change process significantly affect subsequent stages and have direct impact on the success of the change process or the direction in which the change will go. The interactions of the stages create unique results when the process has been completed.

In Fullan’s (1991) four areas of change, the first phase, initiation, follows the recognition of the need for change. Like Easton’s Political Systems framework, this initial change phase is generated by some form of input. Fullan’s second phase of change is that of implementation, which describes the phase in the change process where the innovation becomes operable or is put to use. This phase usually lasts from two to three years. While Fullan uses continuation to describe the third phase of change, a term more frequently used is that of institutionalization. This phase can best be described as the phase during which the innovation or reform becomes a way
of life for the target institution, or subsystem, as described by Easton (1965). The fourth and final phase identified is called *outcome*. Outcome is directly related to the degree of change which is the result of the change process or reform effort and whether the results or outcome of organizational reform has reached the intended result.

According to Fullan (1991), as new inputs are gleaned from the outcome of the change process, continual reform will result. Outcomes may in fact initiate new inputs in the political systems model, thus creating the need for new reform. Reciprocal processes have potential to enhance improvement in political subsystems as well as to inhibit the subsystem itself.

**Summary**

Societal changes such as increasing ethnic diversity, rising rates of suicide, poverty and drug abuse profoundly challenge schools and teachers in their efforts to improve student performance. National reports, such as the *SCANS Report, Goals 2000*, and *America 2000*, have also focused public attention on a perception of problems with the academic performance of students and declared a crisis. The national call for improved accountability has placed demands on both public school students as well as their teachers. The result has been a push for systemic statewide reform for schools and teachers. The 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort is one of many significant changes Texas has implemented throughout the state’s educational area. This study focused on the forces, individuals, events and activities which brought about the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort.
Easton's (1965) Political System's Model provided a framework in the study for understanding the cause and need for the Texas 1992 reform efforts in teacher education. Easton's model also served as a tool in the study to analyze the inter-relationship of the political system (legislature) with other subsystems (entities preparing educators). Fullan's (1991) model provided a framework for understanding the phases of the change process (initiation, implementation, continuation and outcome). The change process model described by Fullan served as a tool in analyzing and identifying the current phase of each of the initial 17 institutions approved under the new approval process. Easton's (1965) Political Systems Model and Fullan's (1991) Change Process Model also served as tools to analyze and understand the extent to which the intentions of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts have been achieved.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to document the process which brought about a performance-based accountability (or results-based) system in educator preparation in Texas. The study serves both as a historical record and an analysis of the political and institutional change processes with a focus on the congruence between the goals of the reform and the actual results.
Research Questions

In providing a historical description and analysis of the performance-based accountability educator preparation system initiated in Texas in 1992, many specific research questions were addressed.

1. What were the roles and responsibilities of individuals and groups in the early development of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts?
2. What specific actions were undertaken by individuals and groups to bring about policy changes?
3. Was there congruence between the actions taken by the SBOE, the CSTP and the intentions of legislative action and policy change?
4. What were the 17 initial institutions intended outcomes based on the policy change.
5. After four years of reform, what are institutional outcomes for the 17 institutions and to what extent have the intentions of the reform been realized?

Significance of the Study

Numerous studies of educational reform in higher education have been conducted; however, only a small amount of that research focused on components of the change process and its impact as institutions made their transition from a process driven to a performance-based accountability system focusing on the product of their program. Few studies exist that have investigated the reform process from inception to the first round of implementation by examining program approval documents of
Texas institutions to determine evidences of what undergirds the Accountability System for Educator Preparation, as well as the new teacher proficiencies, particularly through the lenses of David Easton's Political Systems Model and Michael Fullan's Change Process Model.

Limitations of the Study

The investigations involved in this study had several limitations. First, the investigation was limited to the original 17 teacher preparation entities which sought program approval under the new program approval process. The second limitation was the availability of documents and artifacts of the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) related to the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort. A third limitation was the perspective of the researcher who was involved directly in the events described in this study. As an active participant, opportunities to influence the researchers' judgment created limitations for the study. Caution, however, was taken by the researcher to review objectively documents from multiple sources and remain unobtrusive when reporting results obtained from the sources used in the information gathering process. The fact that the researcher and two members of the doctoral committee were participant observers in this 1992 Texas teacher educator reform effort was a limitation because of the possibility and likelihood that the interpretations regarding the events, processes and actions related to the 1992 Texas educator reform effort were congruent and possibly impacted the objectivity of the study.
A sixth limitation included citations of sources and confirmation of events with second and third parties. This constituted a limitation since information received by the researcher may have been subjected to personal interpretations by the second and third parties when reported.

Definition of Terms

*Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS)* — The accountability system for Texas public schools used to determine the school’s effectiveness. Indicators within the system include results of the state mandated Texas Assessment of Academic skills (TAAS), drop out rates, attendance, graduation rates, and students in advanced placement courses (*Academics 2000: Education Improvement Plan, 1995*).

*Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP)* — Texas’ state-adopted system designed to (1) assist entities in program improvement for educator excellence and equity, (2) identify entities who are in compliance with state standards for accreditation, and (3) generate information to develop state policy for educator preparation (*TEA, A Paradigm Shift: A Manual of Programs, 1995*).

*Approval document* — A written overview of the proposed education preparation program describing the results of the transition to a Center (if applicable), containing a maximum of 45 pages in length. This document is used to provide evidence of product, provided by the entity seeking approval, and may include such things as program proficiencies including evidences of first year teaching success, Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) competencies identified in the program, assessment for programs and for individuals,

*Change* — A situation, a particular place, status or point as a result of some altering or the organizational structure or organization's culture (Bridges, 1991).

*Change facilitator* — Any individual or group of individuals responsible for implementing an innovation within an organization (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987).

*Change Process* — Organizational change and the activities in which individuals participate as they implement a new idea or innovation (Fullan, 1991).

*Demands* — Articulated statements, directed toward authorities, proposing that some kind of authoritative allocations ought to be undertaken and may take the form of request for justice, recognition and reward or equity in allocating resources (Easton, 1991).

*Field based teacher education* — Professional education courses (methods courses, delivery system) normally taught in a university classroom, established at public school campuses, to include intensive field experiences.

*Field based internship* — Students seeking teacher certification directly involved with a certified teacher to learn about public education.

*Inputs* — Stress-generated influences (demands or supports), also known as outputs of the environment and hence inputs to the political system, and are critical indicators of the way in which environmental influences and conditions modify and mold the operations of the political system (Easton, 1965).
Organizational culture — A system of shared values and beliefs that interact with an entity’s people, organizational structures, and control systems to produce behavior norms (Uttal, 1987).

Organizational climate — Member’s subjective reactions about the organization (Bass 1990, Kozlouski & Dougherty, 1989).

Organizational structure — The way an organization’s activities are coordinated and controlled (Fullan, 1991).

Performance-based accountability system — Procedures that replaced State Board of Education rules regulating specific program components, allows providers greater flexibility to design a variety of programs to meet diverse needs of prospective educators, and facilitates response to the needs of a growing diverse student population.

Political system — A subsystem in David Easton’s (1965) Political System’s Model whose roles of its members often contain behavior that has consequences for other sectors of society (Easton, 1965).


Product - Well-prepared educators who exit preparation programs.

Program Approval Process — The process used by educator preparation programs to provide evidence of ability to deliver educators competent in proficiencies, who meet performance criteria for program completion (TEA, A Paradigm Shift: A Manual of Programs, 1995).
Reform — Changes that occur within an organization. Primarily used when referring to educational organizations (Fullan, 1991).

Restructuring — To preserve and build upon what has been successful in educating children and to rethink and redesign those aspects of the enterprise that have failed (Harvey & Crandall, 1988).

Stakeholders — The individuals who are impacted by the change.

Subsystem — The major institutions that make up a society (Easton, 1965).

Supports — A willingness by members of a subsystem to accept the decisions of the system or the system itself (Easton, 1965).

Teacher Proficiencies — Learner-centered proficiencies on which the Accountability System for Educator Preparation is based and which measure an educator preparation entity’s ability to produce teachers who demonstrate these state adopted proficiencies. The five teacher proficiencies describe what teachers must know and be able to effectively demonstrate so that all children have access to a quality education. They include: learner-centered knowledge, learner-centered instruction, equity in excellence for all learners, learner-centered communication and learner-centered professional development (TEA, A Paradigm Shift: A Manual of Programs, 1995).

Transition — A psychological process people go through to come to terms with new situations (Bridges, 1991).

Withinputs — Demands or influences within the system which lead to stress on the system (Easton, 1965).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Call for Teacher Education Reform

Recognition of change in the nation's social and economic structure has led to a push for systemic reform. Systemic reform pervades almost every aspect of schooling and requires changes on many levels. If progress in the performance of our children is to be realized, according to the Report of the Sid. W. Richardson Foundation Forum entitled, *The Professional Development School - A Commonsense Approach To Improving Education* (1993), the problem and changes must be attacked and dealt with on both ends. This reform effort includes classrooms, where teachers and students interact, and the university, where future teachers are preparing for their careers.

This national call for the restructuring of teacher education grows increasingly louder with criticism of teacher education programs from both outside and within the profession. While the specifics of these criticisms vary, in a review of the literature, Roth (1992) found that they are generally focused upon the following beliefs:

1. Teacher education candidates often lack academic potential.

2. Beginning teachers do not master the content they teach.
3. Teacher education courses fail to prepare teachers for the realities of teaching; and more improved field experiences should be provided to prospective teachers.

4. Teacher education programs have failed to respond to changing societal conditions such as technological development and new multi-ethnic demographics.

The last 10 years have seen tremendous discussions, debate, and decisions about the quality of teachers. Goodlad (1994) stated, "We are not likely to have good schools without a continuing supply of excellent teachers" (p. 1). He continued by posing the question, "What comes first, good schools or good teacher education programs?" His response was that both must come together and efforts should be toward renewing the two simultaneously. Frazier (1993), in his executive summary, *A Shared Vision: Policy Recommendations Linking Teacher Education to School Reform*, concluded, "Public schools struggling to restructure cannot be handicapped each year with the arrival of thousands of new teachers unprepared, to respond to the public demand for change. Simultaneous reform must be the focus" (p. 1).

Educator preparation and lifelong development are the nexus for moving issues related to professionalizing the field of education. For the first time in 20 years, Fullan (1991) believed a growing need and shortage of teachers in the United States exists. Additionally he stated, if any single determinant is acute to change, it is professional development which encompasses what educators bring to the profession.
However, Fullan also held that the preparation of educators is a blossoming enterprise with much promise, but a poor track record. Besides a growing shortage of teachers in the United States, the demographics of university faculty with large numbers of retirements in this decade provide yet another opportunity to restructure and revamp the role of colleges of education through reform efforts and initiatives (Fullan, 1991).

Three major components in educator preparation that have the potential of influencing initial teacher socialization have been identified by Zeichner and Gore (1990). These include (1) general education courses completed outside facilities and colleges of education, (2) methods and foundation courses completed within education facilities and (3) field-based experiences usually carried out in public school classrooms.

To address the first component, there is a trend toward strengthening preservice teachers' subject-matter preparation and other liberal arts courses. The National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education report (1985) also called for a program of liberal studies, subject area specialization, and professional education. Additionally, efforts have resulted in a move from integrated or concurrent four-year undergraduate education programs in favor of fifth year programs. Issues related to the integration of theory and practice have also emerged. This relationship between theory and practice encompasses subject matter and methods, as well as foundation courses. Goodlad (1994) supported this component of teacher education restructuring by concluding "there is a need for a curriculum
tied to a conception of teaching rather than to the somewhat artificial division of knowledge from which required courses are extracted" (p. 290). He further explained that every curriculum component must be developed for its contribution to a professional curriculum, not simply to meet specific content prerequisites. Additionally, the socialization process must become an eminently intellectual one through which students transform their previous experience as somewhat passive course-takers and become active procurators in the learning of others.

In order to address the need for improved curriculum, Goodlad (1991) proposed a center of pedagogy intended to bring together and blend harmoniously and coherently three essential components of a teacher's education: general, liberal education; the study of educational practices; and the guided exercise of the art, science and skill of teaching. The function of centers of pedagogy includes the preparing of educators for early childhood settings, elementary schools and secondary schools of various types. Goodlad (1994) stated the mission of teacher education in a center of pedagogy is geared to the mission of schooling in a democratic society. The mission of a center of pedagogy includes these four components:

1. enculturating the young in a social and political democracy,
2. providing access to knowledge for all children,
3. practicing pedagogical nurturing, and
4. ensuring responsible stewardship. (Goodlad, 1994, p. 5)
Using a hypothetical setting, Goodlad also identified the major task of a center of pedagogy as:

1. developing a pre-education core curriculum,

2. developing an accompanying formal and informal program of socialization into teaching,

3. developing integrated upper-division majors,

4. developing the five-part enculturating general-studies curriculum,

5. developing a field-oriented integration of theory and practice,

6. creating exemplary, renewing school sites – partner schools,

7. continuing negotiations with state universities to develop a joint doctorate in pedagogy, and

8. ensuring equal access of all students to all program components. (Goodlad, 1994, p. 357)

Goodlad concluded that it is imperative there be a school or center of pedagogy committed exclusively to advancing the art and science of teaching and saturating educators in it. Further he identified essentials needed for the center. They include: (1) a dedicated budget; (2) possession of authority and responsibility over a student body of explicit size and qualities, and over personnel, laboratories, equipment, materials, and other resources needed for the professional preparation of its members; (3) a full complement of academic and clinical faculty members requisite for the development and renewal of a high quality curriculum; (4) control of the specifications of prerequisites for admission and, in collaboration with school
officials, the educational use of practice facilities (Goodlad, 1994). Additional measures to improve the curriculum and quality of teacher preparation programs have included the lengthening of the total preparation time as well as a move from integrated or concurrent four-year undergraduate education programs to fifth year programs (Fullan, 1991). Fullan also recommended and believed it is essential that professional components both on campus and in the field occur in earlier collaboration with liberal arts and science faculties.

In looking at change within education courses and liberal arts, education faculties have not received, nor do they currently enjoy, university respectability nor the field effectiveness necessary to bring about effective institutionalization of current educator preparation reform efforts (Fullan, 1991). More than 70% of the four-year colleges and universities in this country operate state-approved teacher education programs with most of their faculty members not typically involved in the production of knowledge about teacher education (Fullan, 1991). States Fullan, universities and their faculties of education have not yet "got it right" (p. 300).

Internship or field-experience, the third and most valued component of teacher education preparation by students, has received much attention during this new wave of reform. Barrett (1987) ascertained that any process to strengthen teacher education programs must include a careful study of field experiences. While many teacher education programs use student teaching as the primary exit evaluation of student competencies, factors such as questionable assessment instruments and untrained
evaluators impede effective assessment. While the field-based experience is of paramount significance in the training of the future educator, it is imperative that such experience introduce future teachers to diverse settings and place emphasis on both time and quality of the program experiences (Fullan, 1991; Goodlad, 1994).

The broader school reform and its consequences needed to rethink teacher education is a major reason for redesigning state requirements for program approval/accreditation. Many schools of education are in fact involved in rethinking their programs and practices, reshaping course work, designing internship programs and creating professional development schools as part of their reform efforts.

Fullan (1991, p. 289) states two assumptions about teacher preparation:

1. Teacher education, or teacher as learner, must be thought of as a career-long proposition. Teacher education or teacher development is a continuum of learning.

2. Teacher development and school development must go hand-in-hand. You cannot have one without the other.

Goodlad and associates (1990) supported Fullan's assumptions. The results of a research investigation called *Studying the Education of Educators* proposed four sets of expectations for teacher education preparation:

1. The program should prepare teachers to enculturate the young into a political democracy.

2. The program should provide teachers with the necessary intellectual tools and subject-matter knowledge.
3. The program should insure that teachers have a solid initial grounding in pedagogy.

4. The program should develop in teachers the beginning levels of knowledge and skills required to run the nation’s schools. (Goodlad, et al., p. 699)

Fullan’s (1991) assumptions as well as Goodlad et al.’s (1990) four expectations for teacher education programs have served as a framework for national and state teacher education reform efforts.

Many teacher education reform efforts have reflected a shift to an emphasis on academic preparation and other efforts to professionalize teaching. Components of these efforts have included the lengthening of the total preparation time as well as a move from integrated or concurrent four-year undergraduate education programs in favor of fifth year programs (Fullan, 1991). Fullan also recommends and believes it is essential that professional components both on campus and in the field occur in earlier collaboration with liberal arts and science faculties.

He further suggests that while this type of initiative is essential and meritorious, the development of these types of reform efforts is greatly hampered by the lack of contact, low mutual respect, low status of education within the university, and a host of other disincentives and diversions existing on university campuses (Fullan, 1991). Until these barriers to collaboration are addressed any reform effort of this nature is likely to fail the test of continuation or institutionalization.
Teacher Education Reform Efforts

Holmes Group

Consisting initially of a small group of education deans from the prominent research institutions, the Holmes group's mission was to discuss problems associated with the low quality of teacher preparation in the United States. The University of Texas at Austin and Texas A & M University were two universities from Texas that were initially in this group. Their report, Tomorrow's Teachers, was released in 1986 and identified seven major assertions as shown in Figure 1.

1. The entire teaching profession should be up-graded and strengthened, including the institution of grades or ranks of teachers in school.

2. Excellent teacher education programs depend on quality undergraduate programs in both teacher education programs and the arts and sciences.

3. Pedagogy and research about teaching and learning are crucial.

4. The undergraduate arts and sciences experiences should be totally integrated with teacher education curriculum and teaching.

5. The undergraduate education major should be abolished and substituted with a five-year degree program leading to a master's degree.

6. High quality competency tests and teacher certification should be developed and implemented.

Figure 1. Holmes group seven assertions about teacher education programs.

The Holmes Group's work resulted in these significant recommendations: (1) strengthen the teacher education curriculum, (2) create a five-year program for teacher education, (3) enhance the stature of the profession and, (4) connect the educational system by linking schools of education with public schools.
John I Goodlad and Associates' Efforts

The work of Goodlad and his colleagues also contributed significantly to efforts geared toward improving the quality of teacher education. Goodlad believed that in today's society, "much more will be required of teacher education programs than simply preparing teachers for individual classrooms, as if the rest of the institution did not exist" (Goodlad, 1991, p. 52). In addition to more being required, Goodlad (1991) concluded that "if all institutions are bones of our civilization, they must be appropriately prepared and attentively nurtured" (Goodlad, 1991, p. 52). Further, if schools are part of the fundamental structure, they must not be overlooked or they will decay. Teachers, Goodlad emphasized, are the main stewards and programs that prepare teachers must alert teachers to this responsibility and prepare them for it. He described four critical dimensions of teaching in schools, which require teachers to:

1. possess a deep understanding of governance structures and process of political democracy and requisites of human citizenship;
2. learn the requisite subject matter twice—initially so it becomes a part of their being and secondly in order to teach it;
3. attain comprehensive mastery of pedagogy; and
4. demonstrate comprehensive grasp of values, knowledge, and skills to be brought to bear in unfolding renewal of schools where teachers spend their professional career. (p. 52)
Goodlad (1991) concluded professional studies are required in the preparation of teachers just as other professions demand. Goodlad’s work included and identified 19 postulates or conditions necessary for effective teacher education, of which 2, 4, 6, 12, 15, 16, 18, and 19 were reworded for clarity in his book, *Educational Renewal* (1994). The intent of these postulates was to lay out the components of an agenda for the redesign of teacher education. These revised postulates are identified in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of the nations’ educators must be viewed by institutions offering them as a major responsibility to society and be adequately supported and promoted and vigorously advanced by the institution’s top leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must enjoy parity with other professional education programs, full legitimacy and institutional commitment, and rewards for faculty geared to the nature of the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must be autonomous and secure the borders, with clear organizational identity, constancy of budget and personnel and decision-making authority similar to those enjoyed by the three major professional schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There must exist a clearly identifiable group of academic and clinical members for whom teacher education is the top priority: the group must be responsible and accountable for selecting diverse groups of students and monitoring their progress, planning and maintaining the full scope and sequence of the curriculum, continuously evaluating and improving programs, and facilitating the entry of graduates into teaching careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postulate Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The responsible group of academic and clinical faculty members described above must have comprehensive understanding of the aims of education and the role of schools in our society and be fully committed to selecting and preparing teachers to assume the full range of educational responsibilities required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The responsible group of academic and clinical faculty members must seek out and select for a predetermined number of students places in the program those candidates who reveal initial commitment to the moral, ethical, and enculturating responsibilities to be assumed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Seven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators, whether elementary or secondary, must carry the responsibility to ensure that all candidates progressing through them possess or acquire the literacy and critical-thinking abilities associated with the context of an educated person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Eight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must provide extensive opportunities for future teachers to move beyond being students of organized knowledge to become teachers who inquire into both knowledge and teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Nine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must be characterized by a socialization process through which candidates transcend their self-oriented student preoccupation to become more other-oriented in identifying with a culture of teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Ten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must be characterized in all respects by the conditions for learning that future teachers are to establish in their own schools and classrooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Eleven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must be conducted in such a way that future teachers inquire into the nature of teaching and schooling and assume that they will do so as a natural aspect of their careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postulate Twelve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must involve future teachers in the issues and dilemmas that emerge out of the never-ending tension between the rights and interest of individual parents and interest groups and the role of schools in transcending parochialism and advancing community in a democratic society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Thirteen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must be infused with understanding of and commitment to the moral obligation of teachers to ensure equitable access to an engagement in the best possible k-12 education for all children and youths.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Fourteen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must involve future teachers not only in understanding schools as they are but in alternatives, the assumptions underlying alternatives, and how to effect needed changes in school organization, pupil grouping, curriculum, and more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Fifteen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must assure for each candidate the availability of a wide-array of laboratory settings for simulation, observation, hands-on experiences, and exemplary schools for internships and residencies; they must admit no more students to their programs than can be assured these quality experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Sixteen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must engage future teachers in the problems and dilemmas arising out of the inevitable conflicts and incongruities between what is perceived to work in practice and the research and theory supporting other options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Seventeen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators must establish linkages with graduates for purposes of both evaluating and revising these programs and easing the critical years of transition into teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postulate Eighteen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the education of educators require a regulatory context with respect to licensing, certifying, and accrediting that ensures at all times the presence of the necessary conditions embraced by the seventeen preceding postulates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programs for the education of educators must compete in an area that rewards efforts to continuously improve on the conditions embedded in all the postulates and tolerates no shortcuts intended to ensure supply of teachers.

Figure 2. Goodlad's postulates necessary for effective teacher education.

The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy

Another significant report focusing on teacher education reform was the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (1986). This report included several recommendations related to improving the quality of teacher education programs as reflected in Figure 3.

All recommendations by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy were essentially reflected in teacher education discussions in Texas during the reform movement. Recommendations to provide internships, prepare minorities for teaching careers, provide schools with technology and the establishment of high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do are specific of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts discussed in this study.

Fullan (1991) concluded that the work of The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy was an effort to improve "respectability as well as field effectiveness" of teacher education. The Forum recommendation to create a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBTS) addressed the need for uniform teaching criteria and improved methods of assessment for gauging how well such standards
are met. The goal of the Forum was to do for teaching what the Carnegie Corporation did for medical standards and prestige through the Flexner Report (1910), which made specific recommendations for improving the quality of medical education and provided the impetus for revolutionary advances in training of physicians (Morrow, 1988, p. 1).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Require a Bachelor’s degree in the arts and science as a prerequisite for professional study of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Develop a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education leading to a Masters in Teaching degree, based on systematic knowledge of teaching and including internships and residencies in the schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Restructure schools to provide a professional environment for teaching, allowing them to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Restructure the teaching force, and introducing a new category of lead teachers with proven ability to provide active leadership in the redesign of the schools and in helping their colleagues uphold high standards of learning and teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mobilize the nation’s resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Relate incentives for teachers to school-wide student performance, and provide schools with the technology, service and staff essential to teacher productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Make teachers’ salaries and career opportunities competitive with those in other professions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Create a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, organized with a regional and state membership structure, to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet that standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.* The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy recommendations.
Three Teacher Education Initiatives

*Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)*

Three initiatives have propelled colleges and universities into restructuring as well and promise to ensure that teachers new to the profession can influence proactively the movement toward high standards of performance for all students. These initiatives include: the September 1992 publication of *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing and Development* created by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching and the recent redesign of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Standards (NCATE) (Stoffels, 1993).

The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) has articulated performance-based standards for initial licensing of teachers that are built upon and compatible with those of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Performance based standards articulate what entering teachers should know and be able to do in order to practice responsibly, and to develop the kinds of deeper expertise that will enable highly accomplished practice as the teaching career evolves. In addition, statements of disposition or attitudes are included to address affective issues.

Using the National Board's propositions as criteria for identifying excellent teaching, the INTASC task force incorporated state teacher competency efforts from California, Minnesota, New York, and Texas. Additionally, the INTASC task force used recommendations derived from the Holmes Group of education dean's report.
and Alverno College's performance-based approach to teacher education. The result of this task force was 10 standards presented in the form of principles articulating the common core of teaching knowledge. Each of the 10 principles is correlated with knowledge, dispositions and performances aligned with that principle. Figure 4 identifies these ten principles (INTASC, 1992).

| Principle #1 |
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful to students. |
| Principle #2 |
The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development. |
| Principle #3 |
The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners. |
| Principle #4 |
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills. |
| Principle #5 |
The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. |
| Principle #6 |
The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle #7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunity to grow professionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.* Ten principles or standards for licensing beginning teachers.

A number of states have already adapted and adopted the INTASC standards to guide their reform in licensing and program approval. Maine and Arkansas have enacted performance-based licensing using INTASC standards as a substantive foundation. Ohio has written new standards based on the INTASC model. Texas, Minnesota and Connecticut have proceeded with their implementation of performance-based licensing using standards that are closely linked to the INTASC standards.

Indiana, Wisconsin, and Delaware are currently considering adapting and adopting the INTASC standards as a starting point to their move toward
performance-based licensing. The INTASC report (1992), *Moving Towards Performance-based Licensing in Teaching: Next Steps*, documents clear momentum for creating a system of licensing that focuses on what teachers know and can do and that links to national professional standards established for professional Teaching Standards and those of the professional organizations.

An important attribute of all standards described is their performance-based nature. They describe what teachers should know, be like, and are able to do rather than listing courses that teachers should take in order to be awarded a license. Performance-based standard-setting is in line with the approach to licensing taken in other professions and with many state level changes already occurring. The criteria for assessment and licensing place more emphasis on the abilities teachers develop than on hours they spend taking particular classes. Performance-based licensing, according to the INTASC document should provide states greater innovation and diversity in how teacher education programs operate by assessing quality of outcomes rather than merely regulating their inputs or procedures.

Performance-based licensing and accreditation systems also demand more rigorous and meaningful assessments for all candidate licensing. Moreover such a system requires rigorous program approval/accreditation based on evidence that programs offer learning opportunities responsive to the standards and graduates can in fact meet the standards for beginning teachers.

Performance-based licensing would require that a state undertake the following steps:
1. Adopt general standards for what all teachers should know and be able to do, and more specific standards as needed in each area for which a license is required. These standards should be clear about the kinds of knowledge teachers must draw upon and the kinds of teaching decisions and activities they must be able to accomplish effectively to support student learning.

2. Develop a comprehensive assessment system that can evaluate teachers’ attainment of the standards. Redesign licensing regulations so that they do not rely on the accumulation of course credits but more so on the successful completion of assessments of knowledge and performance. These assessments may take place in part during the teacher preparation sequence and an associated internship experience and in part in a common examination that occurs in an assessment center.

3. Ensure that all candidates are evaluated according to the same performance standards, eliminating differences in standards that have emerged due to alternative and emergency certification programs. The presumption of performance-based licensing is that while preparation programs may differ in how they organize courses, all entrants must demonstrate that they have mastered the essential knowledge and skills necessary for responsible practice. (INTASC, p. 67)

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBTS)

Although not everyone would agree that teaching is like practicing medicine, many tend to agree with the Carnegie Forum’s major report, A Nation Prepared:
*Teachers for the 21st Century*, that teaching needs to be improved (Haberman, 1986). Launching the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), a private, nonprofit body, with Carnegie Corporation funding of $5 million over a five-year period (Report on Education Research, 1988) was the Forum's answer to the problem. The board established in May 1987 had 63 members including school administrators, teachers (the majority), teacher educators, governors (past and present), children's advocates, and business leaders.

The policies of the national board have broadly influenced all levels of education, affecting teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and boards of education (Caldwell, 1986). National standards have begun to reshape the teaching profession and teacher training through college-based teacher education programs and state licensing and certification procedures.

*National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)*

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has pursued efforts to strengthen the quality of teacher education programs by supporting the standards recommended by INTASC. The efforts of NCATE included changes which encouraged states to work with NCATE as a partner in enforcing professional standards. NCATE also recommended the creation of a program for state partnerships for performance-based licensing and accreditation. Included in several options for state partnership programs was one that enabled states adopting performance-based licensing systems to incorporate those systems into NCATE review as a
substitute for certain other NCATE requirements. The INTASC standards were also incorporated into NCATE's proposals for performance-based licensing and accreditation.

*Professional Development Schools*

Another effort to enhance the quality of teacher education programs include public school-university partnerships and collaboration. School-university collaboration has a long history. The first initiated collaboration occurred in the late nineteenth century by a committee under the chairmanship of Charles Elliot (Clark, 1988). However, since World War II, more recently fueled by national reports such as those from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1966, 1985), The League of Cooperating Schools (Smith & Goodlad, 1966), John Goodlad (1975, 1988, 1991, 1994), and Michael Fullan (1991), partnering in such collaborations has resulted in a national move toward professional development schools where preservice teachers are educated in authentic settings.

Conceptually, a professional development school (PDS) is a functioning school, commonly a public school, which possesses, as one of its fundamental missions, the professional development of preservice, novice, and practicing teachers. The desire is for a superlative learning environment for children and adults.

Several labels exist for professional development schools. The term "professional development school" also appears in the 1986 Holmes Group report, *Tomorrow's Teachers*, and these schools are the focus of its report, *Tomorrow's Schools* (Holmes Group, 1990). The Carnegie Report, *A Nation Prepared*, proposed

The idea of professional development schools was included in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee proposed legislation, the Professional Development Academy Establishment Act of 1989. This Bill would have funded collaboratives between public schools and higher education institutions to provide teacher induction, inservice training, and testing of new teaching techniques (U.S. Congress, 1989). The United States Department of Education, in its FY 1992 budget, proposed the funding of a new program, Partnerships for Innovative Teacher Education. College and school partnerships through this initiative would plan and operate teaching schools that would be similar to teaching universities. A PDS is meant to be more than a laboratory school, a model school, or a setting for clinical supervision of novice teachers. It is intended to be a new institution (Holmes, 1990).

Serving as models of developing best practice, PDSs have emerged and are being perceived as the most effective locations for clinical training of future teachers. Considerable evidence exists that teachers consider their student or practice teaching
experiences to be the most powerful element in their professional preparation (Goodlad, 1990; Levine, 1988).

PDSs have been envisioned as sites where structured induction of preservice teachers, as well as continuing professional development of experienced teachers, are viewed as a priority. Hence, PDSs play a crucial role in the restructuring and ultimately improvement of both pre- and inservice teacher education. Focus on the student and student learning is crucial to understanding restructuring/reform/revolution. The purpose of teaching/learning is "... to ensure that students develop the understanding and abilities they need in order to respond to and shape the world in which they live" (Stoffels, 1993, p. 1).

Stoffels (1993) further stated what is central to the understanding of this point is that focusing on student learning, rather than on teaching, per se, changes the nature of our reaching. The result, she further concluded, is that teacher education is expressed as a framework for student learning.

**Report of the Sid Richardson Foundation**

Activities of the Sid Richardson Foundation Forum also played a significant role in enhancing the quality of teacher preparation programs (as well as the historical process related to the 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts). In 1989, a Texas Summit, mainly for corporate leaders in Texas, was conducted. The purpose of the summit was to motivate businesses to get involved in educational reform. This summit was sponsored by the Texas Research League, Young Lawyers Forum, History Association, Exxon Foundation and Southwestern Bell. The Texas
Business and Education Coalition (TBEC) provided leadership to grassroots alliances and to invigorate collaboration among concerned persons, groups and organizations at both the state and local levels. Several task forces and committees were created, one of which dealt with the area of instruction, curriculum and technology.

One subcommittee of this task force, according to the Report of the Sid Richardson Foundation, entitled *The Professional Development School: A Common-sense Approach to Improving Education* (1993), looked at the subject of administrator and teacher preparation. This subcommittee expressed interest in "the need for educative clinical experiences and a closer, cooperative relationship between universities and schools in the preparation process" (p. 38).

The report of the Sid Richardson Foundation (1993) identified five major objectives of the Professional Development School:

1. to develop the literacy, numeracy and reasoning skills of students;
2. to develop the staff of the school in effective teaching and administration;
3. to prepare future teachers, administrators and teacher educators in effective teaching and leadership;
4. to engage in necessary research and reflection about learning; and
5. to serve as a model of learning, inquiry, reflection, innovation and professionalism for other schools. (p. 3)

The Sid Richardson's report also described the Professional Development School as an open window or opportunity for those whose vision and mission includes educating all persons as well as enhancing the professionalism of teaching.
Summary of Teacher Reform Efforts

The purpose of teaching/learning is "... to ensure that students develop the understanding and abilities they need in order to respond to and shape the world in which they live" (Stoffels, 1993). Stoffels further stated that central to the understanding of this point is focusing on student learning, rather than on teaching, per se, to change the nature of teaching. As a result, teacher education is expressed as a framework for student learning. This framework is exemplified in three major components needing improvement in educator preparation: (1) general education courses completed outside faculties and colleges of education, (2) methods and foundation courses completed outside faculties and colleges of education within education faculties and (3) field-based experiences usually carried out in public school classrooms. Additionally, national and state actions, including those in Texas, have moved forward in supporting the enhancement of these components through their recommendations, initiatives and reform efforts. The new Texas Teacher and Administrator Proficiencies are inclusive of actions resulting from the 1992 Texas teacher education reform.

1992 Texas Teacher Education Reform

Education legislation passed in Texas since the mid-50s reflects a growing importance of public education's role in solving many state economic and social problems. At the crux of this trend and resultant 1992 Texas teacher education reform was the evolving process of certification in Texas. According to the TEA document, *A Paradigm Shift: A Manual of Programs* (1995), legislative actions have
occurred over the last four decades allegorizing this changing trend in educator certification and consequential educator preparation.

This process, evolution of certification in Texas, began in 1955 when a legislative mandate required a Bachelor degree in education for teacher certification. In 1966, legislative actions resulted in principals and superintendents being required to complete 60 semester hours of credit hours prior to certification with a minimum of 12 hours in content areas. Senate Bill 8 (1969) required teacher preparation entities to enter into contractual agreements with school districts for the placement of student teachers and observers in teacher education programs. Subsequently, the State Board of Education instituted the Teacher Center Concept of Collaborative Governance in 1973, requiring each teacher education entity to participate with an advisory board composed of representatives of the institution, the organized teaching profession, and administrators of each school district with which each institution had a contractual agreement.

The purpose of a Teacher Center was to advise the institution on its preparation programs. In 1972, Legislative action resulted in a change of the previously enacted 1966 mandate. Mid-management (principals and central office) was modified to 45 semester hours while superintendents remained at 60 hours. A multicultural component was added to educator preparation. In 1981, a state examination in content area prior to certification was passed.

On May 30, 1983, the House of Representatives and the Senate passed House Concurrent Resolution No. 275, by Representative Bill Haley, creating a study
committee on public education with Ross Perot appointed by Governor Mark White as the Chair (Barron, 1994). The release of national reports on education, such as *A Nation at Risk*, provided impetus for this resolution and state initiative. The Select Committee on Public Education (SCOPE), with 22 members, was involved in 10 school district tours, met 25 times as a full committee and an additional 24 times as subcommittees seeing and listening to concerns regarding public education. On April 18, 1994, the Select Committee on Public Education finalized its recommendations. A special session of the Texas Legislature was called by Governor White on June 4, 1994. House Bill 72 (HB 72), the educational reform package, was passed prior to the conclusion of this special session on July 3, 1984 (Barron, 1994).

In 1984, Texas legislative actions set in motion significant edicts that would result in modifications to educator preparation. The Texas legislature mandated a state-required assessment program for all educators seeking certification, which emphasized subject matter and pedagogy. As a result, the State Board of Education (SBOE) required both individual and institutional standards for the Examination of the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET). Thus the State Board of Education established minimum passing standards for educator preparation.

During this same year, alternative certification for teachers—the first field-based teacher preparation program—was enacted. Individuals in this program were required to hold a bachelors degree prior to program entry and received certification after training and a one year mentored internship, as well as passage of state competency examinations in content areas.
In 1985, House Concurrent Resolution 105 mandated the Select Committee on Higher Education (SCOHE). This government-appointed committee was to make a comprehensive study of issues and concerns related to higher education in Texas. Their focus covered all components of higher education in Texas, including issues related to junior colleges. In February, 1987, the final version of the SCOHE's report was issued with recommendations from the report resulting in most of the components of SB 994 (Barron, 1994).

In 1986, legislative mandates (HB 72) resulted in the approval for development of alternative certification programs for administrators. Similar to provisions afforded teachers, this initiative assisted degreed individuals a flexible entry into the profession. Individuals who sought certification through this route could choose from three delivery models: (1) regional service center, (2) school district, and (3) higher education entry. The comprehensive and extensive collaboration among colleges and universities, educational service centers, and schools serve as a key component of all alternative certification models (TEA, A Paradigm Shift: A Program of Manuals, 1995).

The Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)

History and Purpose

Sponsored by Ray Farabee of Wichita Falls, Senate Bill 903 (1979) authorized the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), resulting in the replacement of the State Board of Examiners with the Commission on Standards for
the Teaching Profession. The Commission was representative of the total education profession in Texas, and included public school teachers and administrators as well as representatives from colleges and universities.

State Board members were authorized by Senate Bill 903 to appoint the members of the Commission and to recommend and oversee standards of educational preparation and certification. The State Board of Education was required to seek advice from the Commission on all matters pertaining to education programs, standards, and certification requirements. The Commission first met June 28, 1979, then convened at least six times yearly. Appendix A includes the CSTP’s brochure including specifics regarding the Commission’s history, purpose, membership, meetings and activities.

The Evolution of Texas Teaching Standards and Certification and the Work of the CSTP

Standards for teacher education and certification in Texas has evolved over time. Beginning in 1912, with rather open provisions, most of the responsibility for teacher education was placed with the county superintendent’s office. In 1915, the state required student teaching for kindergarten, then expanded that requirement to elementary and secondary certification in 1922 and set more specific and broad-ranging institutional standards for teacher preparation in 1955 (Consortium of State Organizations for Teacher Education, 1991).

In 1972, the Texas Education Agency sought to implement a single set of competency-based standards for approval of teacher education institutions. Attorney
General John Hill ruled that a single set of standards could not be implemented for teacher education in the state. The reason given by Hill was, that while the Texas Education Code gave the State Board of Education (SBOE) the power to approve such programs, it did not unequivocally grant the SBOE the power to disapprove such programs (Consortium of State Organizations, 1991). Hence, no enforceable set of standards for teacher education existed from 1972 until the 1984 proposal of a single set of standards by the Commission On Standards for Teaching Profession.

In 1979, as a result of the passage of Senate Bill 903, the words "disappeared" were added to the empowerment of the State Board of Education concerning teacher education. Teaching was also declared in the language of that Bill to be a legal profession in Texas, and its members charged with the responsibility to build and improve the profession. This included establishing a single set of comprehensive standards for entities preparing teachers. The result was the adoption of the 1984 standards by the CSTP. However, the 1984 standards were short-lived because of other statewide educational reform efforts. Two of these included a restructured State Board of Education and recommendations of the Governor's Select Committee on Public Education.

Final passage of a single set of standards for teacher education programs approval by the SBOE did not occur until 1987. The result was the 1987 revision of standards for teacher education programs. Concurrent with the passage of the 1987 standards was Senate Bill 994 (SB 994). This legislative ordinance limited traditional educator programs to 18 semester hours and required that candidates have
a content degree prior to certification as well as pass state examinations in content and professional development. Education as a college major in Texas was eliminated as a result of SS 994. The 1987 Standards of the Commission and the SBOE prescribed the content of a maximum of 18 semester hours of professional preparation for initial teacher certification, which included 6 semester hours for student teaching.

*Senate Bill 994*

According to Barron (1994), the 1987 passage of Senate Bill 994 significantly transformed baccalaureate teacher education programs in Texas and has been the subject of discussion among legislators, state agency personnel and educators. Senate Bill 994 was signed on May 31, 1987 by the Senate and House and sent to the Governor on June 1, 1987. Figure 5 outlines the seven major sections contained in the Bill as filed.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td>Required an applicant for a teaching certificate after September 1, 1991, to have an academic major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td>Limited the number of education courses that may be required for a teaching certificate to 18 semester hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td>Mandated an apprenticeship teaching program which would include a fully planned clinical teaching experience by students enrolled in teacher education programs and after graduation, a period of apprenticeship teaching coached and supervised by master teachers and faculty of institutions of higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong></td>
<td>Required the Texas Education Agency to develop and implement a teacher recruitment program including multimedia program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong></td>
<td>Limited the validity of emergency certificates to three years after the date of issuance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Provided for grants for teaching and education research. The Coordinating Board, out of funds appropriated for that purpose, was authorized to award grants on a competitive basis.

7. Required the Texas Education Agency to sample the inservice performance of public school teachers on a regular basis and report that performance to the school district administrative personnel and to institutions operating approved teacher education programs.

Figure 5. The seven major sections of Senate Bill 994.


The Consortium of State Organizations for Teacher Education (CSOTE) Position Paper (1991), Building a Profession: Quality Assurance in Professional Preparation Programs, reported that regulatory interpretation by the Higher Education Coordinating Board imposed limitations on individual state institutions and required that the 18 semester hours be offered at the undergraduate level. The report further stated it was the belief of CSOTE members, which the authors represented, that Senate Bill 994 was a "manifestation of lack of public and professional confidence in the quality of higher education-based teacher education programs" (p. 3).

Senate Bill 994 and the Texas Induction Program

As Texas increasingly focused upon the preparation and retention of professional educators, the role of mentors became an essential component in teacher preparation. Senate Bill 994 (1987) mandated that all new teachers be assigned a
mentor during their first year of service. This gave birth to the induction program, a first step toward bridging pre-service and in-service in Texas (Barron, 1994). However, this requirement was not funded and was never fully implemented or institutionalized throughout the state.

The induction program was designed with two purposes in mind. The first was to provide professional support and assistance to new teachers in their transitional year from college student to classroom teacher. The second, and most important, purpose was to provide students of first year teachers with better classroom instruction (Barron, 1994).

Centers for Professional Development and Technology

As a result of the 1991 legislation, the State Board of Education and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, under the direction of Commissioner Lionel R. Meno and Commissioner Kenneth H. Ashworth, instituted competitive procedures for institutions of higher education with an approved teacher education program to establish a Center for Professional Development and Technology. Authorization for the establishment of Centers for Professional Development and Technology came as a result of H.B. 2885, conducted during the 72nd legislature regular session, and Texas Education Code, 13.505.

The centers were to be created through a collaborative process which would involve colleges, schools, or departments of education with public schools, regional education service centers and other entities or businesses. These CPDTs were also
required to have rigorous internal and external evaluation procedures that focused on content, delivery systems, and teacher and student outcomes. Additionally, centers were intended to integrate innovative teaching practices and technology into pre-service and staff development training of teachers and administrators (TEA, *A Paradigm Shift: A Manual of Programs*, 1995).

The CPDT initiative was one important reform initiated in Texas involved in a complete rethinking and restructuring of teacher education. In an effort to improve the quality of new teachers, and to attract and retain successful teachers, the Texas educator preparation process experienced a paradigm shift.

*The Role of CSTP in the 1992 Texas Teacher Education Reform*

The CSTP was charged with providing leadership in all facets of educator preparation: revision of standards, review of certificates, and recommendations of new programs. However, its role was advisory to the State Board of Education. Specifically, all Commission activities were designed to foster growth of public education through the continual improvement of preparation programs for educators.

The 1984 legislative mandate provided the initial framework for the establishment of an accountability system for educator preparation. The 1984 legislative mandate was subsequently supported in March 1993, when the State Board of Education (SBOE) set in motion a significant policy change for teacher preparation and certification by moving toward a performance-based accountability system.
These two actions served as the impetus for the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort and was the focus for this study.

In June of 1992, Commissioner of Education, Lionel R. Meno, challenged the Commission on Standards to design a performance-based system aligned with student learning standards as an accountability system for professional educator preparation. This challenge necessitated a number of momentous actions and activities by the Commission: developing a set of learner-centered outcomes for all avenues to certification or licensure for Texas educators; developing institutional components and indicators; recommending assessment standards; recommending educational policy to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education; providing recommendations to entities offering licensure on matters related to program approval and program review; requiring progress and program improvement reports; developing guidelines for the program approval process and requirements for all entities offering programs for licensure in the State of Texas; developing a learner centered evaluation system; and, recommending individuals and groups to assist in fostering the objectives and challenges given the CSTP by the Commissioner.

In response to the challenge, the CSTP and TEA Draft of teacher professional certification set on a course in September 1993. The CSTP presented to the State Board of Education Committee on Personnel five essential components undergirding the performance-based accountability system for educator preparation. These included:

1. teacher and administrator proficiencies,
2. performance-based criteria and standards for individuals completing programs (new appraisal system currently under development),

3. performance criteria and standards for institutions delivering educator preparation programs (program approval process),


This 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort provided a rare opportunity for the education profession to develop its own performance-based accountability system rather than have it dictated to the profession by legislators who mandated this initial impetus for change in 1984. Texas' reform efforts are aligned with national efforts in that they include three major components in educator preparation that have the potential of influencing initial teacher socialization as identified by Zeichner and Gore (1990). These include efforts to enhance: (1) general education courses completed outside facilities and colleges of education, (2) methods and foundation courses completed within education facilities, and (3) field-based experiences usually carried out in public school classrooms.

The 1992 Texas reform effort is in alignment with the recommendations made by national reports and researchers including Holmes' (1986) seven assertions regarding teacher education programs, Goodlad's (1991) proposed four expectations education and 19 postulates necessary for teacher education preparation, INTASC's

The Texas 1992 initiative specifically addressed: improved standards through performance-based criteria for individuals completing programs, improved and increased field experiences particularly through the CPDT’s, and program approval which evidences the ability to attain proficiencies and performance criteria through a more comprehensive performance-based accountability system for Educator Preparation Programs (ASEP). Texas has, however, added a new dimension to its teacher education reform effort by including an emphasis on technology via the Centers for Professional Development and Technology. Hence, technology is a critical component of the Texas reform effort as outlined in the CPDT, and therefore distinguishes this teacher education reform movement from other national and statewide teacher education reform movements.

Change Process Models

A Context for Change

William Bridges (1991) described some of the causes and remedies for resistance to change. Bridges concluded that,

"It isn’t the changes that do you in, it’s the transitions. Change is not the same thing as transition. Change is situational: the new site, the new boss, the new team, roles, the new policy. Transition is the
psychological process people go through to come to terms with the new situation. Change is external, transition is internal." (pp. 1-2)

According to Bridges, unless transitions transpire, change will not work.

Based on the work of the Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, as cited in Hord, et al.’s book, *Taking Charge of Change*, the following includes assumptions about change that served as a basis for these author’s Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM):

1. Change is a process, not an event.
2. Change is accomplished by individuals.
3. It is only when we can determine that each, or almost each, stakeholder in the organization has absorbed the improved practice can we say that the organization has changed.
4. Change is a highly personal experience.
5. If change is highly personal, then obviously varied responses and interventions will be required.
6. Change involves developmental growth.
7. Change is best understood in operational terms; and,
8. The focus of facilitation should be on individuals, innovations, and the context. (Hord, et al., 1987, pp. 5-6)

Susan Loucks-Horsley (1989) agreed that change takes time and attention. She further concluded that change is concurrently a profusely personal experience which is entangled in the norms, structures, and peculiarities of the organization. Loucks-
Horsley also identified four critical ingredients drawn from the knowledge of the change process to describe key dimensions of the change process. She identified them as the four "P's" and averred they are crucial to the success of change efforts and, in fact, must be considered in every effort aimed at change, if it is to succeed. The four "P's" include:

- **People** — their needs, behaviors, motivation, and the roles they play in the change process.
- **Process** — how change progresses over time and what can be done along the way to promote and ensure its success.
- **Practices** — characteristics of the innovation being initiated.
- **Policies** — the pressures or push from policy makers and administrators that take the form of mandates, guidelines, regulations, expectation and direction. (p. 115)

The last 10 years in the field of education has witnessed numerous attempts at what Fullan (1991) described as planned educational change. At the crux of understanding educational change is an understanding of the organizational and institutional factors that influence the process of change. This requires an understanding of the difficulty and complexity of change and an understanding of why individuals resist change. Additionally, it is crucial that individuals responsible for facilitating and implementing change recognize, as concluded by Loucks-Horsley (1989), Bridges (1991), and Hord, et al. (1987) that change is not an event but a process requiring a series of steps.
The needs of individuals who are impacted by the change or reform must be addressed at each step if successful change is to occur. Successful change occurs when individuals draw on knowledge about the factors and insights associated with successful change efforts. David Easton's (1965) Political Systems Model and Michael Fullan's (1991) Change Process Model provided a framework for understanding the factors that initiate and influence change and a knowledge-base to gain insights on how to successfully implement and institutionalize change or reform efforts.

*David Easton's Political System's Model*

*Context and Overview of Easton's Model*

In light of Loucks-Horsley's (1989) fourth "P" identifying policies as one of the key dimensions in the change process, reports such as the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1984) and the consequential 1984 Texas legislative mandate establishing the initial framework for the development of the accountability system (ASEP), Easton's Political Systems Model provided an appropriate starting point for analysis of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform. The numerous reports emphasizing the need for educators to be prepared to address diverse student needs in classrooms also suggest that the boundaries that once defined the domains of education are disappearing and interdependence now circumscribes our reality.

Easton's Political Systems model effectively describes the interdependence and reciprocal relationship between subsystems in our society. His model illustrates a
dynamic and interactive political system framework, as well as provides a rationalization of how political subsystems endure over time (Figure 6).

Easton's model (1965) embodies the shared perspective that a society composed of major institutions or "subsystems" exists in social and physical environments. The environment of these systems comprises social and physical environments.

The universal environment, according to Easton (1965), refers to areas of the political system that lie outside the confines of a political system and yet within the same society. Both intrasocietal and extrasocietal systems make up two fundamentally different types of the many systems external to a political system. The intra-societal environment includes such systems as ecological, personality, biological and social systems. Within the social system lies the cultural, economic, and demographic systems as well as the social structure and other subsystems.

The extra-societal or international society also has three classifications of systems. Social, ecological and political systems are likewise identified under the extra-societal or international society. Two of these systems, political and social, have relevancy for the focus of this study. Examples of the international political systems identified by Easton include the United Nations, NATO and SEATO as well as other individual political systems. Internal to the social systems of this category are demographic, social structure, economic and cultural systems. In a political system, states Easton (1965), the roles and actions of its members often have consequences for other sectors of society.
Figure 6. A simplified model of a political system.

Components of the Political System

Demands and Inputs. Demands are defined by Easton as articulated statements, aimed toward authorities, recommending that some kind of authoritative allocations ought to be undertaken. In essence, these demands are pressures on the institution. They may take the form of request for justice, recognition and reward or equity in allocating resources. Behind these demands lies the common problem of wants, the human condition of longing for something in short supply. In all societies these wants are never plentiful enough to satisfy all claims, therefore requiring authorized agents to allocate resources and values. Demands and inputs, according to Easton (1965), can be employed as the primary indicators in determining the way in which environmental events and conditions modify and impact the operations of the political system. Easton (1965) concluded that by understanding the value of inputs as a concept, one can then recognize the effect of the enormous variety of incidents and conditions in the environment as they pertain to the persistence of a political system.

In addition to demands or influences external to the system, many demands exists concurrently within a system itself. Easton termed these influences as withininputs (p. 114). Influences both within and outside of the system lead to stress. Such inputs delineate how behavior in the various sectors of society affects what happens in the political sector.

Stress. A system may be exposed to stress from demands in two ways. One way is authorities in the system are incapable or reluctant to meet the demands of
the members in some measurable proportions. This form of stress would eventually procreate a high and ever-increasing state of dissatisfaction. Should the denial of the demands persist, the discontent of the members who have influence might spill over to the regime. Thus, to the extent that demands are unfilled, they would have important consequences for the input of support. On the other hand, demands may induce stress on grounds independent of their impact on support. In other words, stress may occur because too many demands are being made, or their variety and content may be such that the conflict they stimulate requires excess amount of time to process. In this case it would be a matter of the system not having time to process. Stress due to input overload occurs as a result of the simple truth that no system is able to accept and process through to outputs in unlimited number and variety of demands.

Outputs. Disturbances in the existing system create stress and result in change. Easton (1965) concluded that these stress-generated influences, also referred to as outputs, ultimately lead to its transformation. In reply to the stress the system either becomes obsolete and is absorbed by some other society or it may respond and adapt itself by adopting altered political structures. This may be in the form of political parties, legislatures or some other form of generalized leadership. Additionally, changes in the environment serve to broaden the type of demands for which satisfaction is now sought through the political system. Easton further concluded that few systems succumb to stress from a stable environment or even from a rapidly
changing one. In fact, many systems are able to cope with the disturbances that may threaten their very existence.

Wirt and Kirst (1992) applied Easton's model to the school's political system and advocated its use for analysis and understanding of educational policy and events. Whatever form an output takes, according to Wirt and Kirst (1992), in Easton’s Political Systems Model all outputs are alike in containing a statement of "who gets what, when, and how" (p. 34). The similarity in all outputs based on this change process model is that they authoritatively allocate values and resources.

Supports. Supports, described in Eaton’s Political System Model, represent a willingness to accept the decisions of the system or the system itself is consistently needed to sustain its legitimacy (i.e., the accepted sense that the system is to sustain its legitimacy). So essential is this input that all societies impregnate their young to support their particular system. The political system converts such inputs, sometimes combining to reducing them, sometimes absorbing them without any reaction, but at other times converting them into public policies or outputs. Clearly not all demands are converted into public policy, for the political system is more responsive to certain values. Figure 7 illustrates a flow of Easton’s Political System Model.

*A Flow of Easton’s Political System Model Illustrated*

The workings of a political system indicate what is going on within its environment and alters or impacts the political system via the variety of influences that flow into the system. By way of its configuration and process, the system then
Figure 7. A flow of Easton's Political System Model illustrated.

acts on these intakes in such a manner that they are transformed into outputs. Easton (1965) referred to these outputs as authoritative decisions and their implementation.

The outputs then reenter the systems in the environment. In some instances however, these outputs may rotate instantly and without go-betweens reenter the system itself. The interchange or reciprocity of the association between the system and its environments are, in reality, simply the outputs of the political system itself. In addition, Easton stated that there exists a continuous discharge of influences or outputs from the political system into and through the various environments. By modifying or adjusting the environments, political outputs therefore sway the subsequent round of effects that move from the environment back to the political system. This process, in essence, illustrates and can be identified as a continuous loop. The basic nature of the structures and operations through which a political system transforms its inputs into outputs are worked upon, then converted into outputs that are sent back to the designated external systems as inputs from them.

Those responsible for running the political system regularly interact in the conversion process with either those outside or those inside the political system. The pattern of this interaction often derives in part from role definitions imposed by the political system itself or with inputs. These may in turn shape the conversion process and its products. Once the outputs of the subsystem have been achieved they become inputs to the other social subsystems that first generated stresses. However, the implementation of outputs in the larger community always has a
different impact. Wirt and Kirst (1992) suggested that a resulting profile of public policy, while varying with the culture of the times, tends to reflect the structure of power and privilege and tells us much about what currently dominates the political system.

*Implications of Easton's Political System's Model*

Whether within the internal or external part of the environment, disturbances arise from changes in existing interactions. Some disturbances or stressors critically encroach upon the basic capacity of a political system's ability to allocate values for society and to persuade most members to accept decisions as binding. In Easton's model, however, at some point, a stress can move from the external environment in the form of exchanges or transactions that penetrate the political system's confines. These *stress-generated influences, outputs* of the environment, are, in reality, inputs to the political system, intersecting and epitomizing those areas in the environment that are relevant to political stress. Thus, in this change process model the inputs, whether demands or supports, are critical indicators of the way in which environmental influences and conditions modify and mold the operations of the political system.

Easton's (1965) model provided a tool for analysis of the Texas political system with teacher education entities in 1992 teacher education reform efforts. The model also served as a tool for separating and categorizing experiences of the 1992 Texas education reform effort in an analytical framework. This framework included
the roles and responsibilities of individual and groups in the early development which brought about the 1992 reforms, events and specific actions undertaken by individuals and groups to bring about policy changes, policy changes that occurred and how they were developed, the impact of policy, and the institutional outcomes for the identified 17 institutions, including to what extent the intentions of the reform have been realized. Additionally, Easton’s model provided a tool in which to analyze the interaction of outputs (entities preparing teachers transition to performance-based teacher education programs) with other members of the subsystem and the political system.

The use of Easton’s model provided a framework for analysis in determining the gap between output and outcome. This gap related to the intentions of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts and the extent to which these intentions have currently been achieved. The fact that the action of the political system may not result in outcomes because outputs can influence society, may generate a subsequent set of inputs to the political system through a feedback loop. In other words, addressing the stress causes a response in the system, the response creates a new stress, and the new stress is articulated to the political authorities, thus, creating a new round for the process—a new reform effort.

Michael G. Fullan’s Change Process Model

Similar to Easton’s (1965) model, Fullan believed that understanding the nature of social and educational changes begins by examining sources and purposes. He agreed with Easton by stating that some major internal or external source (stress
in Easton’s terms) give birth to the need for change. Many sources create reform or innovation as outlined in Easton’s Political Systems Model. As federal, state and local governments have become increasingly interventionist over the past decade, mandated innovation and reform have become more frequent.

Innovations or reform efforts have promulgated through a mixture of political and educational leaders. Fullan (1991) proclaimed that politically motivated change is accompanied by greater commitment of leaders, the power of new ideas, and added resources. On the other hand, change can generate overload, impractical timelines, inconsistencies, uncoordinated demands, overly simplified solutions, misdirected efforts, and miscalculations of what it takes to bring about reform.

Components of a Reform or Change Process

The implementation of educational change involves "change in practice" (Fullan, 1991, p. 37). It involves altering or modifying from a multidimensional level. Hence, according to Fullan, innovation or reform (change) is multidimensional with at least three essential components at risk when implementing any new program or policy. These include: (1) the possible use of new or modified resources and materials, (2) the possible use of new teaching strategies and techniques and, (3) the possible transformation of beliefs. These three components of change are indispensable since together they exemplify the means of accomplishing a designated educational objective or group of goals. The three components served as a tool in this study for analyzing the elements of the 1992 Texas teacher reform effort including the actions, events, individuals, and institutions involved in
the change process to determine if the intent or goal of the reform effort was achieved. Whether or not the goal of the reform is attained is largely contingent on the merit and appropriateness of the innovation for the task at hand. Fullan emphasized that change has to occur in practice along with these three dimensions in order for it to have a prospect of influencing the outcome.

*Phases of Michael Fullan’s Change Process Model*

While many researchers (Dubrin, 1996; Hord, et al., 1987; Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Simsek & Hasan, 1994) in the field of change identified three broad phases to the change process, Fullan elected to add an additional fourth phase. The four phases identified by Fullan include initiation, implementation, continuation and outcome. Figure 8 depicts an overview of Fullan’s model including other terms frequently used for each phase.

*The Flow and Factors Affecting Each Phase of Fullan’s Model*

The flow of Fullan’s (1991) change process model follows the course of an individual, group of individuals or event (input or stressor as Easton termed it) that promotes a specific program, reform or direction for change (initiation). The direction for change advances to a stage of attempted use (implementation). The effectiveness of this second phase is dependent upon the quality of use by individuals involved in the change effort. Continuation is a perpetuation of the implementation phase in that the change or reform effort is adhered to beyond the first year or two.
Depending on the intent or goal of the change or reform, outcome can pertain to several kinds of results. Essentially, outcome can be viewed as the degree or extent of school improvement in relation to specific criteria. A number of factors operate at each phase.

Fullan's (1991) is not a linear process as indicated by the two way arrows in Figure 8, instead the model is one in which events at one phase can provide feedback to modify decisions made at preceding stages, that continue to work their way through a connected interactive manner. The scope of the change or reform effort and the total time perspective of the reform or change are not specifically differentiated in Figure 8.

Initiation, for example, may be in the works for years; and implementation usually takes two or more years for most changes; outcomes can be assessed in a relatively short time period, but many outcomes should not be anticipated until the change or reform has had a chance to be implemented. Fullan (1991) concluded, "implementation is the means to achieve certain outcomes; evaluations have limited value and can be misleading if they provide information on outcomes only" (p. 49). He further deduced that the total time from initiation to continuation or institutionalization can be long, ranging from 3 to .5 years for fairly complex reforms. Major reform or restructuring efforts could take as long as 5 to 10 years. The most significant point Fullan professed from his model is that change or reform of any type is a process.
Figure 8. Michael Fullan's Change Process Model
**Description of Fullan’s Phases**

**Phase I - Initiation.** The initiation phase leads up to and includes the determination to proceed with implementation. Initiation takes a variety of forms ranging from a decision by one authority, or political system as Eaton describes it, to a massive-based edict or mandate, a planned process, or a great application.

Whether a reform effort of any kind gets started is dependent on a number of factors. Fullan identified eight factors that influence or are associated with this first phase of the change process model. Figure 9 identifies these eight factors.

Fullan suggested ascertaining the presence of the three R’s (Relevance, Readiness, Resources) prior to initiating any change or reform effort. Relevance refers to the interaction or necessity, lucidity of the innovation.

Do the practitioners responsible for implementing the innovation have a clear understanding of why this education change is a critical question to pose prior to initiating the reform or innovation? Readiness involves the entity’s realistic and conceptual capability to launch, develop, or adopt a given reform or innovation.

All factors identified had a direct impact and influence on the 1992 Texas Teacher Education Reform effort.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existence and virtue of the proposed change.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opportunities to have the reform effort accessible to the individual.</strong> Fullan emphasized that accessibility is largely contingent on an infrastructure or underpinning of communication. This refers to the ease in which individuals can have access to information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td><strong>External stressors or reform promoters such as political groups and governmental agencies or legislators.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Pressure from the community either in the form of support or apathy. This may be from the national or state level or result from a change in the demographics of the student population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A new policy stemming from the local, state or federal level may also influence the initiation phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Advocacy from central administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>External agents including those in national, regional or state roles bureaucratic orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The opportunities and capabilities to engage in problem solving and gubernatorial briefings or orientations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9.** Factors influencing initiation.

**Phase II - Implementation.** After initiation occurs the implementation time of two or three years, when an institution's individuals attempt to integrate new professional behaviors and knowledge into their occupation. Susan Loucks-Horsley (1989) states that the predominant concern in the implementation phase is one of management. This second phase also implies follow-up assistance.

Fullan outlines nine critical factors organized into three main categories which impact the implementation process: (1) characteristics of change, (2) local characteristics, and (3) external factors. Critical factors related to characteristics of the change include: (1) need, (2) clarity, (3) complexity, and (4) quality or practicality.

Four areas are also identified under local characteristics, including the attributes of the teacher, principal, community and district. The third area of eternal pressure involves governmental and other agencies who play a vital role in initiating
reform efforts. Fullan emphasized the importance of the appropriateness or "fit" between a new program and district and or school needs. In most instances however, it is only after the implementation process begins that this "fitness" is made clear. The need to experience success and progress as well as address perceived needs is critical during this phase (Fullan, 1991, p. 69).

Fullan also identified six themes in the implementation process. These themes have evolved as a result of reforms becoming more holistic in breadth as innovations have moved away from a single focus to multilevel. This broad focus has made it necessary to rethink the change process resulting in a more dynamic and vivid picture of it.

Key themes found in successful reform, or improvement efforts include: vision-building, evolutionary planning, monitoring and problem-coping, restructuring, staff development and resource assistance, in addition to initiative-taking and empowerment (Fullan 1991). Each theme feeds into and on each other. They are interactive and dynamic and are all requisite for momentous change to occur. Figure 10 provides a brief description of each theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision building, according to Fullan, permeates the organization with values, purpose, and integrity for both the what and how of the innovation or improvement. It is a constant process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evolutionary Planning

The blending of "top-down" initiative with "bottom-up" involvement is often an attribute of successful multilevel reforms. This area provides for modifications and adaptations along the way in order to mesh the change, conditions within the workplace and unexpected developments. Fullan terms this as evolutionary planning approaches.

### Initiative-Taking and Empowerment

This process serves as a major itinerary to change. "Power sharing" is crucial to the successful implementation of any innovation. The essence of educational change encompasses the learning of new ways of thinking and doing, the acquisition of new skills, knowledge and attitudes. Providing support through this social process by extending involvement and authority to stakeholders is fundamental to this theme.

### Staff Development and Resource Assistance

Staff development is a central theme related to change in practice. However, the amount of staff training is not necessarily related to the quality of implementation, but it can be if it combines pre-implementation training with assistance during implementation. Failure to realize that there is a need for training during implementation is a common problem.

### Monitoring and Problem Coping

The monitoring and problem coping theme includes information systems and resources, as well as a process for acting on the results. This should involve a means to promote problem solving and problem coping strategies. This theme is not an evaluation as we normally view it. It engages individuals as crucial to the success of the reform as measuring the results of the reform. There are two functions in which monitoring serves: (1) making information available by providing access to good ideas, and (2) exposing new ideas to inspection. The second of these two functions provides a method by which to weed out mistakes and further develop auspicious practices. The gathering of data for the purpose of monitoring the system is crucial. The success of implementation is highly contingent on the establishment of effective ways of getting information on how meritorious or inferior a change is going in the entity impacted. This area is probably the last element of a change initiative that gets effectively, if at all, put in place. It is also the most difficult and complex strategy for change to consummate.
Restructuring

The organizational and sociological configuration of the entity as a workplace, whether it be a public school or university campus, is what Fullan refers to as restructuring. This includes the roles of individuals, monetary affairs and governance, organizational arrangements, and policies that categorically build in working environments which either succor or prod for improvement. Examples might include time for team and individual planning, school improvement procedures, staff development policies.

Figure 10. Paramount themes in the implementation process.

**Phase III - Continuation.** While implementation represents the mammoth barrier at the level of practice, according to Fullan (1991), the question of continuation or institutionalization is critical, since it represents another adoption decision. Fullan described this phase as the stage in which the innovation is built in, as an ongoing component of the system, or dissipated by way of a decision to reject. Eradication of the innovation or reform may occur through attrition during this phase.

The continuation, often referred to as institutionalization, is characterized by the integration of the new practice or innovation into the structure, systems, and routines of the organization—school, district, university or corporation. This enhances the probability that the new practice will remain. Critical to the continuation or institutionalization of any new practice or innovation is the addition of resources to support the change, including financial and support services.

**Phase IV - Outcome.** This is the fourth and final phase of Fullan’s Change Process Model and refers to the end-results of the innovation or reform. The
implementation phase constitutes the means by which one achieves the "outcome" or end results of the innovation.

Even though outcomes, according to Fullan (1991), can be ascertained or passed in the relatively short run, one can not expect many results until the reform effort or change has had time to become implemented. The total time from implementation to continuation ranges from 3 to 5 five years. Reform which involve major restructuring efforts could take as long as 5 to 10 years to assess their outcome.

*Fullan's Explanations of the Meaning and Implications of Change*

What we have learned and now know about any type of reform or change, according to Fullan (1991), is that "it can not be done successfully to others" (p. xiv). Since demand for reform in a complex society is always present, individuals are given a choice of whether or not to change.

Fullan identified two implications one should be cognizant of when assessing the value of a change, innovation or reform. First, the worth of that particular policy or innovation cannot be taken for granted. This point is relevant since one cannot be certain about the purposes, possibilities of execution, or actual result of intended changes. None should be accepted or discarded uncritically.

The nature, however, of educational change should be looked at or examined according to the particular objective values, episodes or events, as well as consequences that are brought about in actual situations. Again, Fullan's (1991)
Change Process Model was used as a tool or lens to examine the events, activities and extent to which the intentions of the 1992 Texas teacher reform effort results have been accomplished.

In the case of Texas' reform efforts, the mission and vision of both legislators and SBOE members included efforts directed toward improving the quality of educator preparation and increasing the achievement levels of all Texas' public school students. As Fullan deduced, "educational innovations are not ends in themselves" (1991, p. 28). Instead, one should endeavor or strive to seek meaning in assessing specific innovations. Individuals involved in the innovation should be suspicious of changes that do not make sense or address the intended purpose of the reform. According to Fullan (1991), we must attempt to determine whether the change initiated is a first-order or second order change. First-order changes are described as those which do not alter the manner in which adults or children perform their roles. These types of changes are targeted at improving the efficacy of what already is being done. On the other hand, second-order changes tend to reciprocate first-order changes. They pursue an altering of the essential ways in which organizations are fabricated.

Fullan ascertained that second-order changes have largely failed and that most changes during this century have been first order ones. Second-order changes that attempt to transform the culture and organization of schools, reassign responsibilities and restructure roles of not only school personnel, but parents and students as well, have become the challenge of this decade.
Fullan's Six Observations or Assumptions About Change

Fullan (1991) identified six observations about change that should be mastered if the reform is to achieve its intended outcomes or results. The first involves understanding of the suitableness of the proposed reform. Does the change have meaning within the context of those who will be involved?

The second area of consideration is what Fullan termed, "another version of inauthenticity of change" (p. 44), or situations where participants believe they were utilizing a new technique or approach, but in reality were not. This observation is also described as the failure of understanding.

Fullan's third observation involves a need for using specifications or criteria to discern the nature and plausibility of specific reforms or changes. What are the objectives and components of the change. This objective examination may reveal that while the goals are specific and have clarity, the means of implementation may be abstract. The beliefs and goals may be abstract, vague, and unconnected with teaching techniques.

An overwhelming number of changes makes it impossible to effectively implement the reform. In either case, Fullan stated such an analysis may lead to several conclusions including the need for additional development, more consistency, additional and/or more appropriate resources. Another possible conclusion might be that the proposed reform fails to provide cohesion or is too prescriptive.
The fourth area to consider is a need to recognize realities of the current state of being or the status quo. For most individuals involved in change, this state of being is so solid, little room exists for reform or change.

Fullan's fifth observation focuses on the fact that change can be very deep-rooted and personal. Change creates qualms about purposes, self-worth and feelings of competence. Failure to attend to these observations from individuals involved in the change process may result in only superficial change, withdrawal into a self-protected shell or in the worst case scenario the rejection of all proposed changes.

The final observation Fullan provides lends credence to this study. This observation poses the question, "How do we know if a particular change is valuable, and who decides?" (Fullan, 1991, p. 45). Fullan's response to this question supported Easton's model by emphasizing that the value of any change or reform is dependent on the values and beliefs of those impacted by the change or reform.

Fullan observed that it matters not whether the intentions of those who initiate the reform are virtuous; individuals involved in the change process will encounter some concerns about the meaning of the new reform or practice, belief, goal, and medium by which it will be implemented.

*Final Insights About Fullan's Change Process Model*

Fullan emphasized that broad implications of any change process are that its implementation process has several interrelated components. Effective implementation depends on the combination of all factors and themes Fullan
identified in his model. The ability to not only identify what causes change but how to influence those causes, stressors as Easton described in his political systems model, will afford change facilitators to bring about more about effective change. To accomplish this, what is needed are better implementation plans.

In order to attain such plans we need to know how to change our planning process. Subsequently, models of change, such as Fullan (1991), demonstrate how to change the planning process by knowing how to produce better planners and implementers.

Fullan (1991) identified 10 "do" and "don’t" assumptions or insights which are basic to a successful approach to educational change. These 10 assumptions are:

- Successful implementation consists of some transformation or continual development of the initial ideas. Hence, do not assume the initial version or your view of the innovation will be adopted or implemented.
- Effective implementation is a process of clarification and requires each individual to endeavor to develop his or own understanding of the change.
- Assume that discord and conflict are fundamental to successful change. These are also natural and healthy components of the process.
- Assume that some pressure (stressor) is requisite in order for individuals to change. The direction and effectiveness of change rely on opportunities for individuals to interact with the change, receive technical assistance and form their own beliefs.
• Assume that effectual changes occur over time. Since persistence is a critical attribute of successful change, thus, it should be viewed as a process of "development in use."

• Assume the reason for lack of implementation by individuals might be value rejection, inadequate resources to support the innovation or insufficient time rather than outright rejection of the reform itself.

• Assume not all individuals involved in the reform will change since progress transpires when we continuously provide opportunities to increase the number of individuals involved in the reform effort.

• Assume a plan is based on the above assumption that addresses the factors known about what impacts those involved in the change is essential.

• Assume that action decisions are uniting a valid knowledge, bureaucratic consideration, impromptu decision and intuition. Hence, there will always exist a hesitation about what action to take, regardless of the amount of knowledge made available to those involved in a change process.

• Assume that the actual agenda is that of changing the culture of organization, rather than instituting single innovations. (p. 106)

Effective reform efforts require developing a thorough understanding of the change process as well as developing a way to think about change. The process of change is not a totally predictable process. Successful reform and changes require a continuous effort of struggling to understand and adapt events and processes that impact the implementation of the proposed change or innovation. "A theory of
change should be judge only in terms of whether it is successfully implemented. Did it actually alter the identified area?" (Fullan, 1991, p. 112).

Concluding Issues and Reflections Related to this Review of Literature

Even though most teacher educators can agree on the need for a body of knowledge and clinical experience in the preparation of teachers, the debate occurs around the scope of knowledge and how it and the preparation for clinical experiences should be presented. During this period of educational awareness, it seems apropos that all teacher preparation programs be re-examined. This is true especially in light of the discussion around the restructuring of basic education and new leadership roles presently recommended for teachers. If meaningful change is to occur in our public schools, then meaningful change must occur in our teacher preparation programs.

To ensure that practicing teachers and new teachers are the best, we must take the necessary steps and expend the necessary time and dollars to make important changes. To do less would be harmful to the children who represent our future.

Reform is designed to bring about change. Change is a process that in any organization does not occur quickly and that is subject to the influence of many variables. In the case of schools, this is especially so because of the organizational structure, and culture and climate of schools.

Furthermore, in order to know if change has occurred, it is necessary to have some indicators to provide valid and reliable data (Blosser, 1989). Fullan's Change
Process Model, coupled with Easton's Political System's model, are appropriate tools to use in analyzing the historical process of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort from a change process perspective. The events, activities, and individuals involved in the 1992 reform movement were analyzed using David Easton's (1965) political systems Model. Easton's Political Systems Model also provided a theoretical framework in which to examine the causes and need for change or reform as well as to analyze the interrelationship of the political system with other subsystems. Additionally, Easton's model created a framework in which to gain an understanding and opportunity to analyze and generalize the link regarding reciprocal interactions between other subsystems and the political system.

Michael Fullan's (1991) Change Process model supported the interpretation and analysis of the historical documentation of reform processes and political systems frameworks. Fullan's model, coupled with the results of individuals surveyed from the first 17 institutions approved under the 1992 approval process, provided tools to use in assessing whether any change in practice had occurred as a result of the reform effort.

Easton's (1965) and Fullan's (1991) models were used as tools for analysis, coupled with the survey data, as a yardstick in which to determine the extent to which the goal and intended results (output from Easton's Model) and (outcome from Fullan's model) of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort have been achieved.
In summary, Fullan’s model for change embraces those factors which must be considered and addressed on an ongoing basis if a reform effort or change is to be successful. Fullan’s model provided four key insights that are important in understanding educational change. The model also provided assistance in the recommendations resulting from this study. The four key insights were: (1) understanding the importance of active initiation and participation, pressure and support; (2) recognizing the crucial role of pressure and support; (3) understanding and attending to the need for change in behavior and beliefs; and (4) understanding and attending to the need for and problem of ownership (Fullan, 1991).
CHAPTER 3

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

This study was an investigation of the process of 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts and an analysis of that process through the lens of David Easton’s (1965) Political Systems Model and Michael Fullan’s (1991) Change Process Model.

The research questions addressed in this investigation include:

1. What were the roles and responsibilities of individuals and groups in the early development of the 1992 Texas Teacher education reform efforts?

2. What specific actions were undertaken by individuals and groups to bring about policy changes?

3. Was there congruence between the actions taken by the SBOE, the CSTP and the intentions of legislative action and policy change?

4. What were 17 initial institution’s intended outcomes based on the policy change?

5. After four years of reform, what are institutional outcomes for the 17 institutions and to what extent have the intentions of the reform been realized?
Data Sources and Collection Procedures

Data for this investigation were collected from a variety of sources. Documents and other artifacts of the procedures, events and activities of the State Board of Education, the Commission on Standards, and various groups who worked with the Commission to initiate the 1992 Texas teacher reform effort were utilized in writing the narrative. A questionnaire was also used to obtain perceptions of individuals involved in the first 17 institutions of higher education approved under the new program approval process. Michael Fullan's Change Process Model (1991) and David Easton's Political Systems Model (1965) were used in the analysis of the political systems change process. These frameworks supported interpretation and analysis of the historical documentation of reform processes and political systems frameworks, specifically as they related to the 1992 Texas Teacher Education reform.

A questionnaire (Appendix A) was developed using the components of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) approval process document, a Texas Education Agency Survey of First-Year Teaching Experiences in Texas, and components of the change process as described by Michael Fullan (1991). Analysis of the results of the questionnaire provided the data used in addressing research questions 6, 7, and 8. Additionally, both formal and informal interviews were conducted with Commission members, staff of the Texas Education Agency, members of the professional organizations who assisted the CSTP, and deans and directors of the 17 identified institutions and Centers for Professional Development
and Technology approved under the new program approval process. Some of the materials used as reference for the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession was obtained first-hand by the author, who served as Co-Chair for the Commission.

Procedures and Reporting of Results

Chapter Three focuses on the methods and procedures used in this study. Investigations in this study involved data collection and analysis, using Easton’s (1965) Political Systems Model, as well as Fullan’s (1991) Change Process Model. The following procedures were utilized to describe the process of change in the Texas political system reform efforts:

Procedure #1

The first procedure involved an analysis of historical documents, formal and informal interviews resulting in the creation of a time-line of significant events and activities which brought about the 1992 Texas teacher education reform. This process also provided an identification of roles and responsibilities of key individuals and groups involved in the early development of the 1992 reform effort. Additionally, this procedure identified and provided a description and discussion regarding policy changes and intended results which occurred as a result of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort. This procedure specifically addressed research questions 1, 2, and 3:

Research Question #1: What were the roles and responsibilities of individuals and groups in the early development of the 1992 Texas Teacher education reform efforts?

Research Question #2: What specific actions were undertaken by individuals and groups to bring about policy changes?
Research Question #3: Was there congruence between the actions taken by the SBOE, the CSTP and the intentions of legislative action and policy change?

Results of this procedure were reported in a narrative format including an annotated time line and a description and discussion of the roles and responsibilities of individuals involved in this initiative, as well as forces, events and activities which brought about the 1992 Texas teacher reform effort. Additionally, the narrative included a description and discussion of the policy changes and intended results.

Procedure #2

The second procedure involved an analysis of the results of a survey and interviews conducted to determine outcomes of the political systems change process for the initial 17 programs approved under the Center Rule. Michael Fullan's Change Process Model (1991) and David Easton's Political Systems Model (1965) were used in the analysis of the political systems change process. These frameworks supported the interpretation and analysis of historical documentation of reform processes and political systems frameworks, specifically as they related to the 1992 Texas teacher education reform. Michael Fullan's Change Process Model, including all four phases (initiation, implementation, continuation and outcome), provided the procedures by which to assess the effectiveness and phases of the change process related to the 1992 reform as perceived by individuals involved in the first 17 institutions approved through the new program approval process. The data obtained from the results of interviews and the questionnaire used to survey the initial 17
institutions approved under the new program approval process were analyzed to determine outcomes under the new approval process.

In addition to the data collected and analyzed from the interviews and questionnaires, David Easton's (1965) Political System and Michael Fullan’s (1991) Change Process Models were used as tools in analyzing and addressing research questions #4, #5:

Research Question #4: What were the 17 initial institution’s intended outcomes based on the policy change?

Research Question #5: After four years of reform, what are institutional outcomes for the 17 institutions and to what extent have the intentions of the reform been realized?

Subjects

Subjects for this study were individuals involved in the first 17 institutions approved through the new approval process. Persons asked to complete the survey included Directors of the Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDT), administrators, and faculty members of the 17 institutions initially approved under the new program approval process. A listing of those 17 institutions is found in Appendix A. The listing of the 17 institutions was compiled from data available through the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession documents, as well as the Texas Education Agency.
Instruments

A questionnaire (Appendix A) was developed using the components of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) approval process document, a Texas Education Agency Survey of First-Year Teaching Experiences in Texas, and components of the change process as described by Michael Fullan (1991).

The questionnaire was relevant and applicable to this study since it was concerned with components of the change process as well as components of the program approval process, which is a part of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP). Perceptions of individuals impacted by the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort were indicators of how the change process evolved in this political systems reform. The questionnaire requested demographic information; information concerning the teacher preparation program at each identified institution; and a rating of the educator preparation program at each entity, as perceived by each respondent, using a "degree of satisfaction" rating with the Likert scale: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Somewhat Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, and 5=Very Satisfied.

Procedures for Questionnaire

In July, 1996, questionnaires and an accompanying cover letter were mailed to the identified directors of CPDTs, deans of those institutions and the identified participants in the programs at these institutions. Respondents were asked to return completed questionnaires in sealed, stamped and self-addressed envelopes provided. All responses were kept confidential. Follow-up letters and questionnaires were
mailed after two weeks time had elapsed, to those institutions not responding. A return rate of 50% was required before data were analyzed. Personal follow-up calls and personal visits were used to ensure a 50% return.

Analysis and Reporting of the Data

The generated data were primarily descriptive with frequency distributions, percentages, and means computed and placed in tabular form. Data were also divided into four groups as identified by the phases of Fullan’s Change Process Model (1991). A coding scale was developed to identify each of the four phases of Fullan’s (1991) Change Process Model (initiation, implementation, continuation and outcome) based on data resulting from the questionnaires and interviews. A narrative conclusion was written in the form of summaries addressing questions #4 and # 5.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

The 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts involved many individuals, groups of individuals, and institutions. As the reform effort evolved, the number of individuals and groups involved in the efforts of developing a performance-based accountability system also increased. The large number of participants in the reform effort afforded those individuals and organizations the opportunity for input and, ultimately, ownership of the final product.

A comprehensive review of available documents from the Texas State Board of Education (SBOE), Texas Education Agency (TEA), Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), and various individuals and professional organizations was used to address the first three research questions:

Research question #1:
What were the roles and responsibilities of individuals and groups in the early development of the 1992 Texas Teacher education reform efforts?

Research question #2
What specific actions were undertaken by individuals and groups to bring about policy change?

Research question #3:
Was there congruence between the actions taken by the SBOE, the CSTP and the intentions of legislative action and policy change?

Appendix A identifies data sources and the type of information used in this study.
An intensive review of documents related to legislative actions occurring prior to 1992 also took place. Legislative actions provided the impetus for policy changes which resulted in the 1992 Texas teacher education reforms. Once the preparation of teachers was identified as an issue for action by Texas legislators, specific rules and policy development were delegated to the SBOE and the Commission and, through them, to members of the profession. Throughout this chapter, interactions are noted between and among individuals and groups and their actions as related to policy formulation, and rule changes.

Role and Responsibilities in Teacher Education Reform

The Roles and Responsibilities of the Texas Legislature

Attempting to address the identified problems or areas of concern, the Texas legislature, through legislative actions, played a central role in the 1992 teacher education reform effort. As early as 1984, legislative actions provided the initial framework for the establishment of an accountability system for educator preparation. Legislation required certified teachers to pass reading and writing competency tests and also required new entrance tests for all prospective teachers. An assessment program for all educators seeking certification emphasized basic knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy.

The following year, the Select Committee on Higher Education (SCOHE) made a comprehensive study of all issues and concerns related to higher education in Texas. The final report, "The Report of the Select Committee on Higher Education"
(February, 1987), contained 14 recommendations specifically related to teacher education. In the final report, two of the recommendations were eliminated:

- Experimentation in teacher education programs be encouraged, and
- The legislature should provide adequate funding for all teacher education offerings, particularly ones which require planning and supervision of field experiences.

Table 1 identifies the original 14 recommendations.

As a result of the Select Committee recommendations, 16 bills were filed: three were companion bills, and several of the bills of one house duplicated sections of bills from the other house. Eventually, 8 of the 16 bills were passed and signed into law: HCR 106, HCR 107, SB 994, HB 2181, HB 2182, HB 2183, SCR 49, and SCR 55 (Barron, 1994); but, Senate Bill 994 was to have the greatest impact on teacher education preparation.

**Senate Bill 994**

According to Barron (1994), the 1987 passage of Senate Bill 994 significantly transformed baccalaureate teacher education programs in Texas. Table 2 outlines the seven major sections contained in the Bill as filed. This legislation limited traditional educator programs to 18 semester hours and required that candidates have a content degree prior to certification. In effect, education as a college major in Texas was eliminated as a result of SB 994.
**Recommendations of the Select Committee on Higher Education**

1. Require Texas Education Agency to develop and implement throughout Texas an intensive recruitment program designed to attract qualified minority and non-minority candidates to the teaching profession.

2. Require the legislature to fund an intensive and recurring multimedia program comparable to those used in military recruitment, and directed by the Texas Education Agency to attract candidates to the teaching profession in Texas.

3. Require TEA to establish and sustain cooperative networks between universities and elementary and secondary schools to identify and cultivate talented young prospects to teaching.

4. Require legislation that would increase forgivable loans to teacher trainees per school year for each highly qualified student and forgive the loan after completion of seven consecutive years of teaching in a Texas public school.

5. Require teacher certification candidates to obtain a baccalaureate degree with a major in one or more academic areas.

6. Require undergraduate prerequisites for teacher education not extend beyond the minor.

7. Require post-graduate courses directed toward post-baccalaureate degrees be sustained at selected universities.

8. Require an increase in the amount of clinical experience in authentic settings via programs designed using joint planning and supervision by school districts and university and college faculties.

9. Require adequate funding be provided by legislature for all teacher education offerings, particularly those involving the planning and supervision of field experiences.

10. Require the coordinating board initiate a study to determine if college and university teacher education faculty are paid commensurate with teachers in other fields and disciplines.

11. Require the legislature to fund a special program of competitive grants to Texas universities and colleges for research in learning, teaching, and effective early childhood education.

12. Require the termination of issuance of emergency training certificates on a phase-in basis during the next eight years with a three year limit on emergency certificates.

13. Require TEA to evaluate at intervals the in-service performance of samples of public school teachers. Personnel in school districts and approved teacher education programs will be provided the results of these evaluations.

14. Require efforts be initiated which would encourage experimentation in teacher education programs.

### Table 2

The Seven Major Sections of Senate Bill 994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Required an applicant for a teaching certificate after September 1, 1991 to have an academic major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Limited the number of education courses that may be required for a teaching certificate to 18 semester hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mandated an apprenticeship teaching program which would include a fully planned clinical teaching experience for students enrolled in teacher education programs and after graduation, a period of apprenticeship teaching coached and supervised by master teachers and faculty of institutions of higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Required the Texas Education Agency to develop and implement a teacher recruitment program including a multimedia program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Limited the validity of emergency licenses/permits to three years after the date of issuance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Provided for grants for teaching and education research. The Coordinating Board, out of funds appropriated for that purpose, was authorized to award grants on a competitive basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Required the Texas Education Agency to sample the inservice performance of public school teachers on a regular basis and report that performance to the school district administrative personnel and to institutions operating approved teacher education programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Senate Bill 994 (1987) also mandated that all new teachers be assigned a mentor during their first year of service. This requirement led to induction programs, a first step toward bridging pre-service with in-service teaching in Texas (Barron, 1994). In fact, a full induction program had been proposed previously by the Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (TACTE) Dean's Council and had passed, but was not funded for the requested 16 million dollars. SB 994
addressed 12 of the 14 recommendations of the Select Committee on Higher Education.

Other Teacher Education Legislative Actions from 1984 through 1992

In addition to SB 994, several other critical legislative actions related to teacher assessment and evaluation occurred. Texas was one of 23 states that had implemented teacher testing by 1984. By 1986, 39 states had implemented teacher testing (TEA, 1993a). The first administration of the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) to teacher education program applicants occurred in 1984. In 1989, the PPST was replaced in Texas with the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP). All students attending Texas public colleges and universities were required to pass this basic test of mathematics, reading, and writing skills during their first year in attendance. Additionally, in 1986, all practicing teachers and administrators were required to pass the Texas Examination of Current Administrators and Teachers (TECAT) as a prerequisite to renewing their certificates.

In the 1987 school year, the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS) was implemented. The TTAS was developed to implement House Bill 72 and was intended to encourage professional growth for both teachers and administrators and to improve instruction in Texas classrooms (TEA, 1986). Two other legislative actions included approval of an alternative certification development plan for administrators (1986) and the requirement that alternative certification candidates pass State examinations in content areas as well as educator professional
development beginning in 1992. These legislative actions demonstrate increased scrutiny and accountability which was placed on teachers and prospective teachers. Educator preparation programs had been limited to 18 hours and the EXCET testing program was in place. However, accountability had not been established at the program level for the quality of new teachers.

Role and Responsibility of the State Board of Education

The Texas State Board of Education serves as the policy-making body for PK-12 public education. In its formulation of rules and guidelines, the SBOE played a pivotal role in the 1992 teacher education reform effort. This elected governmental body responded to legislative actions regarding a performance-based accountability system for teacher education in Texas. Among other actions from 1986 to 1992, this Board oversaw the teacher testing and appraisal process and set both individual and institutional standards for the Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET).

Under legislation passed as part of Senate Bill 1 in 1990, SBOE rules covering teacher education and certification expired on June 1, 1993. This sunset review process provided the SBOE the opportunity to address major issues related to professional educator preparation policy development. In June of 1992, the SBOE approved a calendar for reviewing the chapters of the Texas Administrative Code relating to teacher education and certification.
In 1992, the State Board of Education established a public school accountability system, the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS), designed to hold school districts accountable for student learning. In September 1992, the SBOE also adopted a policy statement addressing the State's goals of preparing more teachers to meet the diverse needs of Texas public school students, of building a teaching force that better reflected the diversity of its population, and assuring Texas better preparation of teachers for these diverse classrooms. This policy statement proposed a variety of avenues to prepare qualified individuals for the education profession.

In March 1993, the SBOE significantly altered its policy for teacher education, assessment, and certification by recommending a performance-based accountability system for teacher education. This policy change advocated professional preparation and development as an ongoing collaborative effort among public schools, education service centers, and other entities involved in educator preparation. This policy initiative consisted of four components:

1. teacher and administrative proficiencies,
2. performance criteria for educator preparation entities,
3. program approval process, and
4. reengineering of the certification system for teachers and administrators.

A list of State Board members and the positions they held when 3 of the 4 components of the performance-based accountability system were adopted is found in Appendix A. The first three components were formally adopted by the State Board of Education in 1994 and 1995.
Role and Responsibility of the Commissioner of Education and TEA Staff Members

Both the Commissioner of Education and TEA staff members, in the Division of Educator Preparation and Appraisal, played significant roles in the early development of the 1992 teacher education reform effort.

The Commissioner of Education, serving in the role of Executive Officer of the State Board of Education, and with the assistance of staff members employed by the Texas Education Agency, is responsible for implementing the policies and procedures adopted by the State Board of Education. The Commissioner of Education from 1990-1995, Dr. Lionel R. Meno, provided much of the philosophical leadership for the performance-based accountability system through his work with the State Board, the legislature, preparation entities, and the teacher education community at large. Among his first actions were the establishment of partnership schools and mentor schools which were designed so that public schools could increase cooperation with universities, businesses, regional service centers, and among themselves.

At the center of this effort was the Commissioner's often-stated goal that schools and teachers should focus on the achievement of students. His emphasis on results rather than methods was congruent with legislative actions and SBOE direction. This accountability was first applied to public schools by shaping existing testing into a comprehensive accountability system: the Academic Excellence Indicator System. Under this system, each school received a "report card." Several indicators—including TAAS scores, attendance levels, drop-out rates, and student
participation in advanced placement classes—were provided to the public. The AEIS was to be a harbinger for both the direction and the form of teacher education reform.

TEA staff members, in the Division of Educator Preparation and Teacher Appraisal, provided technical assistance in the implementation of teacher education policies including the review of programs. Monitoring teacher education programs was carried out to provide quality assurance for policies and procedures adopted by the State Board. This group also provided technical assistance to alternative certification programs and assisted the legislators and the SBOE in the approval of the funded Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDT). The TEA staff had been nearly overwhelmed by the program approval process for initial teacher certification under the 1984 standards and, after SB 994, under the 1987 standards.

Discontent with the existing approval process, along with concerns about traditional teacher education preparation, led to several reports from TEA staff members and advisory committees. These reports espoused the philosophy of Commissioner Meno, emphasized flexibility and accountability for student performance, and encouraged opportunities for collaboration between and among public schools, regional service centers, and entities preparing teachers. An example included the September 20, 1991 Texas Education Agency Reorganization Advisory Committee report which noted three important points:
• For a delivery system to be most efficient, all organizational components must be included in the planning, be involved in the implementation of the plan, and be held accountable for the results.

• Universities approved by TEA to prepare teachers and/or other certified professional staff must involve public school practitioners in developing those preparatory programs and in selecting faculty.

• Universities preparing teachers and/or other certified professional staff must have flexibility to make program decisions to meet expressed needs of school districts. (p. 2.)

Additionally, a January 30, 1992 draft document, "A Design for Staffing the Instructional Delivery Team for Texas Public Schools," was presented by TEA staff members from the Division of Educator Preparation. This document stated that, for the State of Texas to move toward a world-class education system, many changes needed to be made. This report included several actions required to support a system for students who are better prepared for the "real-world":

• defining the expectations for student learning (student outcomes),

• allowing schools the flexibility to achieve the goals for student learning, and

• adopting a design for staffing schools congruent with the other actions.

A report of the Professional Development Task Force, an entity appointed by the State Board, also identified several actions needed. The position paper of the Task Force on Professional Preparation and Development issued 12 policy statements.
Seven of the 12 policy statements focused specifically on professional preparation and are listed in Table 3.

The leadership provided by TEA staff members of the Division of Educator Preparation and Appraisal was critical throughout the 1992 teacher education reform effort. Texas Education Agency staff members who played a significant role are identified in Appendix A.

_The Role of CSTP in the 1992 Texas Teacher Education Reform_

While the SBOE set in motion the policy change that moved educator preparation and certification toward a performance-centered accountability system, the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession served as the change facilitator for this process. In June of 1992, the Commissioner of Education, Dr. Lionel Meno, charged the CSTP with facilitating the change process. The CSTP was to provide leadership in all facets of educator preparation: revision of standards, review of certificates, and recommendation of new programs. In its advisory role to the State Board of Education, Commission activities were designed to foster growth of public education through the continual improvement of preparation programs for educators. The CSTP vision statement (Table 4) for Texas' teachers and administrators guided its efforts in assisting the State Board of Education in policy changes for an accountability system for educator preparation programs.
Table 3

Task Force on Professional Preparation and Development:
12 Policy Statements

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The legislature must provide appropriate resources for quality professional preparation and development programs in support of quality education for the students of Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Professional preparation and development programs may be varied in design and should be a collaborative and collegial effort among institutions of higher education, education service centers, public school districts, state agencies, professional associations, and private industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Programs for the preparation and development of professional school personnel must be a top priority of institutions of higher education and should be reflected by the allocation of appropriate resources and implementation of policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A variety of programs should be developed to identify, recruit, prepare, induct, and retain qualified individuals for the education profession, with special emphasis on minority populations, under-represented groups, and critical shortage areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. | Professional preparation and development programs should:  
   - reflect state-of-the-art teaching and learning practices based on current research;  
   - respond to current and emerging needs in areas such as technology, the arts, affective needs of students, etc.;  
   - provide educators with knowledge and experience to work effectively with students in an ever-expanding diverse culture;  
   - be field-based including induction and internship experiences;  
   - promote concepts and skills for site-based decision making and total quality management;  
   - include needs assessment, collaborative design and delivery, and evaluation; and,  
   - address the short and long-range goals of the campus, the district, and the state. |
| 6. | A professional licensure/certificate system should be adopted which encores and reflects continuous professional development. |
| 7. | Professional preparation and development programs should be addressed through a variety of techniques which focus on teacher effectiveness and eventually on broad student outcomes. |

Table 4

CSTP Vision Statement

To ensure a greater nation through the contributions of the inhabitants and educational entities of the state of Texas, we will take a leadership role in developing an educational system which will maximize achievement for all students of Texas. Hence, all students will become productive citizens, become creative problem solvers, and be able to communicate their needs effectively. Thus, we envision:

A learner-centered framework on which educator preparation entities may design a model program which will assure effective teaching practices to meet the demands of the twenty-first century; and an accountability system by which the above strategies may be measured to ensure excellence through equity for all children (1992).

Legislation established that members of the Commission represented the profession, as well as the State Board of Education. Table 5 identifies members of the Commission in 1992, at which time the teacher education accountability charge was given to it by Dr. Lionel Meno, Commissioner of Education, and the Accountability System for Educator Preparation was actually adopted by the State Board of Education.

When Commissioner Meno redirected the CSTP to a mission of accountability rather than process, the members of the Commission worked on the 1984 and 1987 standards and, from 1987 through 1989, approved over 2,000 university-based programs from 65 entities. However, this approval process had not been deemed very effective and did not focus on quality improvement. In fact, the Commission spent almost two years working on guidelines for program visitation and monitoring
before giving up the task. Steve Tipps, co-chair said, "Existing teacher education standards failed to describe quality. Instead they hold universities to a rigid process and procedure which limits flexibility and creativity. Requiring any number of hours does not assure quality of output" (personal communication, 1996).

The charge given Commission members included the responsibility to work with members of the profession in an adaptive and systematic way to design an accountability system which would be interactive and developmental and which would meet the needs of individual institutions and entities responsible for preparing teachers. The intent of the performance-based accountability system was to produce a teaching force which would enhance student success and achievement. In a June 30, 1992 communication to Dr. Meno, the Chair of the CSTP affirmed that CSTP members had reached a consensus in accepting and demonstrating their willingness to work toward the expectations and challenges he had given them.

The Role of Professional Organizations

Several professional education organizations in Texas also performed crucial responsibilities during the 1992 teacher education reform effort. The CSTP requested that two professional organizations—Texas Professors of Educational Administration and the Texas Consortium of State Organizations for Teacher Education—draft the initial proficiencies for teachers and administrators. The initial drafts identified 11 proficiencies for administrators and 12 for teachers and included detailed descriptors of knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The initial proficiencies are listed in Appendix B.
In developing the initial proficiencies, these two organizations considered recommendations from the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, the Kentucky Reform Movement, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education. Following the development of teacher and educator proficiencies, the Texas Professional Counselors organization was proactive in initiating new proficiencies for Texas counselors using a similar format.

**Individuals and Groups Roles and Responsibilities**

Teacher professional organizations (TSTA, ATPE, TCTA) were also included in many advisory groups and response groups during this period. Representatives of professional organizations regularly attended CSTP meetings and State conferences. Both the SBOE and CSTP were committed to broad participation and understanding of the proficiencies by teachers and teacher educators. Therefore, two actions were undertaken to expand the opportunities to review, comment upon, and make recommendations: focus groups and survey of job relatedness. The input provided by participants was instrumental in refining the documents representative of the teacher and administrator proficiencies as well as other components of the ASEP.
Actions Toward Performance-Based Teacher Education

Pursuant to legislative actions and SBOE policy, many specific actions were undertaken by individuals and groups over a four year cycle to bring about policy changes and move teacher education programs in Texas toward a performance-based accountability system. The actions address research question #2: "What specific actions were undertaken by individuals and groups to bring about policy changes?"

A chronological record of these actions are shown in Table 5. A descriptive narrative focuses on key points, issues, recommendations, and actions. The timeline found in Table 5 identifies the many activities or actions taken over 10 years which contributed to the accountability system.

Beginning the Reform Effort

According to a September 20, 1991 report of the Texas Education Agency Reorganization Advisory Committee, public school educators reported that universities had generally been of little or no assistance to districts in raising the performance level of students and were perceived to be out-of-touch with current school conditions. Beginning teachers were seen as unprepared for what faced them on the job. Educators in higher education expressed many of the same concerns but indicated that rigid, restrictive controls left them in situations similar to those found in public schools. In other words, entities preparing teachers perceived they did not have the flexibility and resources to be creative and/or to respond to the needs of school districts.
### Table 5

*Historical Perspective on the Development of the Texas Educator Excellence Indicator System (ASEP)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Summer 1984  | **SB 994 introduced:**  
  - Texas legislature mandated the development and implementation of a state-required assessment program for all educators seeking certification which emphasized basic knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy.  
  - Beginning of teacher induction program.  
  - SBOE required to set both individual and institutional standards for the Examination for Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET). |
| 1990         | **Senate Bill 1 rules covering teacher education expired beginning the Sunset Review Process.**                                                      |
| May 17-18, 1990 | **CSTP meeting focused on:**  
  - a new look at the approval process  
  - exploratory topics to be considered at the Dean’s retreat  
  - basic operating procedures for program approval.                                           |
| March 15, 1991 | **CSTP meeting focused on:**  
  - Program approval process progress from the Committee for Recruitment and Training/Visiting Teams. (Report included a flowchart, timeline and outline of the progress and immediate goals of the committee.) |
| March 25, 1991 | **Dr. Meno sent information to Deans/Directors of approved teacher education programs at colleges and universities regarding the schedule for teacher education program review.** |
| July 19, 1991 | **CSTP meeting focused on:**  
  - An Interim Report: A working paper submitted by CSOTE on state program approval process.  
  - Draft on requirements for professional certificates.                                       |
| September 20, 1991 | **CSTP meeting focused on:**  
  - Report of TEA Reorganization Advisory Committee                                               |
| Nov. 15, 1991 | **CSTP meeting focused on:**  
  - Future direction discussed with Commissioner Meno.  
  - Review of Agency reorganization report.  
  - Self-study questions generated by CSTP members.  
  - Discussion of relationship of CSTP with CSTP and commissioner regarding future direction.  
  - Discussion of H.B. 2885, Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDT). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| January 20, 1992 | CSTP meeting focused on:  
  - Draft document entitled, "A Design for Staffing the Instructional Delivery Teams for Texas Public Schools" was presented to CSTP.                                                                                 |
| Feb. 28-March 2, 1992 | CSTP Retreat focused on:  
  - CSTP mission, roles, outcomes and strategic plan of action.                                                                                                                                                           |
| June, 1992      | - SBOE approved a calendar for reviewing chapters of the Texas Administrative Code related to teacher education and certification.                                                                                         |
| June 1992       | CSTP meeting focused on:  
  - Commissioner of Education, Lionel (Skip) Meno, urged CSTP to move towards a performance-centered design for all educator preparation programs.                                                                     
  - CSTP solicitation to the profession to develop outcomes for educator preparation  
  - CSOTE and TPEA assumes the leadership role in initial development phase of the outcomes.                                                                                                                   |
| July, 1992      | CSTP meeting focused on:  
  - CSOTE and TPEA’s report on initial progress of educator outcomes and request for additional guidance from CSTP.                                                                                                       |
| Sept. 24-25, 1992 | CSTP meeting focused on:  
  - CSOTE and TPEA’s progress report with revised draft of teacher/administrator proficiencies.  
  - CSTP discussed final plans for draft presentation at the Fall Teacher Education Conference.  
  - Reviewed summary report on ExCET results.  
  - Discussion with Dr. Meno on legislative proposals and future direction for public school education.                                                                                                          |
| Oct. 22-24, 1992 | CSTP meeting focused on:  
  - Acceptance of teacher and administrator draft document.  
  - Draft document presentation and round table discussions at Fall Teacher Education Conference.                                                                                                                    |
| Nov. 19-20, 1992 | CSTP meeting focused on:  
  - Presentation of Teacher and Administrator Outcomes by CSOTE and TPEA.  
  - Acceptance of work by CSOTE and TPEA.  
  - Directing staff to begin planning for broad-based input from the field by way of focus groups.                                                                                                               |
| Dec. 1, 1992    | CSTP reviewed ExCET passing standards for 64 test areas.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Jan., 1993      | CSTP meeting focused on:  
  - Plans for focus groups on Teacher and Administrator Outcomes.  
  - CSTP committee structures, task forces and co-chairs.                                                                                                                                                                    |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 10, 1993</td>
<td>SBOE set in motion policy change for teacher preparation and certification by moving toward a performance-centered accountability system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| March 18-19, 1993| CSTP Meeting focused on:  
  - Approval of draft document for distribution during focus groups  
  - Finalizing plans for Focus Groups and CSTP member assignments to Focus Groups.  
  - Future tasks for CSTP.                                                                         |
| March, 1993      | CSTP Meeting focused on:  
  - CSTP conducts statewide focus groups  
    - March 10  
      - Austin  
    - March 23  
      - Canyon  
      - El Paso  
      - Lubbock  
      - San Angelo  
    - March 25  
      - Corpus Christi  
      - Richardson  
      - Houston  
      - Edinburg  
      - Nacogdoches  
  All professional organizations were invited to attend |
| May 20-21, 1993  | CSTP meeting focused on:  
  - Dialogue with Commissioner Meno.  
  - Review of input from Focus Groups.  
  - Review of input from individual practitioners.  
  - Discussion of formatting and content issues.  
  - Directing TEA staff to take all documentation received from focus groups to combine outcomes where appropriate and reformat draft in a narrative form using information from master teacher and professional development documents.  
  - Directing TEA staff to bring revisions back in July for further consideration.  
  - Appointment of editor by TEA staff.  
  - Report on Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) and annual Performance Report.  
  - Report on legislative activity.  
 CSTP work session focused on:  
  - ExCET passing standards.  
  - Annual Performance Report (Statutory).  
  - Survey by Dr. Tipps and Frances Van Tassell related to comparison of TASP and SAT scores. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 14-18 1993</td>
<td>CSTP chair and vice-chair, along with several members of the TEA Educator Preparation and Assessment Division, attended an intensive workshop at Alverno College in Milwaukee, entitled, &quot;Assessment as Learning.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| July 15-16, 1993 | CSTP meeting focused on:  
- Report of Legislative Activity (H.B. 2585).  
- Report on SBOE actions.  
- Dialogue with Commissioner Meno.  
- Review of draft Teacher and Administrator Proficiencies and deliberated issues related to its format.  
- removal of bullets in proposed proficiencies.  
- reduction of proficiencies (Will these cover all areas and provide enough guidance to institutions and entities preparing teachers/administrators?).  
- Recommending to Commissioner Meno institutional standards for ExCET.  
- Commissioner recommends reappointment of current CSTP members for one year. |
| Sept., 1993    | TEA staff conducted Field Job Relatedness Survey on proficiencies (distributed and scheduled to be returned by Dec. 7, 1993). |
| Sept. 9-10, 1993 | SBOE approved institutional accountability standards for ExCET.  
- SBOE approved reappointment of current CSTP members. |
| Sept. 23-24, 1993 | CSTP work session focused on:  
- Institutional performance standards.  
- Briefing on job-relatedness survey.  
- Performance indicators for students completing programs.  

*All professional organizations were invited to attend.* |
| Oct. 1993      | TEA staff analyzed job relatedness data compiling a draft for CSTP to review in November. |
| Oct. 8, 1993   | SBOE discussion of Teacher and Administrator Proficiencies for educator preparation programs. |
| October 20-23, 1993 | Fall Teacher Education Conference (Corpus Christi) focused on:  
- Round table discussions for input on indicators and approval process.  

*All professional organizations were invited to attend.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nov. 4-5, 1993     | CSTP Meeting focused on:  
|                    | - Review of input from Fall Teacher Education Conference, other individuals and entities.  
|                    | - Finalizing recommendations on Teacher and Administrator Proficiencies for SBOE consideration.  
|                    | - Discussion of Institute on Performance.  
|                    | - Accountability and Components of the Approval Process.  
|                    | - Recommendation of individuals to attend the Institute.  
|                    |  
|                    | - All professional organizations were invited to attend as ex-officio members.  
|                    | - Report on two TEA publications: "Professional Educator Policy Development" and "Working Conditions of Teachers in Texas."                                                                                                                                                                |
| Nov. 11, 1993      | SBOE briefing on Teacher and Administrator Proficiencies and Institutional Performance Indicators by CSTP Chair, representative from TPEA and TEA staff member.                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Dec. 9-10, 1993    | CSTP members focused on:  
|                    | - Discussion of Institutional Indicators.  
|                    | - Components of the Program Approval Process.  
|                    | - Approval of Participants for the Institute for Performance-Based Accountability.  
|                    | - Review of EEIS Strategic Planning.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| January 13, 1994   | SBOE update on proficiencies                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| January 20-22, 1994| Institute for Accountability held at the Stouffer in Austin, Texas. Roster included 48 participants:  
|                    |  
|                    | **Group I:**  
|                    | Consultant: John Hansen-Florida State University  
|                    | Co-Chairs: Chris Borman & Cathy Morton  
|                    | Coordinators: George Hanna & William May  
|                    | CSTP Resource: Lula Henry  
|                    | **Institutional Indicators (24 participants)**  
|                    | **Group II:**  
|                    | Consultant: Betty Fry-Florida Education Center  
|                    | Co-Chairs: Tom Franks & Nell Ingram  
|                    | Coordinators: Marva Dixon & Steve Tipps  
|                    | CSTP Resource: Charles McBee  
|                    | TEA Staff: Educator Preparation Division & Educator Assessment and Appraisal Staff  
|                    | **Program Approval Components (24 participants)**  
<p>| February 10, 1994  | CSTP chair and co-chair present the Educator Proficiencies to the SBOE in El Paso, Texas                                                                                                                                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March 4-5, 1994    | CSTP meeting focuses on:  
|                    | • Approval of Teacher and Administrator Proficiencies for recommendation to SBOE.  
|                    | • Formulation and discussion of an EEIS prototype for presentation at Spring Teacher Education Conference in El Paso, Texas.  
|                    | • Briefing on draft of revisions for Chapter 13 with emphasis on recommendations for changes in the current CSTP to a Standards Board.  
|                    | • Commissioner Meno meets with CSTP for update and recommends re-appointment of current CSTP members for at least one more year to complete the charges given to the CSTP in June, 1992. |
| March, 1994        | CSTP members conduct telephone conference to discuss and refine EEIS prototype before Spring Teacher Education Conference.                                                                                                 |
|                    | • CSTP meeting (March 26, 1994) focused on refining EEIS prototype and glossary, and round table presentation and discussion at the conference.  
|                    | • EEIS prototype presentation and round table discussion.                                                                                                                                                                  |
| April, 1994        | Survey of First Year Teaching Experiences in Texas.                                                                                                                                                                       |
| April 25, 1994     | CSTP members conduct a telephone conference with CSTP Director to discuss and refine the EEIS prototype and glossary.                                                                                                        |
| May 3, 1994        | Task Force on Teacher Appraisal approves recommendation of adoption of proficiencies as framework for new teacher appraisal.                                                                                             |
| May, 4-5, 1994     | CSTP meeting focuses on:  
|                    | • Input from Spring Teacher Education Conference.  
|                    | • Discussion and refining of EEIS prototype and glossary.  
|                    | • Discussion of focus groups on EEIS prototype to be held at all 20 Educational Service Centers across the state.  
|                    | • Focus groups to be conducted collaboratively with CSTP representatives across the state.  
|                    | • Briefing on recommendations by task force on New Teacher appraisal including recommending adoption of Teacher Proficiencies as a framework for the new appraisal system. |
| May 15-16, 1994    | Deans’ Retreat Roundtable discussions conducted by CSTP chair and vice-chair.                                                                                                                                          |
| June, 1994         | • Training session for Regional Education Service Center representatives conducting EEIS focus groups.  
<p>|                    | • Focus groups on EEIS conducted at all Regional Education Service Centers across the state.                                                                                                                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| July 28-29, 1994| CSTP Meeting focused on:  
- Recommendation of ExCET framework and passing standards presented by Pam Tackett and Nolan Woods.  
- Educator Excellence Indicator System:  
  - Regional Service Center focus group meeting reports.  
  - Dean's Advisory Committee proposal presented by John Beck.  
  - Discussions on the Program Approval Process.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| August 24, 1994 | - Program Approval Application Timelines were sent to all teacher preparation entities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| September 8, 1994| - SBOE presentation regarding the proposed Accountability System for Educator Preparation programs by Steven Tipps and Marva Dixon.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| September 15, 1994| - CSTP meeting focused on strategic planning including: EEIS prototype, certification re-engineering and the agenda for October 27.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| October 6, 1994 | SBOE EEIS Presentation -  
- Mr. Davis, SBOE member, suggested the name "Educator Excellence Indicator System" did not make the connection to the teacher preparation process and encouraged the consideration to another name for EEIS.                                                                                                                               |
| October 27, 1994| CSTP Meeting focused on:  
- Program Approval Process parameters led by Dr. Bill Wale and qualitative and quantitative issues related to the accountability system that were still pending.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| October 28, 1994| Discussion group during the Joint Commissioner's Conference.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| November 8, 1994| CSTP Resource Group worked on refining the approval process document, including the following revisions:  
- Revising the Program Conceptualization Development and Program Assessment for Continuous Improvement, and  
- Addition of "product" as evidence.  
Members included:  
- Patrice Warner, Southwest Texas State University.  
- Pasty Hallman, Stephen F. Austin State University.  
- Eileen Reed, Region 13.  
- Jennifer Davies, Huston-Tillotson College.  
- Betty Kissler, CSTP.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| November 11, 1994| CSTP Resource Group worked on refining the Approval Process document including the following revisions:  
- Revising the Program Conceptualization Development and Program Assessment for Continuous Improvement, and  
- Addition of "Product" evidence.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 1994</td>
<td>CSTP Executive Committee Report &amp; Recommendations regarding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ExCET eligibility,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of first-time ExCET test takers versus number of first-time individuals taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ExCET, Cumulative ExCET taker pass rate implementation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How to use indicators-gender/ethnic, phase in, (what the standard would be), and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Certification groupings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This meeting included the following persons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Marva Dixon, LBJ Elementary, Grand Prairie, (CSTP),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Steven Tipps, University of North Texas (CSTP),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Frances Van Tassell, University of North Texas and CSOTE Chair,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Frank Smith, St. Edward's University and Deans' Council Representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2-3 1994</td>
<td>CSTP Meeting focused on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Update of the Educator Professional Appraisal System by Pam Tackett,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feedback from the Joint Commissioners Conference by Delia Quintanilla,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- TACTE Peer Program Assistance Proposal by Dr. Robert Cox,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CSTP Resource Group Report by Dr. Betty Kissler, Report, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recommendations from Executive Committee presented by Marva Dixon and Dr. Frances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Tassell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12, 1995</td>
<td>SBOE Presentation - Dr. Steven Tipps and Marva Dixon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASEP adopted with one SBOE voted against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 1995</td>
<td>CSTP Ad Hoc Committee met to generate accompanying documents to the ASEP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Avenues for addressing Program Approval Process,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Question and answer document, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ASEP manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Products presented to the CSTP Committee of the Whole at the February 2nd and 3rd meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 1995</td>
<td>CSTP Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- First Centers for Professional Development and Technology (1 institution) approval:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen F. Austin State University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 1995</td>
<td>CSTP Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Second Centers for Professional Development and Technology (1 institution) approval:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southwest Texas State University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Actions and Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 1995</td>
<td>CSTP Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Centers for Professional Development and Technology (1 institution) approval: University of Houston-Downtown (unfunded CPDT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5, 1995</td>
<td>CSTP Meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Centers for Professional Development and Technology (4 institutions) approval: Panhandle South Plains CPDT**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** Lubbock Christian University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** Texas Tech University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** Wayland Baptist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** West Texas A &amp; M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** First presentation on March 25, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 1995</td>
<td>CSTP Meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Centers for Professional Development and Technology (3 institutions) approval: Northeast CPDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** East Texas State University - Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** East Texas State University - Texarkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** University of North Texas - Denton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1995</td>
<td>CSTP Meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth Centers for Professional Development and Technology (5 institutions) approval: Center for Educational Development and Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** Our Lady of the Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** Trinity University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** St. Mary's University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** Incarnate Word College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14, 1995</td>
<td>Sixth Centers for Professional Development and Technology (2 institutions) approval: Texas Education Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** Prairie View A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** University of Texas A&amp;M (College Station)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13-14, 1995</td>
<td>CSTP Retreat:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** CSTP prepares &quot;A Position Statement and Recommendations to the State Board for Educator Certification.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 1992 draft document, entitled "A Design for Staffing the Instructional Delivery Team for Texas Public Schools," suggested that moving the State of Texas toward a world class education system would require many changes. Changes included (1) defining the expectations for student learning (student outcomes), (2) allowing schools the flexibility to achieve goals for student learning, and (3) adopting a design for staffing schools which would be congruent with other actions.

In June of 1992, the Commissioner of Education challenged the Commission on Standards to design a performance-based system aligned with student learning standards as an accountability system for professional educator preparation. In developing a performance-based-accountability system, the focus changed from a process-driven system—approving professional educator preparation programs based on compliance with rules—to a performance-based system based on results. A performance-based accountability system focuses on the product of the program—the beginning teacher or administrator. The challenge given to the Commission addressed the State Board of Education's policy direction advocating career-long professional preparation and development and implementation of an accountability system for educator preparation. The shift in emphasis by the SBOE forced a re-engineering of all aspects of the system for educator preparation.

This SBOE initiative was paralleled to the public school Academic Excellence Indicator System. It would hold educator preparation programs accountable for providing individuals who complete preparation programs with the knowledge and skills needed to produce the most effective results for all Texas' children. The
Educator Excellence Indicator System (EEIS) was the initial name given to the proposed teacher educator performance-based accountability system in Texas.

When Commissioner Meno charged the CSTP to move toward a performance-based design for all educator preparation programs, many actions and activities by the Commission were planned:

1. develop a set of learner-centered outcomes for all avenues to certification or licensure for Texas educators,
2. develop institutional components and indicators,
3. recommend assessment standards to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education,
4. require progress and program improvement reports,
5. develop guidelines for the program approval process and requirements for all entities offering programs for licensure in the State of Texas, and
6. enlist individuals and groups to assist in fostering the objectives and challenges given the CSTP-by the Commissioner. (CSTP Minutes, June, July, 1992)

Teacher and Administrator Proficiencies

The first task for the CSTP involved the identification of teacher and administrator proficiencies. These proficiencies would reflect what teachers and administrators should know and be able to do to effectively address diverse student needs. The CSTP turned to professional education organizations to solicit their expertise in identifying outcomes for Texas teachers and administrators. Two significant Texas
professional organizations, the Texas Professors of Educational Administration (TPEA) and the Texas Consortium of State Organizations for Teacher Education (CSOTE), were asked to develop and present the initial proficiencies for professional teachers and administrators.

The initial drafts identified 11 proficiencies for administrators and 12 for teachers and included detailed descriptors of knowledge, skills and dispositions (see Appendix B). CSOTE and TPEA formally presented a draft document of the teacher and administrator proficiencies to the CSTP in January of 1993; the Commission accepted the documents.

Considering people one of the critical elements related to the success of this systemic change, and supporting the commitment of the Commissioner to actively involve practitioners in the development of the reform, the CSTP sought input and recommendations from practitioners. During the Spring of 1993, CSTP initiated ten focus groups throughout the state. Appendix A identifies the dates and locations of these focus groups, as well as the TEA and CSTP representatives responsible for conducting the groups. Over 600 educators, half of whom were public school teachers, participated in the forums.

Throughout the proficiencies focus group sessions, several key concerns surfaced:

- The document was too teacher-centered; it needed more emphasis on students and learning.
- Ethics was a weak component in the administrator draft.
"Bulleted" items in the draft document might end up as discrete college courses.

- Diversity components needed strengthening and better integration into all proficiencies.

As a result of the many forums, work groups, and other meetings of the education community, two philosophies of thinking evolved about the proficiencies. One philosophy was expressed by those individuals who wished to see more specificity in the proficiencies so programs would know exactly what was expected of their students. These respondents sought more concrete examples for each proficiency and wanted to be held accountable for specific performances adopted for each proficiency. The other philosophy was held by those individuals who desired as much flexibility as possible in designing their programs. These individuals preferred broad guidelines based on the proficiencies and desired maximum flexibility in designing programs to reach expected levels of proficiency for beginning teachers or administrators.

The CSTP and practitioners were concerned that the document was prescribing too many competencies for preparation programs. It was crucial to CSTP members that the items not be viewed as one lengthy checklist. In May 1993, the CSTP met again to review concerns and advised the TEA staff regarding these points:

- Shape the working draft document into a format similar to the Master Teacher Competencies layout.

- Integrate outcomes into a more manageable number.
Eliminate the "bulleted" items and create a narrative in a more global framework.

The recommendations indicated that the philosophy of flexibility had prevailed. An editor was appointed by the staff to assist in the rewriting of the document.

Extensive rewriting of the working document was conducted during the Summer of 1993, incorporating the CSTP's and practitioners' concerns and suggestions. The rewriting process resulted in a narrative document with the term "outcomes" changed to "proficiencies." In June 1993, the CSTP chair and vice-chair, along with several members of the TEA Educator Preparation and Assessment Division, attended an intensive workshop at Alverno College in Milwaukee, entitled, "Assessment as Learning." The workshop included participants across professions, both within the states and abroad, focusing on what could be done to improve the learning and accountability process.

This workshop provided a more comprehensive understanding and global view of a performance-centered accountability system which would produce enhanced student learning, success, and achievement. Participation in this workshop also provided participants with an intensive knowledge base and hands-on experience with the Alverno performance-based teacher preparation program which focused on the teacher as the product of the program. Information gleaned from this activity provided a framework and background from which the CSTP chair, vice-chair, and TEA staff members drew from in providing leadership as the 1992 Texas education reform effort evolved.
Several CSTP work sessions covered the key components of the Alverno performance-based program. An overview of critical indicators related to an accountability system was conducted by Commission members and TEA Staff members who attended the Alverno workshop. These sessions provided other Commission members and TEA staff members in the Educator Preparation and Assessment Division with a clearer picture of a performance-based accountability system for teacher preparation. These sessions also assisted in providing direction to individuals who met in July 1993 to review the refined draft document of teacher and administrator proficiencies since one of the fundamental components undergirding the performance-based accountability system was the teacher and administrator proficiencies.

In July 1993, a group of teachers, administrators, faculty from institutions of higher education, and members of the business community met to review the work of the refined draft document. All professional organizations were invited to observe the meeting and provide input to the group. CSTP members received a report of the results of this working group during their July meeting.

Some concerns were raised by members of CSOTE during the Commission meeting held in July 1993. Members expressed concerns that the rewrite phase of the working document produced a synthesized version that extensively altered the format of the original document submitted in January. Lengthy discussions followed regarding further involvement of CSOTE members in the process and the format of the revised document. In an effort to be responsive to CSOTE members and others
who expressed similar concerns, the CSTP decided to conduct an additional work meeting to address these concerns.

In August 1993, a subsequent work group consisting of CSOTE representatives, TPEA members and members of the CSTP met to discuss issues surrounding the draft document. As a result of this work session, participants determined that the most current working draft reflected the (1) concerns and suggestions of practitioners from the statewide focus groups, (2) original content of CSOTE and TPEA documents, and (3) direction that the CSTP gave TEA staff in the rewriting of the working draft. While the CSTP was satisfied with the descriptive statement and narrative statement for each proficiency, the CSTP members did not recommend a list of example performances for each proficiency, but they recommended that the original lists be used as resources for entities wanting more specific examples.

During the months of September and October 1993, a major effort was undertaken to increase input from the field regarding the proposed proficiencies, institutional performance standards, and performance indicators for students completing educator preparation programs. All professional organizations were invited to participate in this process. In September 1993, a field job related survey was mailed to 5,500 public school teachers to validate the teacher proficiencies and 2,500 surveys were sent to public school administrators to validate the administrator proficiencies. Approximately 2,000 surveys were also sent to educator preparation programs at universities and alternative programs to assess the viewpoints of individuals working with new educators. In October 1993, TEA staff members
analyzed the job relatedness data. This information was shared with the Commission members during their November meeting.

The results of the survey indicated that public school teachers rated all proficiencies high. Mean ratings of 4.4 to 4.6 were reported, out of a possible 6. The percentage of public school teachers who responded that proficiency was of "great importance" or "very great importance" (rated it a "4" or "5") were also high. Strong ratings were also given to the teacher proficiencies by administrators. Educator preparation personnel also reported support for the teacher proficiencies with mean ratings ranging from 4.4 to 4.8. The overall ratings for the teaching proficiencies were reported as high.

Likewise, strong support was reported by administrators for the administrator proficiencies with mean ratings of 4.5 to 4.8. Teachers also gave positive ratings to administrator proficiencies even though their mean ratings were slightly lower than the ratings of the administrators. High ratings were also indicated for the administrator proficiencies by teacher preparation educators with mean ratings ranging from 4.4 to 4.8 (TEA, 1993d). Ratings for all proficiencies, by all respondents, are listed in Appendix B. The State Board of Education was briefed on the progress of the performance-based accountability system by Linda Haynes at its September 1993 meeting.

The Commission held its regular meeting in conjunction with the 46th Annual Fall Teacher Education Conference in Corpus Christi, October 21-23, 1993. Roundtable sessions were held to provide opportunities for input related to the
proficiencies, institutional indicators, and program approval process components.

Commission members also approved plans for the Institute for Performance-Based Teacher Education program to be held in January 1994.

In November 1993, the State Board of Education Committee on Personnel was briefed on the teacher and administrator proficiencies and institutional performance indicators by CSTP Chairperson, Marva Dixon; Dr. Linda Avila, representing TPEA; and TEA staff members, Linda Haynes and Linda Cimusz. Five essential components undergirding the comprehensive performance-based accountability system for educator preparation were discussed:

- teacher and administrator proficiencies,
- performance-based criteria and standards for individuals completing programs (new appraisal system currently under development),
- performance criteria and standards for entities delivering preparation programs,
- program approval which evidences the ability to attain the proficiencies and performance criteria for program completion, and
- new teacher and administrator certificates reflecting new standards.

The State Board members were also frequently kept informed of the progress and provided input regarding the development of the performance-based accountability system. In February 1994, the co-chairs of the Commission, Marva Dixon and Steve Tipps, presented the proposed teacher and administrator proficiencies to
the State Board of Education. It was emphasized that these proficiencies formed the basis for future direction of:

- the development and improvement of all educator preparation programs,
- the development of the State assessments for certification, Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET),
- the development of the new Teacher Appraisal System, and
- the proposed new State accountability system for educator preparation programs.

The proficiencies were formally adopted by the SBOE at its March 1994 meeting. These proficiencies served as one of the fundamental components undergirding the Accountability System for Educator Preparation. Twelve central themes emerged in both teacher and administrator proficiencies. These include:

- learner-centeredness,
- diversity,
- active learning,
- teaching for meaningful outcomes,
- communication,
- higher-order thinking,
- intra- and interdisciplinary connections,
- use of technology,
- developmental appropriateness,
- assessment as part of instruction,
the teacher as part of a larger learning community, and

- lifelong learning, including self-assessment.

The Accountability System

The adoption of the teacher and administrator proficiencies by the State Board of Education in February of 1994 served as a framework for the performance-based accountability system for educator preparation and identified proficiencies that teachers and administrators must know, value, and be able to effectively demonstrate for all children to have access to quality education. The next steps were the creation of the accountability system itself and a new type of approval system which would reflect the changes from a rule-based to a results-based teacher preparation system.

The CSTP December 1993 meeting focused on institutional indicators, components of the program approval process, and the approval of participants for the Institute for Performance-Based Teacher Education Accountability. In January 1994, the Commission sponsored an Institute for Performance-Based Teacher Educator Accountability. A two-day working institute was organized to gain input from stakeholders on two issues: the indicators for the accountability system and the process for program approval. Two hundred individuals attended the institute; 80 were invited official members of the institute and others were "observers." The professionals invited to serve as members of the institute were teachers, school administrators, faculty from institutions of higher education, and representatives from education service centers and from the business community. Both official members
and observers were invited to help formulate the conceptual design of the accountability system.

Although indicators to be part of the performance-based accountability system, as well as components of the approval process, had been discussed by CSTP at the same time as the teacher and administrator proficiencies, the first formal list of indicators and recommended components for the approval process emerged from the institute (see Appendix B). This list served as the framework for the first draft of the accountability system and was called the Educator Excellence Accountability System (EEIS) prototype, reflecting its kinship with the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) of the public schools.

**Indicators and Accreditation Levels**

The accountability system included two types of indicators: accreditation indicators and ancillary indicators. The accreditation indicators for the accountability system included the Examination for Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) and the proposed new teacher appraisal system, both of which were specifically mandated by law. While there was much discussion throughout the development of the system not to be limited to a single test or single criteria, the ExCET continued to surface as the only uniform and consistently applied measure available statewide. To ascertain classroom performance and its effectiveness with children, a new appraisal system, based on the proficiencies, was selected with the hope that the new system would accomplish this goal. Data from these measures will also be
disaggregated and analyzed by ethnicity and gender, as described in the implementation schedule located in Appendix B.

A key component of the continuous improvement involved the ancillary indicators. Four areas make up the ancillary indicators: access and equity indicators (recruitment, admission, program retention); placement profile (number of individuals who complete the program and who get jobs); follow-up provisions (survey of perceptions); and retention in the profession (3 year and 5 year rate). The ancillary indicators provide additional information to the State and to educator preparation programs about such issues as access and equity. The ancillary indicators would be used for accreditation because of many uncontrolled issues related to them. A more detailed description of both types of indicators, standard/goal, guidelines by student groups, and implementation schedule is found in Appendix B.

Accreditation levels were included as part of the accountability system. The four levels were determined by the data generated from the accreditation indicators. The levels include: accredited (recognized), accredited, accredited (warned) and accredited (warned with intervention). Ancillary indicator data could also be used for "recognized" accreditation status. Full implementation of the schedule is to begin during the 1997-98 school year or the year in which the new teacher appraisal system is fully implemented.
Continued Discussions Related to the Proposed Accountability System

The formulation and discussion of the prototype was the primary topic discussed at the CSTP March 4-5, 1994 meeting. Telephone conference calls and ongoing communication occurred among and between CSTP members and TEA staff members to refine and clarify the meaning and use of indicators in the EEIS prototype. Two other areas of deliberation were the implementation schedule and glossary of definitions.

The first formal presentation and roundtable discussion of a draft EEIS prototype was presented at the Spring Teacher Education Conference held in El Paso, Texas, March 25-28, 1994 (see Appendix B for initial draft). The philosophy of continuous improvement was central to the Commission in developing the EEIS. As described to participants, the indicators were to represent data which each entity could use in determining the quality of its product. The nature of the indicators, their technical meaning and implementation schedule became the focus of much of the input received from the roundtable discussions held during the Spring Teacher Education Conference. The roundtable discussions were an opportunity for the Commission to share the current status and to get critical and constructive feedback. Participants at the roundtable discussions were informed that other opportunities to provide input and to refine the document would be available; these would include focus groups similar to the ones done for the teacher and administrator proficiencies, CSTP regular meetings and the Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (TACTE) dean’s retreat in May 1994.
The May CSTP meeting focused on (1) input from the roundtable discussions at the Spring Teacher Education Conference, (2) refining of the EEIS prototype and glossary, (3) discussion of the dean's retreat EEIS prototype presentation, and (4) discussion of focus groups for input on the EEIS prototype. At this meeting, Commission members were informed that the focus groups were scheduled for June 1994. Several concerns were expressed by CSTP members regarding the scheduled times for the focus groups since most public school personnel who would provide meaningful input would be on vacation. However, the previous schedules of the Education Service Centers and time needed to train facilitators meant that June was the earliest possible time the focus groups could be scheduled.

An intense discussion of the specific indicators occurred at the annual retreat of the Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education held in May 1994. Both CSTP co-chairs, Ms. Marva T. Dixon and Dr. Steve Tipps, were present at the retreat and conducted an open forum related to the proposed EEIS prototype. The education deans, division heads, and department chairs, along with invited arts and sciences deans, examined a number of issues and concerns:

- the necessity for innovative educator preparation programs,
- the need for an appropriate assessment system for these programs,
- the shortage of minority educators in the state, and
- the potential impact of recent events and impending decisions related to the proposed performance-based accountability system upon preparation entities as they seek to recruit and prepare future minority educators.
Two key concerns were expressed by this group. One concern expressed was that the forthcoming decisions regarding the proposed Educator Excellence Indicator System would unintentionally affect and further aggravate problems related to the preparation of minority education candidates. A second concerned the use of the ExCET as a key indicator. Members of this group were uncomfortable with an indicator based on the percentage of students passing the ExCET tests; some of the test were still under development and passing "cut" scores had not been determined.

While several concerns and issues were deliberated, members of the Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education expressed their support for a profession characterized by both excellence and equity and offered several recommendations:

- Encourage the Texas Education Agency and the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession to develop policies and standards which will ensure that both dimensions of the profession are safeguarded during the process of the move to the performance-based accountability system for educator preparation.
- Set standards for admissions into the profession and the criteria for the evaluation of educator preparation programs to reflect a sensitivity to the concerns previously presented.
- Recommend that the Texas Education Agency and the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession provide agressive leadership in
supporting institutions with a large percentage of minority students in their educator preparation program.

- Postpone action on the EEIS until:
  - ExCET "objectives" for professional development tests are adjusted to the new proficiencies;
  - new ExCET tests are created to measure the new proficiencies, field tested and all "cut" scores are determined;
  - studies determine whether there is a direct correlation between ExCET performance and teaching performance; and
  - the new teacher appraisal instrument is adopted. (CSOTE, 1994)

A commitment was made by TACTE to submit more specific recommendations to CSTP after revisions were made by a TACTE-appointed committee.

Focus groups for the proposed Educator Excellence Accountability System prototype were held at all 20 Educational Service Centers across the state during June 1994. Reports from the service centers indicated a very low participant turnout.

The Commission considered all input received from the focus groups and TACTE during its July 1994 meeting and retreat. A resolution was passed by the CSTP during the July meeting to recommend the proposed Education Excellence Indicator System to the State Board of Education as well as to bring forward, as part of the accountability system, components for approving programs that focus on the
capacity to design, deliver, and evaluate the effectiveness of performance-based educator preparation programs.

During the September 15-16, 1994 Commission meeting, discussions regarding accreditation status levels, standards, implementation timeline, and the components of the approval process were held. Further discussions related to these areas also took place at the Joint Commissioners Conference held on October 26-29 in Austin. The roundtable discussions during the conference focused on the proposed performance-based accountability system including:

- accreditation and ancillary indicators,
- accreditation status level prototype,
- program approval process parameters, and
- pending qualitative and quantitative issues.

The CSTP also met with TACTE to continue discussion on the proposed Educator Excellence Indicator System and components of the approval process. Emphasis was given to this being a working document.

*Presentations to SBOE*

During the months of September and October 1994, CSTP co-chairs, Ms. Marva Dixon and Dr. Steve Tipps, also discussed the proposed accountability system with the State Board of Education. Dr. Delia Quintanilla, director of the Commission on Standards for the Teaching profession, opened with a brief overview of the proposed Educator Excellence Indicator System. Ms. Dixon discussed background information related to the development of the EEIS standards,
guidelines, and implementation schedule. A two-part phase-in process was presented which included the avenues used to gain input from the field and the deliberations of the Commission. Dr. Tipps presented the proposed accreditation standards, status levels, and implementation schedule. He emphasized that recommendations of deans, division heads, and faculty were considered in the EEIS proposal. Dr. Tipps also presented a side-by-side view which compared the EEIS to the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) as he explained the proposed status levels. He commented on the two significant differences between the EEIS and the AEIS:

- Disaggregated student group scores (ethnic groups and gender) are part of the system from the beginning, and
- The opportunity for entities to become responsible for its product through inclusion of a cumulative pass rate indicator.

These two components brought in concerns that the Commission had wanted in the proposed system. It was also noted that ancillary indicators were not used for the determination of accreditation status. These data enable entities to monitor and improve its performance. The ancillary indicators might, in the future, be used for recognized status.

SBOE members were informed that educator preparation entities would be notified of their rating ("accredited" or "accredited review") between January 1995 and August 1997. When the educator appraisal system was implemented, then "recognized," "accredited," and "accredited warned" status levels would be implemented. Ms. Dixon and Dr. Tipps emphasized the CSTP recommendation that no
entity lose its accreditation status until the ExCET was joined with the additional performance indicator, first-year teaching appraisals.

At the October 1994 SBOE meeting, the name of the proposed performance-based accountability system was questioned. As a result of the concern raised by Mr. Davis, a State Board member, the name Educator Excellence Indicator System was changed to Accountability System for Educator Preparation. Mr. Davis suggested another name would provide a better connection to the teacher preparation process. The title Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) was presented to CSTP members and accepted by CSTP members during its November meeting 1994.

Before final presentation to the SBOE, the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession conducted two working sessions in November 1994 to discuss logistical issues on the accountability system. Representatives from the education profession, as well as members of the Commission, attended these sessions. As a result, the Commission finalized its recommendations regarding the accountability system at its December 1994 meeting.

The final adoption of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation by the State Board of Education on January 12, 1995, fulfilled the SBOE’s requirement to review teacher preparation rules as a part of the legislative sunset review process. The adopted ASEP can be found in Appendix B.

Using the CSTP as the change facilitator, the development and adoption of the ASEP officially moved the approval of educator preparation programs from a
process-oriented to a results-based accountability system. The CSTP, with the assistance of members from the field, developed an accountability system that relies on data related to teacher and administrator performances. Analyzing the performance results of each preparation entity, rather than meeting specific rules, became the fundamental operating principle. The accountability system would be used to determine an educator preparation entity's accreditation status as well as to provide explanatory information to the public. At its January 12, 1995 meeting, several SBOE members commended the CSTP for quality and professional work and noted the affects of ASEP on all aspects of universities which prepare educators.

**The Approval Process**

The performance-based accountability system for educator preparation included a component for approving programs that focus on evidences of the capacity of entities to design, deliver, and evaluate the effectiveness of its product—the teacher and educator in Texas schools. Parallel with the development of the ASEP, a new and radically different approval process was being contemplated. Program approval in the past was essentially based on process. The new program approval framework utilizes process but focuses on the product. Beginning well before the Institute for Performance-based Teacher Education Accountability, deliberations on the nature of the components of the approval process took place. Table 6 identifies the nine specific components of the program approval process.
### Table 6

**Specific Components of the Program Approval Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Number</th>
<th>Specific Component Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>An articulated delivery system exists that assures graduates possess knowledge of content, learning processes, pedagogy, and skills to carry out effective instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiple field experiences which provide opportunities to develop skills over time in developmentally appropriate ways and effectively integrate theory and practice. Field experiences include activities in which candidates can improve their ability to work effectively with diverse student cultures, languages, abilities, and learning styles. Field experiences include opportunities for pre-program early, and continuing field work leading to the full responsibility of student teaching or other full-time internships/teaching assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Technology is integrated throughout the preparation program so as to produce teaching/management skills in the prospective educator that enhance student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The program includes collaborative efforts of the multiple stakeholders/entities responsible for the preparation of the educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>An on-going, comprehensive evaluation program operates throughout the program with multiple measures that include traditional and authentic evaluation of proficiencies and the adopted statewide evaluation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Admission and selection criteria exists which identify a diverse pool of candidates being provided to all members of the learner-centered community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ongoing professional development relating to the effectiveness of the program is provided to all members of the learner-centered community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continuous program evaluation and improvement mechanisms are in place which include analysis of proficiency attainment and follow-up study of educators completing the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The sponsoring entity-institution of higher education, the consortium, the center, the ACP, etc. demonstrates the commitment and capacity to deliver an effective program as seen in: qualified and sufficient faculty and staff, financial support and resources, and responsible governance/administrative structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Institute for Performance-Based Accountability, January 21, 1994.*
Through the working sessions and summer retreats of the Commission, roundtable discussions, dean's retreats, and various other formats similar to those utilized in the development of the proficiencies and accountability system, the components of the approval process evolved. The teacher and administrator proficiencies are fundamental to all components of the approval process. Thus, all programs are expected to address all proficiencies. What emerged were five main components of the approval process.

1. Program Assessment for Continuous Improvement.
   A. Evidences of ongoing program assessment used to insure quality, equity, and continuous improvement utilizing:
      - present and former program participants, faculty, teachers and others;
      - state-adopted performance indicators for program involvement, and various assessment techniques.

2. Program Conceptualization/Development.
   A. Evidences of a comprehensive performance-based delivery system, including:
      - integration of educator proficiencies throughout the preparation program;
      - integration of a variety of teaching and learning experiences; and
      - ongoing, comprehensive performance assessment system for educator candidates using multiple traditional and performance-based procedures.

3. Program Commitment and Resources
A. Evidences that the sponsoring entity has commitment and capacity to deliver an effective program using:

- qualified and sufficient faculty and staff,
- financial support and resources,
- responsible/administrative structure, and

B. Evidence of collaborative partnerships and shared accountability for program design, delivery, evaluation, and professional development through:

- role and responsibility of each partner, and
- contributions of each partner.

4. Program Equity.

A. Evidences of equity in recruitment and retention of educator candidates, particularly among underrepresented populations including:

- recruitment efforts,
- selection and admission-process,
- retention and support programs,
- licensure,
- retention in the profession, and
- meeting critical personnel needs in Texas schools.

5. Unique Program Characteristics.
A. Evidence of the product which addresses all areas of the rule or guidelines under which approval is sought and not addressed in the other four components such as:

- Center Rule,
- Alternative Certification Program, and
- focus on special populations or content areas (TEA, 1995).

*Performance-Based Proposal Format*

*The Written Proposal.* Entities requesting approval under the new approval process were required to provide the CSTP a 45-page written proposal with an "Executive Summary for Program Approval Request" addressing the components of the approval process. The entity’s proposal was due one month prior to presentation to the Commission. The written proposal also included:

- a brief overview of the proposed educator preparation program, describing the results of transition to a performance-based delivery system (if applicable;
- evidence of specifically and distinctly addressing the program approval framework; and
- a maximum of 45 pages in length, including appendices (i.e., list of all certificate programs offered, any other supporting evidence).

*Presentation.* Also required was a formal presentation to the Commission highlighting information contained in their executive summary. A variety of entity-selected media was utilized in demonstrating the entity’s effectiveness in preparing
educators. The presentation time constraints included a 30-45 minute formal presentation and a 15-30 minute discussion between Commission members and the entity representatives (TEA, 1995).

A more detailed explanation of the five components was given to the entities with examples of the evidence they might provide for each component. However, in keeping with the philosophy of flexibility, the choice of evidence was left to each institution. Additionally, the process of program approvals such as visits, persons engaged in the visitation (external or internal teams), remain in the developmental process.

Re-Engineering the Certificate—A Task Unfinished

The fourth and final aspect of the performance-based accountability system was to be a re-engineered certificate system for Texas educators. With various standards going back as far as 1952—a multitude of certificates, levels, and specializations—a comprehensive overhaul of the certificates was long overdue. However, before this phase was reached, the Commission on Standards was abolished and replaced by the State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC). Actually, the last two years of the Commission were as a special advisory committee to the State Board as the veteran Commission had been sunsetted in 1992. Commissioner Meno and the SBOE had voted to maintain the CSTP specifically for the purpose of formulating the performance-based accountability system for teacher education.
Three of the four tasks were completed and approved by the SBOE. The last and in many ways most complex task was left undone.

The teacher and administrator proficiencies, the adoption of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation, and the new approval process were prefaced by the significant altering of the State Board of Education policy for teacher education, assessment and certification in the Spring of 1993. This policy initiative advocated professional preparation and development as an ongoing collaborative effort among public schools, institutions of higher education, education service centers and other entities. It established an accountability indicator system, aligned with educator proficiencies, as an accountability system for professional preparation programs.

**Teacher Preparation Improvement Initiative**

The Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (TACTE) assumed a leadership role by appointing a committee to assess the feasibility of developing an effective means of providing peer assistance for the improvement of teacher education preparation programs (TACTE). The Teacher Preparation Improvement Initiative (TPII) was based on the premise that a given profession has the responsibility of assuming the leadership role in assisting its constituents in the development, improvement, and promotion of the profession. This initiative was supported by the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession as well as the Division of Educator Preparation staff members at the agency. As a result of committee recommendations, the name for this initiative was changed from Teacher Preparation Improvement Initiative to Educator Preparation Improvement Initiative (EPII) in June
1995. This initiative, proposed by Dr. Robert Cox and other college of education deans, has become an integral part of the process of moving Texas teacher educator preparation program to a performance-based accountability system.

Policy Changes and Intended Results

Each of the groups in their roles and responsibilities brought different meanings to the intent of the legislative action and SBOE policy change. Each body contributed something unique to the intent of the change and thus to the vision of what the results would look like. If not unanimous, at least a consensus of what the global intentions and significant characteristics of this policy change took place. The consensus was that there were at least two broad intended results of the legislative action and policy change. The general intentions of the legislative action was to improve student performance through better prepared educators. In carrying out these actions, general intentions became more specific. Hence, in addressing question #3: Was there congruence between the actions taken by the SBOE and CSTP and the intentions of legislative action and policy change?," attempts to determine whether there was alignment between the intentions of the legislature and the actions taken by the SBOE and CSTP was needed.

Guiding Principles

As the Texas performance-based accountability system came into place, the effort was strongly influenced by national reports and recommendations included in the review of literature in Chapter 2. Performance-based accountability, as it was
conceived, embraced characteristics out of teacher education reform recommendations and that list reflects the characteristics (Table 7) which appeared consistently in the reports and recommendations. Therefore, this list became the operationalized performance-based accountability system that served as a framework for the work of the Commission. These characteristics were part of the policy recommendations and represented those areas strongly held by Commission members as they formulated the Texas performance-based accountability system. Hence, elements of teacher education reform were put together in the Texas teacher education reform process. This list also represents the framework of policy recommendations that the CSTP used to develop the proficiencies, ASEP, and approval process.

From these national teacher education reforms and reports, 21 areas may be inferred as critical or central elements of the performance-based accountability system. Of the 3 major pieces of the adopted performance-based accountability system, Table 7 shows that 18 of these elements were embedded in the system.

The Performance-Based Policy Change

The 1984 legislative actions provided the initial framework for the establishment of an accountability system for educator preparation. Legislation required certified teachers to pass reading and writing competency tests, and required new entrance tests for all prospective teachers. An assessment program for all educators seeking certification emphasized basic knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy.
Table 7

Alignment of Characteristics of a Performance-based Accountability System and Texas Restructured Performance-Based Delivery System with the 1992 Texas Reform Effort (Proficiencies, Accountability System and Approval Process)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal Characteristics of a Performance-Based Accountability System</th>
<th>Proficiencies</th>
<th>Accountability System (ASEP)</th>
<th>Approval Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance-based Criteria/Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A clear set of performance-based standards for educators</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance-based Program Framework and Curriculum Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restructured delivery system as a comprehensive field-based program—integration of theory and practice.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedagogy and research about teaching and learning are crucial.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher education programs depend on quality undergraduate programs in both teacher education programs and the arts and sciences.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The undergraduate arts and sciences experiences should be totally integrated with teacher education curriculum and teaching.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University teacher education programs are linked with public schools.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology is integrated into the instructional process including innovative teaching practices utilization of technology for instruction is increased.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities to maximize learning for Pre-K-12 students by addressing and responding to the needs of a diverse student population (gender, ethnicity, language and special learning needs).</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Characteristics of a Performance-Based Accountability System</td>
<td>Proficiencies</td>
<td>Accountability System (ASEP)</td>
<td>Approval Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities provided for education candidates to engage in collaboration and innovative exchange of resources.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities provided for education candidates to engage in reflective thinking activities with the intent of learning from their experiences.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educator preparation entities are provided greater innovation and diversity in how teacher education programs operate by assessing quality of outcomes rather than merely regulating their inputs or procedures.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Systems for Continuous Quality Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A variety of authentic assessments in authentic settings are developed, implemented and utilized.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities provided for formative and summative assessment measures intended to assure quality, equity, and continuous improvement.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learner-centered appraisal system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Commitment and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding mechanism provided to establish and support the components of a comprehensive performance-based teacher education delivery system.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources and rewards for faculty are provided to support a comprehensive performance-based teacher education delivery system.</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A commitment to increasing the number of under-represented populations in the area schools is demonstrated through support systems and other resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures equal access of all students to all program components.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data-driven accreditation levels and renewal based on data of franchise</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Characteristics of a Performance-Based Accountability System</td>
<td>Proficiencies</td>
<td>Accountability System (ASEP)</td>
<td>Approval Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based Certification/Licensure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High quality competency tests and teacher certification should be developed and implemented.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation of performance-based licensing using standards that are closely linked to the proficiencies or standards.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Implemented  
U = Under Development  
D = Desired but not addressed  
S = Supports this component

I* = Implemented for funded CPDT's only
To meet the demand of the legislature to design programs that prepare teachers for the changing demands and diverse needs of students, a change in the focus of state policy related to professional preparation programs was also needed. The SBOE’s significant policy change related to teacher education viewed professional preparation and development as an ongoing collaborative effort among public schools and all teacher preparation entities that reflect state-of-the-art research-based teaching and learning practices. This policy change also established a new emphasis on accountability for institutions of higher education and others preparing teachers, which would result in greater flexibility in collaborative efforts with public schools in order to design programs that would prepare teachers for the changing demands and diverse needs of students.

The CSTP used the recommendations from national reports such as the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (1985), Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986), Holmes Group Seven Assertions about Teacher Education Programs (1986), and INTASC’s Ten Standards for Licensing Beginning Teachers (1992) as guiding principles in working with various groups and organizations to fulfill the intentions of the 1984 legislative mandate and SBOE policy change.

The State Board of Education, through its public school accountability system, changed the focus of public education policy. The emphasis was directed toward holding schools and districts accountable for developing complex problem-solving and higher order thinking skills in students. This was in contrast to previous state
policies which focused on improving educational inputs for public schools, such as length in class periods, specifying teaching methodology, and ensuring student competency in basic skills. Educator preparation was to support the concept of learner-centered schools which the SBOE adopted. This, in turn, required that teachers be able to respond to the current and emerging needs of a population of students that was increasing in size and diversity.

Establishing a precedent, the CSTP, with the assistance of members from the field, developed an accountability system that relied on analyzing the performance results of each entity, rather than working on specific rules to govern all preparation programs.

Incorporation of Policy Changes in Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs

The clearest statement of the intended outcomes was the elements of the approval process. The components of the approval process were based on evidence that entities had incorporated the performance-based policies in the program design. The approval process asked entities to document their efforts to incorporate:

- recruitment of under-represented populations in the profession;
- opportunities provided for formative and summative assessment measures intended to ensuring quality, equity, and continuous improvement;
- a commitment to increasing the number of under-represented populations in the area schools is demonstrated through support systems and other resources;
the teacher’s knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

To address question #4: "To what extent were the intended results of policy changes actually carried out in the first 17 programs approved under the performance-based accountability system?," an examination and analysis of the executive summaries for the approval process and actual notes of oral presentations and minutes from the CSTP were conducted. This investigation sought to determine if the restructured teacher education program of the 17 initial institutions addressed the intended results of legislative action and policy change. Further, the investigation would disclose if what the CSTP intended the institutions to do as a result of its actions was actually done. "The Executive Summary for Program Approval Request" document and oral presentations would also reveal how institutions answered the questions and in what ways they showed that they had the characteristics that were inclusive of a performance-based delivery system as a result of their restructured teacher education program. Thus, the global intentions of the legislature to improve students’ performance through improving teacher education programs meant the actions of the CSTP changed global intentions into specific demands on institutions. The demands, as a result of CSTP’s actions, necessitated these entities restructure their current teacher education programs to reflect the characteristics of a performance-based delivery system.
Entities requesting approval under the new approval process were required to provide the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession with a 45-page written proposal, "The Executive Summary for Program Approval Request," which addressed the components of the approval process. They also made a formal presentation to the Commission which highlighted information contained in their executive summary. The primary sources of information used to address research question #4 included the document entitled, "The Executive Summary for Program Approval Request" for the 17 institutions and CSTP's notes and minutes for each of the institution's formal presentation. These documents were reviewed and analyzed to determine whether each institution incorporated the results of the policy changes.

In addition to providing an executive summary which addressed the specific components of the approval process, each institution conducted a 45-minute formal presentation. Presentations involved a variety of resources including multi-media presentations, artifacts, testimonies from program stakeholders, and products (teacher education candidates and graduates). The primary intended outcome for each of the 17 institutions focused on teacher education candidates demonstrating competency of the five teacher proficiencies at entry level mastery upon completion of their teacher education program.

The prevailing and explicit outcome was intended to contribute to the State's goal of achieving excellence and equity for all children in Texas in the 21st century by producing a well-prepared beginning teacher. Hence, components of the restructured teacher education program at each of the 17 institutions were developed with
the primary purpose of improving the academic performance of students in pre-K -12 by designing, implementing, researching, and refining an effective model for training future teachers, experienced teachers, professional support personnel, and administrators. This effort would involve stakeholders working together in order to respond to needs identified by the participants in each collaborative.

The stakeholders included teacher candidates, teacher educators, administrators, parents, community members and students. The focus was client-driven (teacher education candidates) and consumer-driven (public school educators, community and business members). A central theme reported by all institutions was the expectation that this initiative, which included collaboration between and among stakeholders, would influence the cognitive, affective, and socio-emotional aspects of the public school child in positive and productive ways. One entity reported this collaborative effort as its primary goal and termed it "polarization for excellence" (University of Houston-Downtown, May 4, 1995).

Program Assessment for Continuous Improvement

Multiple measures were reported by each institution for the purpose of assessing the program’s process and product. These assessment measures were used to gauge the quality of the program and the product (the pre-service or beginning teacher). Each of the 17 institutions reported that data was provided on the program, the product, and the impact on student learning. The purpose of these assessments was to provide accountability and guidance, as well as add to the current knowledge base regarding effective teaching practices. The collection and analysis of data was
done primarily by the teacher education program’s personnel. This information was disseminated to stakeholders across each collaborative so that program revisions could be made.

The 17 institutions reported the primary objective of this process was to continually focus on program improvement. Examples of revisions made as a result of this process included:

- an increase in technology expectations,
- an addition of conflict resolution training,
- an addition and/or increase in special education courses offered,
- an increase of time in seminars for more concentrated learning,
- an increase in opportunities and time for reflections and inquiry, and
- modifications to the portfolio rubric. (East Texas University-NET CPDT, June 1, 1995)

Program Evaluation

Utilizing a variety of procedures, program assessment was an ongoing process in the restructured programs and provided accountability and guidance, as well as a contribution to the knowledge base. Examples of program assessment procedures used included:

- Interns and residents - course evaluations, program surveys, structured interviews, one-year follow-ups.
- University faculty, mentor teachers and administrators - program surveys, structured interviews, minutes from governing board, district, campus, and grade-level team meetings, one year follow-ups.

- District and Campus improvement plans.

- TAAS Scores.

- External evaluators.

*Product Evaluation.* An emphasis on utilizing a variety of authentic assessment tools based on the new teacher proficiencies was also reported by each of the 17 institutions. These assessment tools were intended to focus on the promotion of professional growth, self-reflection, and life-long learning. Examples included:

- Portfolio rubrics
- Holistic scoring of written work
- Self-reflective journals
- Self-evaluations of professionalism with follow-up discussions with mentors
- Written reactions to discussions
- Self-evaluations of formal lessons (follow-up with mentor/university faculty feedback)
- Team evaluations of individualized teacher education plans
- Videotaping (follow-up conference)
- Portfolio conferences
Intern and resident (student teachers) progress evaluation and final evaluation forms.

- ExCET results (both first time and second time takers)
- Individual growth plans on an as needed basis (continued monitoring for expected progress).

**Impact on Student Learning Evaluation.** In order to focus on continuous improvement in the area of impact on student learning, each entity provided evidence of a commitment to a process of continuous improvement by establishing an ongoing data collection process and analysis process through which decisions were made and implemented based upon the most current and comprehensive data available. Data were collected from several sources, including direct observation, student artifacts and TAAS scores. The nucleus of the process involved the stakeholders in the educator preparation program working as a collaborative group. The stakeholders included teacher education candidates, teacher educators, administrators, parents, community and business members and students. Again, the focus was client-driven (teacher education candidates) and consumer-driven (public school educators, business and community members). This process, as reported by the institutions, included an inquiry process designed to gather information in the form of program accountability indicators. Sources of data included disaggregated performance data from ExCET, TAAS, and public school students’ attendance as reported in the campus’s and district’s Academic Excellence Indicator System. The data were then used to formulate action plans targeted at resource utilization, program design, and
teacher education program improvement, which consequently focused on maximizing learning for public school students.

As a result of analysis of this data, seminar activities for teacher education candidates focused on identifying and implementing specific methods of instruction which best met the specific learning needs of the public school students involved in the collaborative. Interns and residents (student teachers) from most of the institutions were involved in the development and implementation of the public school's "campus improvement plan." Their involvement included participation in activities aimed at improving students' academic performance based on TAAS results.

**Program Conceptualization and Development**

Program conceptualization and development was another key component of the program approval process and also reflected one of the crucial intended outcomes of the restructured teacher education program based on the new policy change. This component provided a summary of evidences which described the institution's comprehensive delivery system through which the new teacher proficiencies would be acquired by the product (teacher education candidates.)

The restructured teacher education program for the 17 institutions included a comprehensive delivery system with enhancements and additions of several critical components. The major areas of this comprehensive delivery system included:

- an increased and enhanced field-based experience,
- integration of technology into the instructional process,
- utilization of a variety of authentic assessments in authentic settings,
integration of teacher and educator proficiencies throughout the delivery system,

opportunities to engage in collaboration activities,

utilization of a variety of authentic assessments in authentic settings,

integration of teacher and educator proficiencies throughout the delivery system,

opportunities to maximize learning for Pre-K-12 students by addressing and responding to the needs of a diverse student population (gender, ethnicity, language and special learning needs),

opportunities provided for education candidates to engage in reflective thinking activities with the intent of learning from their experiences,

formative and summative assessment measures intended to ensuring quality, equity, and continuous improvement,

a commitment to increasing the number of under-represented populations in the area schools is demonstrated through support systems and other resources.

Field-based experiences. The increase in field-based experiences in authentic contexts and settings was reported as one of the most critical additions to the restructured teacher education program for the 17 institutions. This emphasis on increased field-based experiences afforded teacher education candidates greater opportunities for interaction with public school students and mentor or supervising teachers in real world settings. The field-based program, as described by most of the
17 institutions, included evidences of being learner-centered and proficiency-driven. The delivery program for the 17 institutions included both on-campus and field-based courses. The field-based courses were housed in facilities within the school districts identified in the collaborative. Definitions for field-based experiences varied but, for the most part, meant professional education courses taught in a university classroom housed on a public school campus. Classes were taught by university professors for a portion of the day, then the education candidate served as an intern or resident to public school mentor teachers for the remainder of the day.

Interns or residents engaged in a multitude of activities, including working with public school students as tutors, or in small groups and large groups. The intended outcome of the field-based experiences was to provide opportunities for the educator candidate to engage in delivering instruction related to authentic work in the school settings, and to be involved in authentic teacher duties and responsibilities.

Various names were used to describe the second phase of the field experiences; these included the typical term "student teacher" and the term often used in medical models, "resident." A variety of experiences were provided as students progressed through the program with the culminating experiences of the resident or student teacher ranging from eight weeks to a full semester.

Generally, the criteria most often used to designate a course as field-based included the following:

- The field experience made an observable difference in the course outcome (different skills and knowledge is gained from these experiences).
The instruction was related to authentic work in public school settings.

- The teacher candidate was involved in authentic teacher duties and responsibilities.
- The teacher candidate was involved in ongoing interaction among and between teachers, university students, professors, and public school students.
- The university professor played an interactive role in the school setting.

Technology. Another critical component of the comprehensive delivery system and a consequential intended outcome was the utilization and integration of technology in classroom instruction. This influential emphasis regarding technology focused on the creation of new environments which would nurture the enthusiasm for learning by enriching instruction through multimedia projects in authentic contexts. Technology was used to enhance the instructional process for both preservice and inservice teachers. Hence, both the education teacher candidate and veteran teacher would be able to creatively integrate technology into classroom instruction to support an expanded curriculum. The acquisition of technological skills would therefore increase each individual's ability to access powerful information resources in our highly technological information age. Additionally, an intended outcome was to provide education candidates with the opportunity to actively seek knowledge in authentic contexts and enhance the teacher education candidate's retention and application levels.
Program Commitment and Resource

Evidence of program commitment and resources was also an important component of the restructured teacher education program based on the new policy change. The commitment and resources were demonstrated by administration providing necessary resources to support the program through increased funding. This included adequate funding commitments from the university and independent school districts involved in the collaborative. Examples of evidence of commitment and resources included:

- the addition of staffing positions, particularly for clinical positions to support the field-based delivery program, by the university;
- an increase in funds for travel reimbursement of field supervisors by the university;
- the allocation of mentor teachers by districts involved in the collaborative;
- the allocation of incentives for mentors by districts involved in the collaborative; and
- the designation of and permission given to utilize public school facilities to deliver components of the instructional program.

Program Equity

Another intended outcome of the restructured teacher education program was to increase the number of minority teachers in the pool. Evidence which demonstrated a commitment to increasing the number of under-represented populations in area schools was another consequential intended outcome. Based on the State's goal
of maintaining a teaching force that was representative of its student population, emphasis on the recruitment and retention of minority teachers was reported by the 17 institutions as a paramount outcome.

The 17 initial institutions reported a variety of programs and activities aimed at recruiting minorities into the teacher education program at their institution. The intent of these programs and activities was to provide support to minority teacher education candidates while they were securing their degrees. In order to enhance the retention of minority and/or under-represented candidates, most of the 17 institutions provided students with the curriculum and support services needed to ensure every opportunity for their academic success.

Examples of the comprehensive student retention programs and support services provided included:

- offering minority scholarships and other financial assistance, including tuition discounts;
- establishing academic support centers and study skills assistance;
- providing early assessment in learning needs;
- offering classes at off campus locations;
- promoting course credit for a high school teaching class;
- supporting "grow your own" programs through local school districts;
- affording opportunities for para-professionals to enter the program while maintaining employment;
- offering free tutoring, personal guidance and mentoring; and,
- promoting a variety of multi-cultural programs and activities (designed to provide all students with opportunities to gain an increased understanding and appreciation of their own culture as well as the cultural heritage of others with whom they would have daily interactions).

The intent of these efforts and, consequently, an intended outcome, was to reflect evidences which would positively impact learning of minority students and students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

**Unique Program Characteristics**

Each entity included in its proposal an "executive summary" and "formal presentation" which highlighted unique features of their program. Examples reported by the 17 institutions included:

- the number of ISD's involved in the partnership;
- the institution's focus on specific populations such as "Bilingual/ESL," "special education" and/or "minority candidates;"
- The types of certificates offered by the institution; and
- location and population served.

Additionally, each of the 17 initial institutions addressed the design of its program according to the "center rule" and demonstrated evidence of the components contained in the rule. The components of the "center rule" included:

- collaborative decision-making,
- learner-centered, field-based teacher education,
- technology integrated into the delivery of instruction, and
Reflections on the Intended Outcomes

To address research question #5: "After four years of reform, what are the institutional outcomes for the initial 17 institutions and to what extent have the intentions of the reform been realized?" an analysis was conducted on the results of the survey of the initial 17 institutions approved under the new policy change. Ascertaining the outcomes for the 17 institutions and to what extent the intentions of the reform had been realized was appropriately done by surveying the opinions of individuals who were actually involved in the reform effort at these institutions. Questionnaires were mailed to directors of the Centers for Professional Development and Technology and deans or administrative heads of the initial 17 institutions approved under the new approval process.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate which descriptor "best described their place of employment and position." Part II of the survey requested respondents to provide "information concerning the educator preparation at their respective institution." Questions 1 and 2 of Part II of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate which of the descriptors "best described the primary educator preparation route at their respective institution" and to indicate which descriptor "best described the teacher education program their particular institution." Questions 3 through 10 of Part II asked respondents to indicate the "approximate percentages of their educator
preparation which provided various experiences, topics, and budgetary allocations."

The following scale was used to indicate the percentage:

A = less than 20;
B = 20-40;
C = 41-60;
D = 61-80 and;
E = 81-100.

The number of respondents who indicated a rating, percentages of respondents who indicated a response at each rating point, and the mean ratings for each item were reported for each question in Table 10.

Part III of the questionnaire asked respondents to "rate the educator preparation program at their institution." Respondents were requested to indicate if various components described in items A through N were covered and to indicate the degree of satisfaction regarding the institution's coverage of that component. The rating scale used was as follows:

1 = very dissatisfied,
2 = somewhat dissatisfied,
3 = neutral,
4 = somewhat satisfied, and
5 = very satisfied.
The number of respondents who indicated a rating, percentages of respondents who indicated a response at each rating point, and the mean ratings for each item were reported for each question in Table 11.

Table 8 identifies demographic information of individuals who responded to the questionnaire. Respondents were identified in terms of how each described his/her place of employment and position. These are reported in percentages. Table 9 reports how respondents described "information concerning the teacher preparation program at their institution" for questions 1 and 2 of part II of the questionnaire. Table 10 summarizes the findings of how respondents rated the "teacher preparation program at their institution" for questions 3-10 of Part II of the questionnaire. Table 11 summarizes the findings for Part III (items A-N) of the questionnaire.

Survey Demographics and Return Rate

This study involved eight Centers for Professional Development and Technology and included a total of 17 institutions. To ascertain institutional outcomes and to what extent the intentions of the reform had been realized for these 17 institutions, questionnaires were distributed to 25 individuals. In addition to CPDT directors, the dean or university administrator for the teacher preparation program of the institution where the CPDT director was housed was sent a questionnaire. An overall response rate of 56% (14) was obtained from the 25 questionnaires mailed. The respondents represented 15 of the 17 institutions because some CPDT directors were associated with multiple universities.
Table 8

Survey of the First 17 Entities Approved Under the New Texas Approval Process Under the Center Rule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses in Percentages</th>
<th>Part I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check the one which best describes your place of employment (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.7 College of Education</td>
<td>42.9  CPDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ College of Arts and Science</td>
<td>_ ACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Professional Organization</td>
<td>_ TEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check the one which best describes your position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.9 University Faculty Member (Educator Preparation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ University Faculty Member (____ Sciences ____ Liberal Arts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Student (Educator Preparation Program)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Classroom Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.6** University Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Associate Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Director Division of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3 Chair Division of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Director of CPDT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.9 Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Public School Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note: Two administrators were also identified as university faculty members
### Part II. Information Concerning the Teacher Preparation Program at Your Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What best describes the primary teacher preparation route at your institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Undergraduate</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Post-baccalaureate (deficiency plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Traditional Teacher Education Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Center for Professional Development and Technology</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Combination (traditional &amp; CPDT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (specify)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5 year program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. What best describes the teacher education program at your institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Performance-based (where individuals are evaluated on satisfactory demonstration of proficiencies that indicate the successful application of theory.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Field-based (heavy emphasis on college coursework in which the primary activity is the actual performance of some teacher activities while interacting with public school students, teachers and university faculty members in a school-related setting.)</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A combination of performance-based and field experience</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Traditional type program where the majority of course work is conducted primarily at a university-based facility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (specify) School-based nontraditional coursework</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

*Information Concerning the Teacher Preparation Program at your Institution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>less than 20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>41-60</th>
<th>61-80</th>
<th>81-100</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is delivered by university faculty?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Is delivered by public school personnel?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Involves the integration of technology throughout all course work?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Involves field experiences within a public school setting?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Covers assessment and testing including performance-based assessment and/or authentic assessment?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Involves collaboration in planning and delivery of instruction between and among faculty in the college or Department of Education?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Involves collaboration in planning and delivery of instruction between and among faculty in the college or Department of Education and the colleges of Sciences and Liberal Arts?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>What percentage of the universities' budget is allocated to supporting the educator preparation program?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Rating the Educator Preparation Program at your Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Question Area Covered in Program</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Use of technology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Working with cultural/economic student diversity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bilingual and/or English as a second language instruction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Field experiences provided and valued as a part of the program</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Participation in site-based management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Critiquing personal instruction for purposes of self-improvement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Question Area Covered in Program</td>
<td>Number Responding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied (1)</td>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied (2)</td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied (4)</td>
<td>Very Satisfied (5)</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>including performance-based/authentic assessment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Conflict resolution techniques</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Teaming/Working collaboratively</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Working with students having special learning needs (i.e. Special Ed)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Communicating with students/parents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The college of education was selected as the best descriptor of their place of employment by 85.7% of the 14 respondents. The term "CPDT" was selected as the best descriptor for their place of employment by 42.9% of the 14 respondents. Six respondents indicated both college of education and CPDT. "University faculty member" was reported as the best descriptor of their position by 42.9% of the respondents. Those identifying "university administrator" were Dean (42.9); Associate Dean (7.1%); Chair, Division of Education (14.3%); and Director of CPDT (7.1%). Two (14.3%) of the university administrators also reported "university faculty member-education program" as the descriptor for their position. Table 8 reports the findings for Part I of the questionnaire.

Program Types (Questions 1 and 2)

Results of Questions 1 and 2 of the questionnaire are reported in Table 8. "Undergraduate" as the primary teacher education route at their institution was reported by 21.4% of the respondents. "CPDT" was selected as the best descriptor for their primary teacher education route at their institution by 71.4% of the respondents. "Other" was indicated by 7.1% with "a 5 year program" reported as the best descriptor for the primary teacher education route at their institution.

The highest percentage (64.3%) of respondents reported "A combination of performance-based and field experience" for Question 2. "Field-based" was reported by 28.6% of the respondents as the best descriptor for the teacher education route at their institution. One (7.1%) of the respondents reported "other" indicating "school-
based nontraditional coursework" as the best descriptor for the teacher education route at that respondent's institution.

Program Characteristics (Questions 3-10)

Table 10 reports the findings for Questions 3-10 of the questionnaire. The following coding system was used in determining the mean ratings for Questions 3-10:

1 = less than 20;
2 = 20-40;
3 = 41-60;
4 = 61-80, and
5 = 81-100.

Field-based experiences within a public school setting (Question 6) and collaboration in planning and delivery of instruction between and among faculty in the college or department of education (Question 8) were perceived as strong elements in teacher education programs with mean ratings of 4.4 and 4.5. Performance-based assessment techniques (Question 7) were also highly rated as program characteristics (mean of 4.1). Most instruction is still delivered by education faculty (4.2) (Question 3). Technology integration (Question 5) received a mean rating of 3.4, indicating that technology was not fully implemented in all aspects of the program.

Collaboration in planning and delivery of instruction between and among faculty in the college or department of education and colleges of science and liberal
arts (Question 9) was perceived as a weak characteristic (2.43) of teacher education programs. Also, instruction by public school personnel was a low rated area (1.3).

**Satisfaction with Components of Teacher Education Program (A-N)**

Findings for Part III (items A through N) are reported in Table 11. Based on responses by respondents, 11 of 14 (79.6%) areas were identified as being covered in the educator preparation program. This would indicate a high level of consistency in the components of the delivery system by the 17 institutions.

Eleven areas received high ratings of satisfaction with mean ratings between 3.75 and 4.00. Respondents gave the highest mean ratings of 4.2 and above to six areas:

- Pedagogy,
- Content knowledge,
- Working with cultural/economic student diversity,
- Classroom management,
- Field experiences, and
- Critiquing personal instruction for purposes of self-improvement.

Pedagogy received the highest mean rating of 4.42 and the others were rated at 4.2.

Three areas received medium mean ratings between 3.57 and 3.7:

- Bilingual and/or English as a Second Language instruction,
- Conflict resolution techniques, and
- Communicating with students/parents.

The three areas reported as not being covered in their teacher education program were:

- Bilingual and/or English as a Second Language instruction,
- Conflict resolution techniques, and
- Teaming/working collaboratively.

The area covered in the educator preparation program in which respondents indicated the least degree of satisfaction was communicating with students/parents with a mean rating of 3.57.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This study was an investigation of the process of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts and an analysis of that process. The five objectives were: (1) to identify and describe the roles and responsibilities of individuals and groups in the early development of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts; (2) to identify and describe the specific actions undertaken by individuals and groups to bring about policy changes; (3) to identify and describe the policy changes and their intended results; (4) to identify and describe intended outcomes as revealed in the approval process of the 17 initial institutions; and, (5) to ascertain, after four years of the reform, perceptions of leaders of the 17 institutions the extent to which the intentions of the reform had been realized.

In addition to addressing the five research questions, David Easton's (1965) Political Systems Model and Michael Fullan's (1991) Change Process Model were used as theoretical frameworks to analyze the process involved in the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort. The Macrosphere (all societies or subsystems within the environment) is explained by Easton's model and assisted in understanding the process of change as impacted by the political system and other subsystems in the environment. Easton's model helps explain that what happens in the environment affects the political system through the kinds of influences that flow into and through
its structures and procedures. The Microsphere (single individual or entity) is explained by Fullan's model and assisted in understanding the process of implementation of an innovation or reform for a single or small group of individuals or entities within the society. The success of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort can be determined when viewed through the theoretical frameworks of these models.

Findings for Questions 1 and 2 provided a historical perspective and described the key individuals and groups as well as actions each took during the 1992 Texas teacher education reform efforts. The Texas legislature mandated legislative actions to address the identified problems or areas of concern related to teacher education within the State. The 1984 legislative mandate provided the initial framework for the accountability system for educator preparation in Texas. This provided the policy mechanism which set in motion a performance-based accountability system for teacher education in Texas. The charge to develop the performance-based accountability system for educator preparation was communicated by Commissioner Lionel Meno to the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). This Commission undertook the development of teacher and administrator proficiencies, as well as the development of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation and the accountability-oriented approval process. Three elements of the performance-based accountability system were adopted by the SBOE. Only the reengineering of certificates was not completed in two years.
The CSTP, as the primary facilitator for change in educator preparation in Texas, established a process for working with professional educators and securing their ideas. The goal of the CSTP was to develop an accountability system which would, over time, increase the quality of teacher education programs in Texas and would attend to the issues of diversity and special needs in Texas schools. The CSTP, with the assistance of educators, teachers, and members from the field, developed an accountability system that relied on analyzing performance results of each entity. Rather than working on specific rules to govern all preparation programs, this procedure allowed the State to determine the quality of educator preparation entities, teachers and administrators being prepared for work in Texas schools.

The adoption of the teacher and administrator proficiencies by the State Board of Education in February of 1994 identified proficiencies that teachers and administrators must know, value, and be able to demonstrate for all children to have access to quality education. Twelve central themes emerged from CSTP's discussions with members of the field which undergird both teacher and administrator proficiencies:

1. Learner-centeredness
2. Diversity
3. Active learning
4. Teaching for meaningful outcomes
5. Communication
6. Higher-order thinking
National reports and recommendations strongly influenced the efforts of the CSTP as the Texas performance-based accountability system came into place. Performance-based accountability, as it was conceived, embraced characteristics out of teacher education reform recommendations and the list of characteristics (Table 7) identified appeared consistently in the reports and recommendations. This list became the operationalized performance-based accountability system that served as a framework for the work of the Commission and represents the framework of policy recommendations that the CSTP used to develop proficiencies, ASEP and the approval process. Thus, elements of teacher education reform were put together in the Texas teacher education reform process. Since 18 of the 21 ideal characteristics of a performance-based accountability system identified in Table 7 were embedded in the system, it appears that at least on paper the reform effort has achieved a reasonable level of success.

Seventeen institutions were approved under the new process. Based on the Executive Summaries of the institutions and the CSTP’s minutes and notes from the formal presentation, the institutions’ intended outcomes were acceptable responses to
the new policy. All were approved under the process which called for accountability measures, field-base integrated with theory and practice, collaborative decision-making, integration of technology in instruction, and utilization of multiple forms of performance-based assessments in authentic settings. The primary goal of each of the 17 institutions was teacher education candidates who would demonstrate competency in the five teacher proficiencies at entry level upon completion of their teacher education program.

The restructured teacher education delivery system for the 17 institutions was designed similar to a medical model with field experiences primarily in the form of internships and residencies. Benchmark assessments were central to all programs. Finally, the comprehensive delivery system for the 17 institutions provided for the acquisition of all five teacher proficiencies.

Areas identified in the questionnaire (with the results delineated in Tables 10 and 11) included critical characteristics inclusive of a performance-based comprehensive delivery system (product rather than process drive) and addressed the acquisition of all five teacher proficiencies.

Data from the survey of individuals' perceptions associated with the initial 17 institutions indicated that most of the entities were making a transition toward a comprehensive performance-based delivery system which included increased field experience, collaboration with public schools, and integration of technology into the instructional process.
Field-based experiences within a public school setting and collaboration in planning and delivery of instruction between and among faculty in the college or department of education were perceived as strong elements in teacher education programs with mean ratings of 4.4 and 4.5. Performance-based assessment techniques were also highly rated as program characteristics (mean of 4.1). However, most instruction is still delivered by education faculty (4.2). Technology integration was not fully implemented in all aspects of the program and received a mean rating of 3.4.

The two areas perceived as being weak in the teacher education programs were collaboration in planning and delivery of instruction between and among faculty in the college or department of education and colleges of science and liberal arts (2.43) and instruction by public school personnel (1.3).

Respondents gave the highest mean ratings of 4.2 and above to six areas: pedagogy, content knowledge, working with cultural/economic student diversity, classroom management, field experience, and critiquing personal instruction for purposes of self-improvement. Communicating with students/parents (3.57) was the area respondents indicated as providing the least degree of satisfaction. Additionally, three areas were reported as not being covered in their teacher education programs: Bilingual and/or English as a Second Language, conflict resolution techniques, and teaming/working collaboratively.
Analysis of Change Process—
Theoretical Framework

The mandating of an accountability system for educator preparation by the Texas legislature in 1984, and subsequent significant policy change by the Texas State Board of Education beginning in 1992, appears to "fit" David Easton's Political System's Model. External pressures on schools, such as *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (1983), the *SCANS Report, Goals 2000, America 2000*, and Texas' Select Committee on Higher Education (SCOHE), resulting in most of the components of SB 994, served as an impetus to examine the way teachers were trained in Texas. Simultaneous reform—public schools and teacher education working together—became the focus. A thrust to involve and consider the total educational arena from Pre-K to 22 was needed. This effort involved a comprehensive plan to ensure the coordination of effort and to eliminate conflict and duplication.

Additionally, societal changes, including the growing diversity in Texas public school students, were among the environmental and societal demands and influences within and outside of the educational system. These inputs or external factors impinged a stress on the system, as noted by Easton (1965). Easton's Political Systems model effectively described the interdependence and reciprocal relationship between subsystems in Texas (the Texas Legislature, the State Board of Education, the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession, TEA staff members, professional organizations, individual practitioners, and educator preparation entities).
Eastern's interdependence and reciprocal relationship between subsystems were evidenced in the reporting of research questions #1: *What were the roles and responsibilities of individuals and groups in the early development of the 1992 Texas Teacher education reform efforts?*; and research question #2: *What specific actions were undertaken by individuals and groups to bring about policy changes?* Easton's model clearly assisted in understanding and analyzing the dynamic and interactive political systems involved in the development of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort which moved teacher educator preparation in Texas to a performance-based accountability system which focused on the product of the program. Examples of this dynamic and interactive involvement were seen in the discussions of CSTP members with professional organizations, TEA staff members, focus groups, and roundtable discussions during the adoption of the teacher and administrator proficiencies, the accountability system (ASEP) and components of the approval process. While each group and individual brought different meanings and agendas to the table resulting in discussions, at times, becoming rather heated and emotional, and with resistance at an all-time high, a common vision and commitment to improving the quality of the product (teacher education candidate) and ultimately improving and enhancing student learning (public school students) emerged and prevailed.

The pressures in the existing education system, specifically the low academic performance of Texas public school students, along with the disparities that existed between various student groupings, created situations ripe for change. As Easton (1965) indicated, such stress-generated influences, also referred to as "outputs,"
ultimately lead to the reform effort designed to transform the way in which Texas prepares its teachers. The institutions of higher education and public school systems resisted change until pressure created so much disturbance that it potentially threatened their very existence. This was seen in the legislative actions supporting home schooling, charter schools, and an increase in parental rights outlined in Senate Bill 1. Legislative actions demanding greater accountability made it impossible to avoid the growing pressure. In Easton’s Political Systems Model, all outputs are alike in containing a statement of “who gets what, when, and how.” Public school students in Texas were intended to reap the benefits of Texas’ teacher education reform effort.

Output decisions based on this change process model also allocate values and resources. Texas public school students represent resources for this State. The mandate by Texas’ legislature was indeed requisite to initiate change. Supports, described in Easton’s Political Systems Model, represent a willingness to accept the decisions of the system to sustain its legitimacy. Since these institutions, and others involved in preparing Texas teachers, are in the early stages of implementation, whether the results of the Texas legislature’s move to a performance-based accountability system matches its intentions of improving and enhancing the academic performance for all Texas public school students remains to be seen. Table 12 depicts a flow of Easton’s Model applied to the 1992 Texas teacher education reform.
While Easton’s model was appropriate for the analysis of the macrosphere change process, it does not work as well at the change implementation level. Michael Fullan’s (1991) Change Process Model, as a tool to view this process, revealed that each of the 17 initial institutions was making a concerted effort to "implement" the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort (move to a performance-based accountability system). This would mean that these 17 institutions are all currently in Phase II, "implementation," of Michael Fullan’s (1991) Change Process Model. Both Fullan (1991) and Loucks-Horsley (1989) insist that the predominant concern in the implementation phase is one of management. This second phase, in which each of the 17 institutions involved in this study find themselves, and subsequently where all other entities preparing Texas teachers will soon emerge, implies follow-up assistance is critical. Table 13 illustrates Fullan’s Change Process Model as applied to the current phase of the initial 17 Institutions approved under the new approval process.

Several factors affect the implementation phase and, hence, the successful movement to the continuation and final outcome phase of Fullan’s Model (1991). These six themes (vision building, evolutionary planning, initiative-taking /empowerment, monitoring/problem coping, and restructuring), identified by Fullan in Chapter 2, must be attended to by the identified change facilitators (the CSTP, now the State Board of Educator Certification [SBEC]). The vision building and evolutionary planning theme (blending of "top-down" initiative with "bottom-down" involvement) has already occurred for individuals and groups involved in the
Table 12
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development of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform. Theme 3, initiative-taking and empowerment, was demonstrated by Dr. Robert Cox and other college of education deans with the Educator Preparation Improvement Initiative (EPII), and has become an integral part of the process of moving Texas' teacher educator preparation programs to a performance-based accountability system.

The findings addressed in Questions 3 and 4 indicate that the restructuring of the delivery system to a comprehensive performance-based accountability system is well on its way. Perhaps the most crucial of Fullan's 6 themes to be addressed remains that of "monitoring and problem coping." This theme includes information systems and resources, as well as a process for acting on the results. Care in developing a process and appropriate means to promote problem-solving and problem-coping strategies which remain in line with the common vision of continuous improvement and flexibility advocated by CSTP is crucial. Since the Commission on Standards was abolished and replaced by the State Board of Educator Certification, the area of monitoring and problem coping emanates as one of this group's important agenda items. Additionally, since Fullan concludes that this area is the last, most difficult, and complex portion to effectively put in place, it is crucial that information about how successful or unsuccessful the 1992 Texas teacher reform effort is going be is shared with all stakeholders. Also imperative is developing and implementing a mechanism to weed out mistakes and further develop promising practices which will assist Texas educator preparation entities in a successful move to a comprehensive performance-based delivery system. These
efforts will provide greater assurance in determining whether Texas teacher education entities move to true institutionalization of the reform.

Summary of Findings

Reform is designed to bring about change. Change is a process that, in any organization, does not occur quickly and which is subject to the influence of many variables. In the case of schools, this is especially so because of organizational structure, culture and climate. Furthermore, in order to know if change has occurred, it is necessary to have some indicators to provide valid and reliable data (Blosser, 1989). Fullan’s Change Process Model, coupled with Easton’s Political System’s Model, were appropriate tools to use in analyzing the historical process of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort from a change process perspective.

Easton’s Political Systems model provided a broad and holistic view of the political system in operation. Table 7 appears to indicate that the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort did, in fact, follow the theoretical framework of Easton’s model since, through the work of the CSTP, as directed by the SBOE, an accountability system for both public schools (AEIS) and educator preparation programs (ASEP) were adopted. Hence, there was congruence between the actions taken by the SBOE and the CSTP and the intentions of legislative action and policy change.

Fullan’s model provided a means to determine the specific phase of the change process that was being implemented and a gauge to calculate the success of the Texas teacher education reform effort. While the number of institutions involved in
this study was limited, based on Fullan's model and the results of the perceptions of individuals involved in the first 17 institutions, the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort appears to be showing limited positive results. After four years of the reform being in place, the first 17 institutions approved under the new performance-based approval process appear to be in the "implementation phase," as identified in Fullan's model (Table 13). This implementation phase constitutes the means by which one achieves the "outcome" or end results of the innovation.

Fullan concludes that the total time from initiation to continuation or institutionalization can be long, ranging from 3 to 5 years for fairly complex reforms. Major reforms or restructuring efforts could take as long as 5 to 10 years. The complexity of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform required, in most cases, a total restructuring of the instructional delivery system and major changes in beliefs and practices of stakeholders. At the crux of understanding educational change, according to Fullan, is an understanding of the organizational and institutional factors that influence the process of change. This requires an appreciation for the difficulties and complexities inherent in change and an understanding of why individuals resist change. As expected, throughout the development of the reform effort, evidence of resistance by many did occur. However, as noted by Fullan, the most significant point from his model is that change or reform of any type is a process and requires an understanding of the difficulty and complexity of change as well as an understanding of why individuals resist change. Hence, the total time from implementation to continuation ranges from 3 to 5 years and, in reform efforts
Michael Fullan's Change Process Model Applied to the Initial 17 Institutions Approved Under the New Approval Process

Table 13

PHASES

PHASE I
  INITIATION
    MOBILIZATION
      ADOPTION

PHASE II
  IMPLEMENTATION
    INITIAL USE
      MOBILIZATION

PHASE III
  CONTINUATION
    CORPORATION
      ROUTINIZATION

PHASE IV
  OUTCOME
    THE RESULTS
      END PRODUCT

17 Initial Institutions approved under new approval process

Stephen F. Austin State University
Southwest Texas State University
University of Houston-Downtown
Panhandle South Plains CPDT

Texas Tech University
West Texas A&M University
Northeast CPDT
East Texas State University-Commerce
East Texas State University - Texarkana

University of North Texas - Denton
Center for Educational Development and Excellence
Our Lady of the Lake
University of Texas at San Antonio
TTU
St. Mary's University
Incarnate Word College
Texas Education Collaborative
Prairie View A&M
University of Texas A&M (College Station)

**Unfunded CPDT
such as the 1992 Texas teacher education reform which involves major restructuring, efforts and outcome assessment could take as long as 5 to 10 years.

The success of the reforms and changes requires a continuous struggle to understand and adapt events and processes that impact the implementation of the proposed change or innovation. As Fullan notes, "A theory of change should be judged only in terms of whether it is successfully implemented" (1991, p. 112). Did it actually alter the identified area? Hence, in order to fully assess the appropriateness of Fullan’s model and ultimately the effectiveness of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort, further changes and mandates by the legislature need to be limited in order to provide ample time for the reform to be fully implemented and outcomes to be assessed. Thus, as supported by researchers such as Fullan, the single most important idea is that change is a process. Additionally, initiators of change must recognize and attend to the fact that what occurs at one stage of the change process strongly affects subsequent stages. Furthermore, since the processes are so entangled, dynamic, and interactive, new determinants may also appear while the innovation or reform is being implemented.

Several negative conclusions and concerns emerged as a result of the investigations in this study and reflect upon Fullan’s and Easton’s change process models. One negative conclusion that can be drawn from this investigation is the existence of too many stakeholders who chose to resist and refused to become actively involved in the process of improving the quality of teacher education programs. Such passive
resistance is detrimental to the profession as a whole and ultimately can contribute
unnecessary stressors to the political system.

A second concern identified relates to the areas perceived by survey
respondents as being either weak or not covered in their educator preparation
programs (communicating with students/parents, bilingual and/or English as a Second
Language, conflict resolution techniques, and teaming/working collaboratively).
Given the diversity of Texas' student population, particularly with Texas' large
bilingual student population, the increase in violence in Texas public schools and the
increase in parental rights represent crucial areas which need to be addressed in the
preparation of Texas teachers.

Concluding Observations

As stated by Barron (1994), and according Palumbo (1988), policy is the
output of the policy making system; hence, the 1984 legislative action. The 1984
legislative mandate provided the initial impetus for the establishment of an
accountability system for educator preparation in Texas. While the SBOE set in
motion the policy change that moved educator preparation and certification towards a
performance-centered accountability system, it would be the Commission on
Standards for the Teaching Profession who would serve as the change facilitator for
this process. It was the CSTP who recognized that the development of the Account-
ability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) would again verify the research-
based assumptions about change noted in Chapter 2.
The CSTP, serving as the change facilitator, recognized that only people, not materials or equipment, can effectively compel change by altering their behaviors. Serving also as representatives from the profession, Commission members, working with the stakeholders in an adaptive and systematic way, designed an accountability system which was interactive, developmental, and meet the needs of individual institutions and entities responsible for preparing teachers. The CSTP's goal was to fulfill the global intent of the Texas legislature and the SBOE—to develop a performance-based accountability system for educator preparation programs which would ultimately produce a teaching force which would enhance student learning, success, and achievement.

The acceptance of the charge given by the Commissioner to the CSTP to move towards performance-based accountability required that the SBOE give serious consideration to the mission of public education. The development of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation and the new approval process addresses the State's commitment to create and maintain a teaching force which would produce enhanced student learning, success and achievement.

The responses of many of those involved in the process were marked by denial, resistance, defensiveness, and a "this too shall pass" attitude. However, there were many more who saw this as a rare opportunity for the profession itself to develop its own performance-based accountability system rather than have the details dictated by the legislators who, in 1984 and at other times, mandated a change.
On September 20, 1991, the Texas Education Agency Reorganization Advisory Committee recommended three principles adopted by the CSTP:

• For a delivery system to be most efficient, all organizational components must be included in the planning, be involved in the implementation of the plan, and be held accountable for the results.

• Universities approved by TEA to prepare teachers and/or others certified professional staff must involve public school practitioners in developing those preparatory programs and in selecting faculty.

• Universities preparing teachers and/or other certified professional staff will have flexibility to make program decisions to meet expressed needs of school districts. (TEA, 1991, p. 2).

Despite the efforts of the Commission to conduct an open and inclusive process, many individuals and institutions were resistant and hostile, as predicted by Fullan's model. A majority of the educators were in "paradigm paralyses," while a minority could be described as "paradigm shifters."

Virtually every state is re-examining the way its schools are educating children and perhaps, more importantly, state leaders are taking a closer look at "why" the State needs to educate all of its children. To the surprise of many, a realization has occurred that schools can no longer only educate a select few, but must educate all children. Additionally, for a long time, educators defined education in terms of intentions and efforts. A preoccupation with results implies that someone must be held responsible for producing them. The press for accountability is a major
component of the reforms that characterize American education today and is at the 

crux of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort. Likewise, while assessment 

may evoke strong convictions among those who advocate high standards and testing, 

only when it becomes a major political issue at the state or local level, and is joined 

to accountability, do we sense it as a crisis or threat. Again, such is the case with 

the move to a performance-based accountability system for educator preparation in 

Texas. "Don’t fix what’s not broken" was the outburst of many leaders of educator 

preparation programs. However, CSTP members noted a gap between the written 

proposals and the understanding of the move to a performance-based accountability 

system by several individuals involved in the first round of program approval 

process.

Nevertheless, Texas elected officials began, in 1984, to understand the crucial 

role accountability had to play and thus provided the impetus for the significant 

policy change regarding educator preparation in Texas. In a time of difficult fiscal 

rigidity, Texas’ taxpayers are no longer content to hand over their money, in the 

form of tax dollars, and not demand results. Perhaps inspired largely by business 

interests, the "end product" or "output," as perceived by the general public as well as 

elected officials, is increasingly focused on holding educators and educational 

institutions accountable for their results.

The responsibility to educate all students has always been great, but today, 

educators across the nation perceive an increased difficulty in performing that 

charge. Schools are faced with the awesome responsibility of educating America’s
children with a world vision. Educators in our public schools, as well as in institutions of higher education, must be prepared to provide students with the skills to not only compete within the classroom, but to compete in the international arena. Today’s children must be prepared to contemplate solutions, respond to conditions and to procreate ideas and products on a more complex level than ever before. The technological age in which students currently find themselves increases the necessity of having the teachers who are, as compared to past years, better prepared.

Texas educators, with the State’s population growing more and more diverse every day, are faced with an even greater challenge. This, if for no other reason, provided the framework which created the restructuring movement in Texas.

Texas is leading the way in developing a performance-based accountability system (Accountability System for Educator Preparation and new approval process) which involves all of its players in a process of continuous improvement toward the achievement of a single set of comprehensive standards for education preparation entities. Additionally, the development of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation and new approval process provides educator preparation entities in Texas with the flexibility to design a variety of undergraduate degree preparation programs and alternative certification programs to meet the diverse needs of prospective teachers and respond to the changing needs of students through collaborations between entities preparing educators and public schools. Recognizing that it is difficult to move from process to performance, from rigid to flexible, from dictatorial to collaborative, the CSTP chose every avenue to include all stakeholders.
And yet, as a participate observer in the 1992 Texas reform effort, the researcher noted that many individuals did not fully understand the philosophy of accountability. This was noted in the lack of openness among all the key players as well as the verbalization of many that the ASEP and the approval process were "forced down their throats." States contemplating change need to do better at developing a shared vision as they attempt to implement reform efforts as comprehensive as the 1992 Texas reform effort. The new State Board of Educator Certification is already considering changes in the ASEP, which is a good indication that the reform effort did not possess widespread meaning.

Recommendations for Change

Based on the survey of literature and data collected during this investigation, the following recommendations are offered to other states contemplating change, particularly those moving toward a performance-based accountability system:

1. As the first element of quality control, attention should be given to admission requirements for teacher education programs.

2. Attention should be given to the teacher appraisal system currently under development to ensure its appropriateness as an accreditation indicator for the ASEP inferred linkage to student academic achievement. Of particular difficulty in this area is the limitations of Texas' public school assessment measures. In Texas, TAAS is used as an accountability indicator for public schools and continues to measure a narrow focus of learning. Adequate measures for assessing broad ranges of learning have yet to be determined.
3. Attention should be given to addressing teacher empowerment and retention. The need to develop support systems and establish built-in collaborative work cultures for beginning teachers is critical. Opportunities to increase teacher empowerment and improve teachers’ attitudes toward themselves and the profession must be considered and acted upon.

4. Attention should be given to increasing the presence of alternative certification designs and the notion that anyone with proficient content knowledge can be swiftly prepared for teaching. Issues of alternative routes and such schemes as local school districts permit continue to undercut performance-based accountability in public schools and teacher education. These areas demand close monitoring by members of the profession to ensure uniform performance standards are maintained.

5. Attention should continue to be given to ensuring that all stakeholders remain in the loop regarding revisions to the reform effort. Constant attention must be given to both the content and process of the reform and their complex interrelationship. This can be done only when it is rooted in the particular roles and in the particular situations of all stakeholders.

6. Attention should continue to be given to the needs and concerns of those directly involved in the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort. The success of any reform effort depends on people; hence, mechanisms to address the needs and concerns of those directly involved in this 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort are crucial and must be addressed.
7. Attention is needed in addressing all aspects of initial preparation—
academic knowledge, general and specific pedagogy, foundation, and field
experiences. This area requires aligning, including demand coherence and
greater integration. Goodlad stated that every curriculum component must
be developed for its contribution to a professional curriculum, and not be
present simply to meet specific content prerequisites.

8. Attention must be given to maintaining the "continuous improvement"
focus of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation and the new
approval process. This is vital if the Texas educator preparation programs
are to assist in helping the State fulfill its goal of ensuring that, even with
its diverse public student population, all students are able to be
academically successful and are being taught by well-prepared teachers.

9. Proactive involvement needs to be maintained by all stakeholders. The
effective preparation of the beginning teacher is crucial. The Texas
educator program shows promising results toward moving in this direction.
It is important that members of the profession not allow the efforts by the
SBOE, CSTP, professional organizations and practitioners involved in the
development of the performance based-accountability system in Texas, with
its focus on the "product," to be placed on the shelf.
Recommendations for Future Study

While the research literature has yet to validate the linkage between restructuring components and student outcomes, additional studies are needed to determine the outcomes of the 1992 Texas teacher education reform effort (increased and enhanced achievement for all Texas Students). The following areas are suggested for future research analysis:

1. Continued research and analysis regarding the success of the 1992 Texas reform effort, including a survey of larger numbers of Texas institutions approved under the new approval process involved in teacher preparation, should be conducted. These investigations should focus on those areas identified in this study which received the lowest mean ratings to determine, if, over time, improvement has been realized in those areas (communicating with students/parents, bilingual and/or English as a Second Language, conflict resolution techniques, and teaming/working collaboratively).

2. Further research is needed regarding the issue of collaboration, particularly collaborative relationships which focus on planning and delivery of instruction between and among faculty in the college or department of education and colleges of science and liberal arts and public school personnel. In this study, these two areas of teacher education programs were perceived as weak. As a participant observer, and based on the results of this study, it appears that collaboration between teacher education
programs and public schools is a key issue in making these reforms work. Fullan also recommended that professional components, both on campus and in the field, occur in earlier collaboration with liberal arts and science faculties. It may prove interesting to investigate collaboration in teacher education programs as Peggy Killgaard has examined the role of professional development and training in the reform effort.

3. The Educator Preparation Improvement Initiative (EPII), proposed by Dr. Robert Cox and other college of education deans, is another area for further investigation. This type of initiative and peer technical assistance is supported by the research noted in Chapter 2 of this study and would appear to show promising results with regard to improving the quality of educator preparation for those entities whose current education candidates do not meet the State’s standards.

4. Finally, further study and analysis regarding issues of admission standards to teacher education programs is needed, including the impact of admission standards on teacher education candidates’ retention rates and in terms of admission standards related to the needs of the system and employment patterns. These investigations should focus on the criteria used for the selection of candidates such as whether the individual enters with fundamental skills, both academic and personal, such as the communication skills and disposition desired in candidates entering the profession.
Dear Fellow Educator:

Many reform efforts in education, both in public schools and institutions of higher education, have occurred over the past century. Texas, like many other states, continues to struggle with the goals of preparing more teachers to meet the increased demands caused by growth, building a teaching force that better reflects the diversity of the state’s population, and ensuring that teachers are better prepared to teach in the diverse classrooms that characterize Texas public schools.

In 1992, the State Board of Education established an institutional accountability system to hold school districts accountable for student learning. In order to achieve the goals of excellence and equity for all children in Texas, in 1993, the SBOE set in motion a significant policy change for educator preparation and certification by moving toward a performance-based accountability system, known as Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP). The new policy mandated learner-centered schools for Texas. Undergirding the standards, criteria, and program approval process, were educator proficiencies. This new performance-based accountability system for entities preparing educators was designed to create educator preparation programs which are learner-centered, field-based, and focused on public schools and enhanced student learning.

Since the implementation of (ASEP) is relatively new, there are still areas that are developing and issues which need clarification. I am engaged in a study to determine if, and to what degree, the components of educator preparation programs approved under the new approval process under Center Rule and as part of the Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) have been actually implemented. I believe that the results of this survey can offer insights and contribute to our profession in terms of perceptions of stakeholders and benefits and barriers to the change process with regard to this reform effort.

Attached is a questionnaire that you are asked to complete and return in the pre-addressed postage paid envelope. This study involves only individuals associated with the first 17 entities approved under the new approval process under Center Rule. Hence, it is vital to the study that your questionnaire be returned. Your support and assistance are appreciated. Neither your name nor the name of your institution will be identified in the study. Please complete and return your completed questionnaire to me by September 10, 1996. This project has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Committee for the projection of Human Subjects (817) 565-3940.

Your participation and assistance in this endeavor are again greatly appreciated. Hopefully, the results will prove meaningful and useful to Texas educators.

Sincerely,

Marva T. Dixon
Principal, Grand Prairie ISD
Doctoral Candidate, University of North Texas
SURVEY OF THE FIRST 18 ENTITIES APPROVED UNDER THE NEW TEXAS APPROVAL PROCESS UNDER CENTER RULE

Part I: Demographic Information

Check the one which best describes your place of employment (if applicable):

___ College of Education  ___ CPDT  ___ Business
___ College of Arts and Science  ___ ACP  ___ Public School
___ Professional Organization  ___ TEA  ___ Administration

Check the one which best describes your position:

___ University Faculty Member (Educator Preparation)
___ University Faculty Member (___ Sciences ___ Liberal Arts)
___ Student (Educator Preparation Program)
___ Classroom Teacher
___ University Administrator (Title:__________)
___ Public School Administrator (Title:__________)
___ Other (specify)____________

Directions: Please respond to the following questions according to the direction provided under each section.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.
Thank you.

If you have any questions, contact: Marva T. Dixon 1-214-641-0847
or
Fax: 1-214-641-1715.
Part II: Information Concerning the Teacher Preparation Program at Your Institution

1. What best describes the primary teacher preparation route at your institution? *Mark only one answer.*
   a. ____ Undergraduate
   b. ____ Post-baccalaureate (deficiency Plan)
   c. ____ Traditional Teacher Education Program
   d. ____ Center for Professional Development and Technology
   e. ____ Combination (traditional & CPDT)
   f. ____ Other (specify)__________________________

2. What best describes the teacher education program at your institution? *Mark only one answer*
   a. ___ Performance-based (where individuals are evaluated on satisfactory demonstration of proficiencies that indicate the successful application of theory.
   b. ___ Field-based (heavy emphasis on college coursework in which the primary activity is the actual performance of some teacher activities while interacting with public school students, teachers and university faculty members in a school-related setting.
   c. ___ A combination of performance-based and field experience
   d. ___ Traditional type program where the majority of course work is conducted primarily at a university-based facility.
   e. ___ Other (specify)____________________________________

For items 3-11, please respond to the following:
Approximately what percentage of educator preparation at your institution:

3. is delivered by university faculty? *Mark only one answer*
   a. ___ less than 20%
   b. ___ 20% - 40%
   c. ___ 41% - 60%
   d. ___ 61% - 80%
   e. ___ 81% - 100%
4. is delivered by public school personnel? *Mark only one answer*
   a. ____ less than 20%
   b. ____ 20% - 40%
   c. ____ 41% - 60%
   d. ____ 61% - 80%
   e. ____ 81 - 100%

5. involves the integration of technology throughout all course work? *Mark only one answer*
   a. ____ less than 20%
   b. ____ 20% - 40%
   c. ____ 41% - 60%
   d. ____ 61% - 80%
   e. ____ 81 - 100%

6. involves field experiences within a public school setting? *Mark only one answer*
   a. ____ less than 20%
   b. ____ 20% - 40%
   c. ____ 41% - 60%
   d. ____ 61% - 80%
   e. ____ 81 - 100%

7. covers assessment and testing including performance-based assessment and/or authentic assessment? *Mark only one answer*
   a. ____ less than 20%
   b. ____ 20% - 40%
   c. ____ 41% - 60%
   d. ____ 61% - 80%
   e. ____ 81 - 100%

8. involves collaboration in planning and delivery of instruction between and among faculty in the college or department of education? *Mark only one answer*
   a. ____ less than 20%
   b. ____ 20% - 40%
   c. ____ 41% - 60%
   d. ____ 61% - 80%
   e. ____ 81 - 100%
9. involves collaboration in planning and delivery of instruction between and among faculty in the college or department of Education and the colleges of Sciences and Liberal Arts? *Mark only one answer*

a. ___ less than 20%
b. ___ 20% - 40%
c. ___ 41% - 60%
d. ___ 61% - 80%
e. ___ 81 - 100%

10. is universities budget allocated to supporting the educator preparation program? *Mark only one answer*

a. ___ less than 20%
b. ___ 20% - 40%
c. ___ 41% - 60%
d. ___ 61% - 80%
e. ___ 81 - 100%
Part III: Rating the Educator Preparation at Your Institution

Please indicate (with a check in the appropriate space) whether or not the educator preparation program at your institution covered each area listed below. If an area was covered, please indicate by circling your response according to the rating scale) to show how satisfied you are with the quality of preparation provided in that area.

DEGREES OF SATISFACTION

1 = Very Dissatisfied
2 = Somewhat Dissatisfied
3 = Neutral
4 = Somewhat Satisfied
5 = Very Satisfied

A. Use of technology
   NO YES 1 2 3 4 5

B. Pedagogy
   NO YES 1 2 3 4 5

C. Content Knowledge
   NO YES 1 2 3 4 5

D. Working with cultural/economic student diversity
   NO YES 1 2 3 4 5

E. Classroom Management
   NO YES 1 2 3 4 5

F. Bilingual and/or English as a second language instruction
   NO YES 1 2 3 4 5

G. Field experiences provided and valued as a part of the program
   NO YES 1 2 3 4 5
H. Participation in site-based management

I. Critiquing personal instruction for purposes of self-improvement

J. Assessment and testing including performance-based/authentic assessment

K. Conflict resolution techniques

L. Teaming/Working collaboratively

M. Working with students having special learning needs (i.e. Special Ed)

N. Communicating with students/parents/colleagues/community

Thank you for taking the time and effort to complete this survey.
## DATA SOURCES AND TYPES OF INFORMATION OBTAINED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sources</th>
<th>Document Files</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Topic or Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSTP Minutes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOE Minutes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOTE Minutes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Glenda Barron (unpublished dissertation)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lionel Meno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Linda Cimusz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steven Tipps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Frances Van Tassel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lula Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Betty Kissler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nolan Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bill Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TEXAS EDUCATION STAFF MEMBERS WHO PLAYED A SIGNIFICANT ROLE IN THE EARLY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE ASEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEA Staff Member</th>
<th>Position &amp; Assignment</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Haynes</td>
<td>Senior Director</td>
<td>Educator Preparation and Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William M. Wale</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All educator preparation programs and staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Vodika</td>
<td>Director (1993-1995)</td>
<td>CSTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director (1993-1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia G. Quintañilla</td>
<td>Director CSTP; Australian Exchange program; Alternative Certification Programs</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Ajuira</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricky Arredondo</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelina Galvan</td>
<td>Director of Programs</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Recruitment, Retention and Assistance Program, Christa McAuliffe Fellowship Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Gawron</td>
<td>Staff member</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Holden</td>
<td>Director of Programs</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Certification Program; Induction and Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. J. Johnfroe</td>
<td>Staff member</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. (Ret.) Ron Kettler</td>
<td>Educational Program Director</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Military Initiative; Alternative Certification Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Murray</td>
<td>Staff Member</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA Staff Member</td>
<td>Position &amp; Assignment</td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorie Trevino-Ochoa</td>
<td>Director of Programs Director, Centers for Professional Development and Technology</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Poynter</td>
<td>Educational Program Director Texas Military Initiative; Alternative Certification Program</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Sanders</td>
<td>Staff member Technical Support</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Salmon</td>
<td>Director of Programs Alternative Certification Program</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Willis</td>
<td>Staff member Data Analysis</td>
<td>Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan Woods</td>
<td>Staff member</td>
<td>Educator Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Tackett</td>
<td>Staff member</td>
<td>Educator Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTP Member</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Professional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Marva T. Dixon</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Grand Prairie ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steven Tipps</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>University Of North Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Margarita Guerry</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Binational Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. George Hana</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Borger ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lula Henry</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Lamar University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Minnie Jackson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Dallas ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Vera King</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Prairie View A &amp; M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Lopez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>McAllen, Tx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Betty Kissler</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Southwest Texas University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Allan Kownslar</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Trinity University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. William May</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles McBee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Port Arthur ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lawanda McCowan</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rosalinda Rabago</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>San Antonio ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Ruiz, Jr.</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>El Paso ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Terry Taylor</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Paris, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bill Sandford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Coordinating Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEETINGS OF FOCUS GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>TEA Representative</th>
<th>CSTP Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 10</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Linda Cumusz, Nolan Wood, Lynda Haynes, Edward Vodicka</td>
<td>Betty Kissler, Allan Kownslar, Rosalinda Rabago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23</td>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td>Lynda Haynes, George Dugger</td>
<td>George Hanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>Pamela Tackett, Ann Smisko</td>
<td>Margarita Guerry, William Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23</td>
<td>Lubbock</td>
<td>Pat Linares, Magnolia McCullough</td>
<td>Steven Tipps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23</td>
<td>San Angelo</td>
<td>Nolan Wood, Linda Wurzback</td>
<td>Betty Kissler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Ellen Bell, Denist Harrison, Mary Charley</td>
<td>Rosalinda Rabago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Linda Cumusz, Pamela Tackett, James Salmon, Jean Holden</td>
<td>Marva Dixon, Minnie Jackson, William May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Lynda Haynes, Bill Wale, Edward Vodicka, Sara Simmons</td>
<td>Lula Henry, Charles McBee, Vera King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>Edinburg</td>
<td>Nolan Wood, George Dugger</td>
<td>Michael Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>Pat Linares, Floyd Hendrix</td>
<td>LaWanda McCowan, Terry Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIRST 17 INSTITUTIONS APPROVED
UNDER THE NEW APPROVAL PROCESS
UNDER THE CENTER RULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution (CPDT)</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin State University</td>
<td>March 2, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Texas State University</td>
<td>May 4, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston-Downtown**</td>
<td>May 4, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhandle South Plains CPDT</td>
<td>May 5, 1995*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock Christian University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayland Baptist University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast CPDT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Texas State University-Commerce</td>
<td>June 1, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Texas State University - Texarkana</td>
<td>June 1, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas - Denton</td>
<td>June 1, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Educational Development and Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of the Lake</td>
<td>June 29, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>June 29, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity University</td>
<td>June 29, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's University</td>
<td>June 29, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarnate Word College</td>
<td>June 29, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Education Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M</td>
<td>July 14, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas A&amp;M (College Station)</td>
<td>July 14, 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* First Presentation on March 25, 1995

** Unfunded CPDT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Board Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Crawford</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will D. Davis</td>
<td>Vice-Chair</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Berlanga</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Allen</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Christie</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Conrad</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Hasie</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hudson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy Johnson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Miller</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Offutt</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Nunez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Patrick</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Knotts Pekins</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteban Sosa</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
PREFACE

Excellence and equity for all children are central to the vision for educating the students of Texas for the 21st century. To achieve this goal, Texas public schools must be restructured and the roles of educators redefined.

Inherent in the restructuring is a comprehensive and coherent professional development system which links all aspects of the education profession. This document proposes outcomes of what teachers and administrators must know, value, and be able to do. The proposed outcomes will be used to align preparation and certification of persons entering the education profession, the evaluation of teachers and administrators, and staff development to enhance educators' knowledge and skills.

This set of draft outcomes was developed by the Consortium of State Organizations for Teacher Education (CSOTE) and the Texas Professors of Educational Administration (TPEA) at the request of the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), which is appointed by the Texas State Board of Education. The Texas Education Agency is grateful to these organizations for the thoughtful and thorough document which resulted from many hours of work.

Though each of these groups consulted Texas educators in the initial development of these outcomes, the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession is now requesting statewide input on the proposed outcomes from Texas teachers, administrators, students, parents, business and industry leaders, educators involved in the preparation of new teachers, and local school board members. The draft outcomes will be revised based on the statewide input and presented to the State Board of Education. The outcomes may be used to frame a professional development system for Texas.

(continued)
CSSTE and TPEA acknowledge the contribution of the following groups and/or sources in the development of the proposed outcomes:

- The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). *Outcome-Based Teacher Education Standards for the Elementary and Middle School Levels* (June 1992)
- The U. S. Secretary of Labor's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). *SCANS in the Schools* (June 1992)
- Alverno College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. *A Model of the Development of Teacher Abilities*
- Clayton State College, Morrow, Georgia. *Outcomes-Based Plan* (August 1992)
- Kentucky State Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky. *Guidelines for Outcomes-Based Student Assessment* (April 1990)
- The American Association of School Administrators
- The National Association of Elementary School Principals
- The National Association of Secondary School Principals
- The National Policy Board for Educational Administration
PROPOSED OUTCOMES FOR A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM FOR TEACHERS (PREPARATION, CERTIFICATION, EVALUATION, AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT)

Outcomes are defined through KNOWLEDGE, DISPOSITION and PERFORMANCE statements.

OUTCOME ONE: KNOWLEDGE BASE
Demonstrate a cognitive understanding of the subject matter and pedagogical skills in one's teaching field.

KNOWLEDGE
THE TEACHER:
- demonstrates a thorough understanding of major concepts, assumptions, processes, organizing principles, ways of knowing, etc., central to one's teaching field (i.e., is able to make judgments about the nature of knowledge).
- knows what is important to teach in one's discipline and why.
- has a thorough understanding of a variety of pedagogical skills inherent in and central to one's teaching field or area of specialization.
- understands the historical and philosophical frameworks of the concept of teaching.

DISPOSITION
THE TEACHER:
- demonstrates a commitment to keep abreast of and contribute to the growth of knowledge and good practice within the profession.
- reflects critically on the subject matter knowledge base and considers implications for the teaching process (i.e., is willing to change as knowledge might suggest).
- acknowledges that one's beliefs may influence one's teaching.

PERFORMANCE
THE TEACHER:
- effectively uses multiple explanations and accurate representations of disciplinary concepts in the design and implementation of instruction.
- critiques resources out of her/his understanding of the discipline and creates/transfers additional resources to enrich student learning.
OUTCOME TWO: CURRICULUM

Develop multiple perspectives through integrated disciplines of study in order to plan and deliver instruction in authentic contexts.

KNOWLEDGE
THE TEACHER:
- knows how to relate his/her central disciplinary knowledge to other subject areas, to students' interests, and to the workplace,
- knows how to plan and deliver instruction in authentic contexts rather than in isolation,
- knows how to use technological resources to develop and deliver integrated curriculum and instruction,
- knows how to develop and deliver integrated thematic units.

DISPOSITION
THE TEACHER:
- appreciates the contribution that several disciplines can make to common concerns and questions and is open to multiple perspectives,
- appreciates varied approaches to the attainment of knowledge and consistently seeks to expand his/her knowledge base,
- values technological advances as resources for developing and delivering curriculum and instruction in authentic contexts.

PERFORMANCE
THE TEACHER:
- develops and uses curricula that encourage students to question and interpret content from diverse perspectives,
- engages students in generating knowledge from a variety of sources across and among disciplines,
- develops and delivers integrated curricula, when appropriate,
- utilizes technological resources in planning, developing, and delivering instruction across and among curriculum areas.
OUTCOME THREE: INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING

Develop and implement short- and long-range instructional plans based upon effective instructional strategies, knowledge of the discipline, student needs and performances, the global society, the community, and the curriculum.

KNOWLEDGE

THE TEACHER:
- understands the many facets of instructional planning (e.g., learning theory, subject matter, knowledge of discipline, curriculum development, instructional and financial resources, individual student aptitude and needs, community expectations).
- knows and can use the technological resources available for planning and preparing curriculum and instruction.
- recognizes constraints associated with curriculum development.
- knows how to incorporate authentic experiences into teaching goals.
- knows the principles of scope and sequence.

DISPOSITION

THE TEACHER:
- has a commitment to flexibility in planning based on long- and short-term goals and student needs.
- values planning as a collegial activity.
- demonstrates support for local innovation and the decision-making process.
- values the use of technological resources in instructional and curricular planning.

PERFORMANCE

THE TEACHER:
- as an individual and as a member of the instructional team, selects and creates learning experiences that are appropriate for the discipline and the curriculum goals, relevant to learners, and based upon principles of effective instruction (e.g., that activate students' prior knowledge; recognize variation in learning styles and models of learning - visual, aural, kinesthetic; anticipate preconceptions; encourage exploration and problem-solving; and build new skills on those previously acquired).
- creates lessons that meet the developmental and specific needs of diverse learners and that help each learner progress to full potential.
- incorporates the use of technological advances (e.g., computer-assisted instruction, computer-managed instruction, and computer graphics) in planning and preparing curriculum and instruction which will enhance students' learning in real-world settings.
- incorporates authentic experiences into instructional practices for all students.
- creates long-term and short-range plans that are linked to student performance and needs and adapts the plans to ensure and capitalize on student progress and motivation.
- develops short- and long-range plans consistent with curriculum goals, learner variances and learning theory, special populations, and priorities of the state, the district, and school site.
- participates in campus-based decision making in planning curriculum and delivering instruction.
- applies principles of scope and sequence in planning curriculum and instruction.
OUTCOME FOUR: INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY
Develop and deliver instruction appropriate to students' developmental needs.

KNOWLEDGE
THE TEACHER:
- understands that students' physical, social, emotional, linguistic, cultural, moral and cognitive development influence learning and understands the importance of considering these factors when making instructional decisions.
- understands theories of learning and their application.
- knows how to use instructional strategies that promote student learning.
- is aware of expected developmental progressions and individual variation within each domain (physical, social, emotional, linguistic, cultural, moral, cognitive), can identify levels of readiness in learning and development, and understands how development in any one domain may affect performance in others.
- knows suitable technologies for delivering instruction appropriate to students' needs.

DISPOSITION
THE TEACHER:
- appreciates and plans for individual variation within the physical, social, emotional, linguistic, cultural, moral and cognitive domains.
- shows respect for the diverse talents of all learners and is committed to the support of students' academic success and the development of students' positive self-image.
- genuinely believes that all students can learn and achieve high standards.
- values the use of technological advances in delivering appropriate instruction.

PERFORMANCE
THE TEACHER:
- uses data about individual and group progress to plan and deliver appropriate instruction to meet the learner's current needs and to lead to the next level of development.
- uses technologies to align instruction with students' developmental characteristics and stages of readiness.
- links new ideas to already familiar ideas, thus making connections to students' prior experiences.
- provides opportunities for active engagement, manipulation, and testing of ideas and materials in order for students to assume responsibility in shaping their learning tasks.
- uses technologies to monitor student performance and adapt instruction to meet emerging needs.
- plans and implements developmentally appropriate practices for all students, including special populations.
- uses a range of questioning techniques for particular purposes (e.g., probing for learner understanding, helping students to articulate their thinking processes, promoting risk-taking and problem-solving, facilitating factual recall, encouraging convergent and divergent thinking, stimulating curiosity, helping students to question).
OUTCOME FIVE: STUDENT DIVERSITY
Provide and deliver instruction appropriate to diverse cultures and populations, learning styles, and background experiences.

KNOWLEDGE
THE TEACHER:
- recognizes that students represent diverse populations and values, and bring special needs and approaches to learning that are influenced by individual talents, developed intelligences, learning styles, and prior learning experiences, as well as race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, religion, and language.
- understands the pedagogical implication of diversity (e.g., the relationship of culture to curriculum and instruction).
- understands legal and ethical regulations related to the education of special populations.
- understands the responsibilities of living in a multicultural society.

DISPOSITION
THE TEACHER:
- appreciates and values diversity, shows respect for students' varied perspectives and learning styles, and is committed to the pursuit of the development of each student's unique abilities.
- is sensitive to community and cultural norms.

PERFORMANCE
THE TEACHER:
- identifies individual student's learning styles, strengths, and needs.
- assess individual student's thinking and experiences as a basis for instructional activities and incorporates learning materials appropriate for various cultures.
- uses teaching approaches and technologies that address different learning and performance modes, linguistic differences, and the special needs of learners who have disabilities.
- creates a learning community in which individual differences are respected.
- adapts instruction to maintain the integrity of the discipline and to ensure sensitivity to the needs of learners.
- routinely gathers information about students' culture and community and uses it in instruction.
OUTCOME SIX: PROBLEM SOLVING, CRITICAL AND CREATIVE THINKING

Enhance problem solving and critical and creative thinking skills through a variety of instructional strategies, technologies, resources, and techniques.

KNOWLEDGE

THE TEACHER:
• understands principles, procedures, advantages, and limitations associated with various instructional strategies and resources.
• knows how to enhance critical and creative thinking and problem solving through the use of a wide array of materials and sources, including human and technological resources.
• understands the modes and processes of critical and creative thinking and problem solving within and among the various disciplines.

DISPOSITION

THE TEACHER:
• values the development and expression of critical and creative thinking and problem solving in the content areas.
• values inquiry and flexibility in the teaching process.
• values various points of view and collaboration in the classroom.
• values multiple resources, including technological resources, in the development of critical and creative thinking and problem solving.

PERFORMANCE

THE TEACHER:
• addresses academic performance, critical and creative thinking, and problem-solving skills by using a variety of instructional strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, discovery learning, direct instruction, independent study, interdisciplinary instruction); resources, materials and technology (e.g., computers, videotapes and discs, local experts, primary documents and artifacts, as well as textbooks, reference books, and other literature) to meet different student needs and to create meaningful learning experiences which promote academic performance.
• varies his/her role in the instructional process (e.g., instructor, facilitator, coach, audience) in relation to the content and purposes of instruction.
• routinely engages learners in meaningful active learning opportunities to promote the development of critical and creative thinking and problem solving in the context of the discipline areas and constantly monitors and adjusts strategies in response to learner feedback.
OUTCOME SEVEN: MOTIVATION
Promote positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

KNOWLEDGE
THE TEACHER

- demonstrates an understanding of factors related to student motivation and behavior (e.g., anxiety, locus of control, self-fulfilling prophecy, self-worth, risk-taking).
- knows the skills for helping students work productively and cooperatively with each other in complex social settings.

DISPOSITION
THE TEACHER:

- recognizes and values the importance of intrinsic motivation and cooperation over competitiveness.
- is committed to the continuous development of individual student's abilities and to considering how different motivational strategies are appropriate to encourage this development.
- views his/her role as a facilitator of learning (i.e., the teacher takes responsibility for establishing a positive climate in the classroom and participates in maintaining such a climate in the school as a whole).

PERFORMANCE
THE TEACHER:

- uses a variety of techniques (e.g., relating lessons to students' personal interests, allowing students to have choices in their learning, leading individuals and groups of students to ask questions and pursue problems that are meaningful to them) to engage students in individual and group learning activities that help them develop the intrinsic motivation necessary for academic and real-world success.
- demonstrates an ability to recognize factors and situations that are likely to promote or diminish student motivation.
- creates a climate where all students feel valued.
- establishes shared expectations for student interactions, academic discussions, and individual and group responsibility that create a positive classroom climate of openness, mutual respect, support, and inquiry.
- creates a smoothly-functioning learning community in which students assume responsibility for themselves and one another, work collaboratively and independently, and engage in purposeful learning activities.
OUTCOME EIGHT: ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Critique, construct, and utilize multiple forms of appropriate assessment techniques in order to monitor progress, modify and adapt instruction, and set goals.

KNOWLEDGE

THE TEACHER:
- understands the purposes of assessment (e.g., to gain knowledge about the intellectual, social, emotional, moral and physical development of the learner).
- understands the characteristics, uses, advantages, and limitations of different types of assessment (e.g., criterion-referenced, norm-referenced, traditional standardized, and authentic performance-based).
- understands assessment-related issues and terminology.
- knows how to select, construct, use, and critique formal and informal assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to the learning outcomes being evaluated and to other diagnostic purposes for all learners, including students in at-risk situations and special populations.

DISPOSITION

THE TEACHER:
- values ongoing assessment as essential to the instructional process, and is committed to using assessment to promote student growth.
- recognizes that multiple forms of assessment are necessary for analyzing student learning and understands the limitations of each.

PERFORMANCE

THE TEACHER:
- uses a variety of formal and informal assessment techniques (e.g., observation, portfolio development, teacher-made tests, performance tasks, student self-assessment, peer assessment, and standardized tests) to enhance his/her knowledge of learners, monitor student progress and performance, modify teaching and learning strategies, assess learners' strengths and weaknesses, and set goals for learning for all students, including special populations.
- monitors his/her own behavior in relation to student success, modifying plans and instructional approaches appropriately.
- uses assessment data to help learners become aware of strengths and to set personal goals for learning.
- maintains useful records of student work and performance and communicates student progress ethically and knowledgeably.
OUTCOME NINE: COMMUNICATION
Use effective communication techniques, including verbal, nonverbal, and media communication that are sensitive to student differences and needs.

KNOWLEDGE
THE TEACHER:
• understands communication theory and language development.
• understands cultural and gender differences as they affect communication in the classroom.
• recognizes the importance of effective verbal and nonverbal communication techniques in creating a climate that is conducive to a positive rapport with students and others in the learning environment.

DISPOSITION
THE TEACHER:
• appreciates the cultural dimensions of communication and seeks to foster culturally sensitive communication by and among all students in the class.
• values the power of language in self-identity, expression, and influence and is a thoughtful listener.

PERFORMANCE
THE TEACHER:
• communicates effectively with students, parents, colleagues, and the community to create a climate of openness, mutual respect, support, and inquiry.
• models effective communication strategies (e.g., appropriate and accurate written and verbal communication, monitoring the effects of messages, restating ideas and drawing connections, responding to nonverbal cues given and received).
• creates opportunities for students to communicate effectively in various ways and contexts (e.g., written and oral tasks, multimedia and artistic presentations, and technological experiences, individually and in groups).
• communicates in ways that demonstrate a sensitivity to cultural and gender differences and that promote gender equity.
• appropriately uses effective eye contact and body language to encourage and acknowledge different modes of participation.
• communicates accurately in the language of instruction.
OUTCOME TEN: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
Create and manage an effective environment and learning community in which students assume responsibility for themselves and one another, work collaboratively and independently, and engage in purposeful learning activities.

KNOWLEDGE
THE TEACHER:
• knows the theories, philosophies, and models for classroom management and discipline to establish a positive environment conducive to learning in independent and collaborative ways.
• knows the organization and operation of schools, knows case law, and understands campus, district and state guidelines and policies.
• knows legal aspects of discipline procedures and professional ethics.
• knows how to establish a system of expectations, routines, procedures, reinforcements, feedback, and task engagement.
• knows problem-solving approaches to discipline interventions.

DISPOSITION
THE TEACHER:
• takes responsibility for establishing a positive climate and participates in maintaining such a climate in the school as a whole.
• values the role of students in promoting learning and recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning.
• values students as individuals with differing family and cultural backgrounds and varying skills, learning styles, talents, and interests.
• is committed to democratic values in the classroom.
• views the classroom as a learning community rather than a collection of individuals.

PERFORMANCE
THE TEACHER:
• creates a positive classroom climate with regard to shared values, shared experiences, and patterns of communication in order to promote students' academic, social, and emotional development.
• develops and practices effective classroom management.
• identifies, allocates, organizes, and manages the resources of time, money and space to provide for active and equitable engagement of students in productive tasks and to provide for a positive learning climate.
• engages appropriate discipline management strategies to develop student's self-discipline.
OUTCOME ELEVEN: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH
Engage in reflective analysis in order to actively seek out and participate in professional development opportunities.

KNOWLEDGE
THE TEACHER:
• knows and understands the benefits of reflective analysis.
• is aware of major areas of research on teaching and of resources available for professional learning (e.g., professional literature, colleagues, professional associations, professional development activities).
• understands methods of inquiry that provide a variety of self-assessment and problem-solving tools.
• understands the complex interactions of the teaching/learning process.
• knows how to use reflection techniques which are based on current research literature to assess instructional practices.
• understands the relationship of self to the learning environment.

DISPOSITION
THE TEACHER:
• values self reflection, assessment, and learning as ongoing processes and is willing to be helped.
• values critical and creative thinking and self-directed learning as habits of mind.
• recognizes a professional responsibility for engaging in and supporting appropriate professional development for self and colleagues.
• is committed to developing and continually refining practices that address the individual needs of students.

PERFORMANCE
THE TEACHER:
• uses classroom observation, information about students, pedagogical knowledge, and research as sources for evaluating, reflecting on, and revising practice.
• uses reflection strategies for problem solving.
• draws upon professional colleagues within the school and other professional arenas as support for reflection and problem-solving, for generating new ideas, for actively sharing experiences, and for seeking and giving feedback.
• actively seeks time for personal reflection and peer observation.
OUTCOME TWELVE: PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS AND COLLABORATION

Establish positive, productive relationships with colleagues, parents, and community agencies to support students' learning and well-being through participation in collaborative decision making and problem solving.

KNOWLEDGE

THE TEACHER:

- understands how factors in the students' environment outside of school (e.g., family circumstances, community health, economic conditions) may influence students' life and learning.
- knows how to identify community resources to foster student learning.
- understands and can apply laws related to students' rights (e.g., equal education, free appropriate education for students with exceptionalities and/or disabilities, confidentiality, privacy, and appropriate treatment of and respect for students).
- understands and can apply laws related to teacher responsibilities for student welfare (e.g., in situations related to possible child abuse, treatment of students with special needs).
- understands the processes, characteristics, uses, advantages, and limitations of collaborative and shared decision making and problem solving.
- understands applications, techniques, and skills involved in shared and collaborative decision making, problem solving, group dynamics, and campus-based decision making.
- knows and understands the Texas Code of Ethics and Standard Practices.

DISPOSITION

THE TEACHER:

- is concerned about all aspects of the child's well-being (cognitive, emotional, social, moral and physical) and experiences.
- is willing to consult with others regarding the education and well-being of all students, including students in at-risk situations and special populations.
- respects the privacy of students and confidentiality of information.
- is alert for signs of difficulties students may have, and is aware of strategies and resources for supporting students who encounter such difficulties.
- is willing to work with all students in the learning environment, both at school and at home, including those in at-risk situations.
- values independence in thinking.
- values collaborative decision making and problem solving based on long- and short-term goals and the needs of all students.

(continued)
OUTCOME TWELVE  PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS AND COLLABORATION (continued)

PERFORMANCE
THE TEACHER:

- establishes respectful and productive relationships with all parents and guardians,
- seeks to develop cooperative partnerships in support of student learning and well-being,
- participates in activities designed to make the entire school a productive learning environment,
- engages in appropriate conferencing strategies,
- utilizes existing practices and policies within the district to ensure proper contact with parents, agencies, and the community,
- talks with and listens to students, is responsive to clues of distress, examines circumstances, and seeks help to remedy problems,
- participates in collaborative decision making and problem solving with colleagues in different disciplines and at different educational levels through shared and campus-based decision making activities (i.e., instructional and curricular planning, professional development, staffing, etc.).
**Proposed Outcomes for a Professional Development System for Administrators**

(Preparation, Certification, Evaluation, and Staff Development)

Outcomes are defined through Knowledge, Disposition and Performance statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME ONE: LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate leadership which maximizes student achievement through collaborative visioning, strategic planning, risk taking, and decision making while maintaining professional ethics and personal integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knowledge**

- The Administrator:
  - understands the importance of vision and knows how to develop a collaborative vision which provides future direction for the campus.
  - possesses knowledge of time effectiveness techniques.
  - understands strategic planning processes and goal setting.
  - knows how to communicate the mission, goals, and objectives of the campus.
  - understands the Texas Code of Ethics and high standards of moral, ethical, and professional conduct.
  - understands leadership styles and empowers others to reach high levels of performance and productivity.
  - demonstrates understanding of decision-making processes, creative problem solving, and ability/willingness to take risks.
  - demonstrates an understanding of organizational learning, development, and change.
  - exhibits an understanding of the theories of child/adolescent development and the options for organizing/managing student behavior.

**Disposition**

- The Administrator:
  - values the fostering of self-esteem in staff and students.
  - believes in the highest standard of moral, ethical, and professional conduct.
  - recognizes that school administrators must be leaders of leaders.
  - recognizes the effect of leadership styles upon one's own behavior and the ramifications of such styles upon staff and others.
  - possesses the courage to engage in creative problem solving and risk taking toward maximizing student outcomes.

(continued)
OUTCOME ONE. LEADERSHIP (continued)

PERFORMANCE

THE ADMINISTRATOR:

- formulates collaboratively a vision of future direction for the campus and communicates the mission, goals, and objectives of the campus.
- exhibits the highest standard of moral, ethical, and professional conduct.
- empowers others to reach high levels of performance and productivity and builds self-esteem in staff and students.
- engages in decision-making processes and creative problem solving in ways that demonstrate courage in risk taking.
- based on research findings and data, exercises vision and provides leadership that appropriately involves staff, parents, students, and the community in the identification and accomplishment of the school's mission.
- collaboratively facilitates planning activities and implementation of programs to attain the school's mission.
OUTCOME TWO: CULTURE AND CLIMATE
Collaboratively identify, assess, analyze, and develop strategies to improve school culture and climate, thus enhancing student learning.

KNOWLEDGE
THE ADMINISTRATOR
- understands theoretical concepts from organizational behavior and organizational development.
- has knowledge of methods to assess school climate and culture.
- understands multicultural and ethnic characteristics, as well as other factors leading to diversity.
- understands the importance of group process, interpersonal communication, and motivation in establishing a school culture which supports student learning.
- exhibits an understanding of factors related to high expectations and achievement and to a positive, caring school climate.
- understands the processes of establishing and enhancing school culture.

DISPOSITION
THE ADMINISTRATOR
- respects the worth of all individuals and empowers them to reach their own potentials.
- values interpersonal relationships among staff and students as enhancing student learning.
- respects multicultural and ethnic diversity, as well as diversity arising from other factors.
- demonstrates commitment to principles of group process, interpersonal communication, and motivation.
- believes that a learning climate is based on mutual trust and respect and places strong emphasis on the fact that all children, regardless of their cultural or socioeconomic background and learning differences, can be successful in schools.

PERFORMANCE
THE ADMINISTRATOR
- applies theoretical concepts from organizational behavior and organizational development.
- uses climate and culture assessment methods.
- demonstrates an appreciation of all types of diversity, including multicultural and ethnic understanding.
- bonds the community through shared values and beliefs.
- establishes strong interpersonal relationships among staff and students to enhance learning and builds a positive, caring, orderly, purposeful climate which leads the campus toward accomplishing its established mission.
- demonstrates skill in ensuring positive staff morale in an environment of collegiality, empowerment, and team building.
- displays skill in conferencing parents, students, and staff concerning behaviors to enhance learning climate.
OUTCOME THREE: POLITICAL COMPETENCE
Understand political theory and apply political skills to build strong internal and external support for the campus and district.

KNOWLEDGE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- understands the need for effectiveness in school/community relations, coalition building, school/business partnerships, and related public service activities.
- understands the politics of school governance and board relations.
- understands the use of capacity building, consensus building, policy development, team building, lobbying, negotiating, and professional consultations.
- recognizes the need to communicate and project an articulate position for public education.
- recognizes the influence that mass media has in shaping and forming opinions and understands how to influence mass media.
- understands the dynamics of local, state, and national decision making and recognizes their importance in garnering support for schools and students.
- understands strategies necessary to attract support for appropriate issues in public education.

DISPOSITION
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- values school/community relations, coalition building, school/business partnerships, and related public service activities.
- commits to the effective use of capacity building, policy development, lobbying, negotiating, and professional consultations.
- values mass media in shaping and forming opinions.
- commits to mediating and resolving conflicts.
- believes in, communicates, and projects an articulate position for public education.

PERFORMANCE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- remediates and resolves conflicts and builds consensus while engaging in the use of capacity building, policy development, lobbying, negotiating, and professional consultations.
- communicates and projects an articulate position on local, state, regional, and national education issues.
- influences mass media in shaping and forming opinions.
- develops plans and strategies to attract support for appropriate issues in public education.
- involves both school and nonschool elements of the community in the development and support of the school's program.
- develops two-way communication between the school and community to secure community involvement in carrying out the mission of the school.
- demonstrates effectiveness in school/community relations, coalition building, school/business partnerships, and related public service activities.
OUTCOME FOUR: CURRICULUM

Demonstrate the ability to develop and implement a strategic plan for curriculum development and improvement to further student achievement.

KNOWLEDGE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- understands the planning process to anticipate future occupational trends and their implications for life-long learning.
- understands instructional taxonomies, goals, objectives, and processes.
- understands cognitive development and learning theories, and their importance to the sequencing/structuring of curricula.
- understands assessment processes and procedures in curriculum development and the relationship of educational philosophy to curriculum.
- possesses a thorough understanding of child growth and development.
- understands the place of technology, practical arts, and liberal arts in the comprehensive curriculum.

DISPOSITION
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- evidences commitment to a comprehensive curriculum that is relevant to the needs of all children.
- exhibits a legitimate philosophical base.
- exhibits awareness of the inevitability of curricular change.

PERFORMANCE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- develops and applies valid and reliable performance indicators for instructional outcomes.
- uses computers and other technologies and provides appropriate technology for staff and students' use.
- encourages students and staff to participate in supplementary activities that enhance and complement what is learned in the classroom.
- develops validation procedures for curricular units, sequences, and auditing.
- conducts assessments of present and future student learning needs.
- encourages faculty input and involvement in continual and systematic review, monitoring, and renewal of the curriculum to ensure that the appropriate scope, sequence, and content are followed and that the curriculum is responsive to the needs of the students, teachers, and community.
- uses curricular alignment to ensure higher-order thinking.
OUTCOME FIVE: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Plan, develop, and implement an effective instructional system which includes the best uses of research findings, time, staff, advanced technologies, community resources, and financial means to enhance student outcomes.

KNOWLEDGE

THE ADMINISTRATOR:

- understands curricular design and instructional delivery strategies.
- understands instructional and motivational psychology.
- has knowledge of alternative methods of monitoring and assessing student achievement.
- understands use of technology to enhance instruction.
- has knowledge of processes of allocating instructional resources effectively to maximize student learning.
- understands classroom management theories and techniques.
- understands the theory and research related to the evaluation of teaching/learning process, the systemic change process, and collaborative instructional planning.

DISPOSITION

THE ADMINISTRATOR:

- demonstrates concern for the development of the total child, including linguistic, physical, social, emotional, and cognitive needs.
- encourages students and staff to set high personal goals which result in meeting the needs of each individual.
- encourages risk taking and innovative behavior.
- exhibits sensitivity to affirmative action goals.

PERFORMANCE

THE ADMINISTRATOR:

- applies principles of instructional and motivational psychology.
- manages change to enhance the mastery of educational goals.
- utilizes technology to improve instructional programs.
- insures effective use of instructional time and resources.
- assesses regularly the teaching methods and strategies being used and insures that they are appropriate, varied, and effective.
- applies principles of learning for both students and adults.
- improves systematically the instructional process, learning environment, curriculum, and instructional program through cooperative planning, organizing, staffing, developing, implementing, providing necessary resources, monitoring, and evaluating.
- analyzes available resources and assigns them in the most cost-effective and equitable manner to enhance student outcomes.
OUTCOME SIX: HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
Assess needs and design strategies for human resource development and evaluation.

KNOWLEDGE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
• has the knowledge to identify areas and strategies for staff development.
• understands the use of campus and staff evaluation data in setting personnel policy and making decisions.
• knows how to assess individual and institutional sources of stress and develop methods for managing that stress.
• possesses knowledge of theories, concepts, and techniques of personnel management.

DISPOSITION
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
• appreciates the diversity of individual staff members.
• recognizes the importance of effective human relations skills in institutional assessment.

PERFORMANCE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
• utilizes needs assessment techniques for staff development purposes.
• uses campus and staff evaluation data in personnel decision making.
• evaluates the effectiveness of staff development programs as they affect professional performance and impact student achievement.
• uses appropriate supervision strategies and techniques in staff development and evaluation.
• assesses individual and institutional sources of stress and develops methods for stress management.
• utilizes personnel management techniques.
• encourages and develops the leadership of others.
• defines the performance expectations for instruction and classroom management to school personnel, students, and community.
OUTCOME SEVEN: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
Allocate human, material, and fiscal resources to efficiently, effectively, and equitably assure student learning.

KNOWLEDGE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
• understands facilities planning, maintenance, and operation.
• understands legal concepts, regulations, and codes for school operation as they apply to resource management.
• utilizes appropriate analytical and technological techniques in resource management.
• understands financial operations (e.g., budgeting, planning, account auditing, monitoring, cash flow management, and financial forecasting).

DISPOSITION
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
• exercises creativity in finding new resources for supporting the school’s program.
• demonstrates commitment to all personnel by providing support, encouragement, and training as needed.
• evidences commitment to equity and excellence for all students.

PERFORMANCE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
• maintains facilities, equipment, and operations to ensure a safe, orderly, and clean environment.
• uses financial forecasting, planning, and cash-flow management strategies.
• equitably applies legal concepts, regulations, and codes for school operation, finance, and facility management.
• participates in budgeting, planning, management, accounting, auditing, monitoring, and evaluation as needed.
• coordinates the use of available human, material, and financial resources to achieve the school’s mission and goals.
• involves staff and representative members of the community in the development of school budget priorities.
• utilizes cost effective practices in the management of all school funds.
OUTCOME EIGHT: SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION
Continuously utilize data to facilitate informed decisions for school improvement and maximization of student learning.

KNOWLEDGE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- understands research designs and methods including gathering, analyzing, disaggregating, and interpreting data.
- understands the purposes of various assessment strategies and instruments.
- evaluates research findings for appropriate use in program and organizational decisions.

DISPOSITION
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- values students as individuals and assures that relevant programs are offered to meet their needs.
- demonstrates commitment to protecting students from cultural and economic biases through selecting appropriate assessment instruments and procedures.

PERFORMANCE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- applies appropriate research designs and methods including gathering, analyzing, disaggregating, and interpreting data and research designs.
- applies evaluation methods and planning models.
- collaboratively selects and interprets appropriate assessment instruments (e.g., norm-referenced tests, portfolios, teacher-made tests, performance tasks).
- evaluates the organizational and program outcomes to maintain student learning as the primary focus of the school.
OUTCOME NINE: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Develop and implement a professional growth plan.

KNOWLEDGE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:

- stays current with developments in education on local, regional, state and national levels.
- has knowledge of self-assessment processes and procedures to establish personal and professional goals and to plan for achieving goals.
- understands techniques to maintain personal, physical, and emotional wellness and manage time effectively.

DISPOSITION
THE ADMINISTRATOR:

- values opportunities for personal professional growth and seeks continual improvement in professional effectiveness.
- values the need to exemplify the behavior expected of others.
- shows commitment to professional and personal growth by encouraging students and staff to engage in self-assessment and the development of professional and life goals.

PERFORMANCE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:

- engages in performance assessment in the competency areas outlined in these outcomes.
- seeks and encourages input from a variety of sources to assist in the self-evaluation process and develops a self-initiated growth plan by utilizing acquired assessment information.
- participates in a variety of professional growth activities and documents that participation.
- advances the profession through active participation in local, regional, state, and national professional groups.
OUTCOME TEN: COMMUNICATION
Communicate effectively with students, staff, parents, the community, and the media.

KNOWLEDGE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- possesses skills to speak and write clearly and concisely in conveying messages to a variety of audiences and possesses listening and reading skills which facilitate understanding of messages conveyed by others.
- possesses skill in nonverbal communications to project a positive image of self and the school.

DISPOSITION
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- values active listening skills in communication.
- values the need for honest and open communication which addresses the mission of the school, highlighting student achievement.

PERFORMANCE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
- communicates effectively with all constituencies.
- articulates beliefs persuasively.
- exemplifies stated beliefs by personal actions.
OUTCOME ELEVEN: PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES
Identify, provide, and evaluate programs and services to meet the needs of all students.

KNOWLEDGE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
• is familiar with strategies and models for appropriately evaluating student progress and learning.
• has knowledge of how to develop and implement, through a collaborative process, the management of student records, support services, and categorical programs.
• understands legal concepts, state and federal regulations, and other parameters within which student support services must operate.

DISPOSITION
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
• demonstrates caring by creating a learning climate that is based on mutual trust and respect, produces high morale, and places strong emphasis on the success of all children.
• recognizes the importance of support services for students to the education of the whole child.

PERFORMANCE
THE ADMINISTRATOR:
• develops cooperatively a student management system, communicates student conduct guidelines, monitors observance of rules, and insures that consequences for violations are equitable.
• identifies, employs, and evaluates appropriate student support services.
• uses due process procedures in dealing with disciplinary and other student matters.
• facilitates the coordination of community service agencies so that appropriate resources are directed to student needs.
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PROFICIENCIES FOR TEACHERS IN LEARNER-CENTERED SCHOOLS
LEARNER-CENTERED KNOWLEDGE

The teacher possesses and draws on a rich knowledge base of content, pedagogy, and technology to provide relevant and meaningful learning experiences for all students.

The teacher exhibits a strong working knowledge of subject matter and enables students to better understand patterns of thinking specific to a discipline. The teacher stays abreast of current knowledge and practice within the content area, related disciplines, and technology; participates in professional development activities; and collaborates with other professionals. Moreover, the teacher contributes to the knowledge base and understands the pedagogy of the discipline.

As the teacher guides learners to construct knowledge through experiences, they learn about relationships among and within the central themes of various disciplines while also learning how to learn. Recognizing the dynamic nature of knowledge, the teacher selects and organizes topics so students make clear connections between what is taught in the classroom and what they experience outside the classroom. As students probe these relationships, the teacher encourages discussion in which both the teacher's and the students' opinions are valued. To further develop multiple perspectives, the teacher integrates other disciplines, learners' interests, and technological resources so that learners consider the central themes of the subject matter from as many different cultural and intellectual viewpoints as possible.
LEARNER-CENTERED INSTRUCTION

To create a learner-centered community, the teacher collaboratively identifies needs; and plans, implements, and assesses instruction using technology and other resources.

The teacher is a leader of a learner-centered community, in which an atmosphere of trust and openness produces a stimulating exchange of ideas and mutual respect. The teacher is a critical thinker and problem solver who plays a variety of roles when teaching. As a coach, the teacher observes, evaluates, and changes directions and strategies whenever necessary. As a facilitator, the teacher helps students link ideas in the content area to familiar ideas, to prior experiences, and to relevant problems. As a manager, the teacher effectively acquires, allocates, and conserves resources. By encouraging self-directed learning and by modeling respectful behavior, the teacher effectively manages the learning environment so that optimal learning occurs.

Assessment is used to guide the learner community. By using assessment as an integral part of instruction, the teacher responds to the needs of all learners. In addition, the teacher guides learners to develop personally meaningful forms of self-assessment.

The teacher selects materials, technology, activities, and space that are developmentally appropriate and designed to engage interest in learning. As a result, learners work independently and cooperatively in a positive and stimulating learning climate fueled by self-discipline and motivation.

Although the teacher has a vision for the destination of learning, students set individual goals and plan how to reach the destination. As a result, they take responsibility for their own learning, develop a sense of the importance of learning for understanding, and begin to understand themselves as learners. The teacher's plans integrate learning experiences and various forms of assessment that take into consideration the unique characteristics of the learner community. The teacher shares responsibility for the results of this process with all members of the learning community.

Together, learners and teachers take risks in trying out innovative ideas for learning. To facilitate learning, the teacher encourages various types of learners to shape their own learning through active engagement, manipulation, and examination of ideas and materials. Critical thinking, creativity, and problem solving spark further learning. Consequently, there is an appreciation of learning as a life-long process that builds a greater understanding of the world and a feeling of responsibility toward it.

Excellence and Equity for All Students
EQUITY IN EXCELLENCE FOR ALL LEARNERS

The teacher responds appropriately to diverse groups of learners.

The teacher not only respects and is sensitive to all learners but also encourages the use of all their skills and talents. As the facilitator of learning, the teacher models and encourages appreciation for students' cultural heritage, unique endowments, learning styles, interests, and needs. The teacher also designs learning experiences that show consideration for these student characteristics.

Because the teacher views differences as opportunities for learning, cross-cultural experiences are an integral part of the learner-centered community. In addition, the teacher establishes a relationship between the curriculum and community cultures. While making this connection, the teacher and students explore attitudes that foster unity. As a result, the teacher creates an environment in which learners work cooperatively and purposefully using a variety of resources to understand themselves, their immediate community, and the global society in which they live.
LEARNER-CENTERED COMMUNICATION

While acting as an advocate for all students and the school, the teacher demonstrates effective professional and interpersonal communication skills.

As a leader, the teacher communicates the mission of the school with learners, professionals, families, and community members. With colleagues, the teacher works to create an environment in which taking risks, sharing new ideas, and innovative problem solving are supported and encouraged. With citizens, the teacher works to establish strong and positive ties between the school and the community.

Because the teacher is a compelling communicator, students begin to appreciate the importance of expressing their views clearly. The teacher uses verbal, nonverbal, and media techniques so that students explore ideas collaboratively, pose questions, and support one another in their learning. The teacher and students listen, speak, read, and write in a variety of contexts; give multimedia and artistic presentations; and use technology as a resource for building communication skills. The teacher incorporates techniques of inquiry that enable students to use different levels of thinking.

The teacher also communicates effectively as an advocate for each learner. The teacher is sensitive to concerns that affect learners and takes advantage of community strengths and resources for the learners' welfare.

Excellence and Equity for All Students
LEARNER-CENTERED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The teacher, as a reflective practitioner dedicated to all students' success demonstrates a commitment to learn, to improve the profession, and to maintain professional ethics and personal integrity.

As a learner, the teacher works within a framework of clearly defined professional goals to plan for and profit from a wide variety of relevant learning opportunities. The teacher develops an identity as a professional, interacts effectively with colleagues, and takes a role in setting standards for teacher accountability. In addition, the teacher uses technological and other resources to facilitate continual professional growth.

To strengthen the effectiveness and quality of teaching, the teacher actively engages in an exchange of ideas with colleagues, observes peers, and encourages feedback from learners to establish a successful learning community. As a member of a collaborative team, the teacher identifies and uses group processes to make decisions and solve problems.

The teacher exhibits the highest standard of professionalism and bases daily decisions on ethical principles. To support the needs of learners, the teacher knows and uses community resources, school services, and laws relating to teacher responsibilities and student rights. Through these activities, the teacher contributes to the improvement of comprehensive educational programs as well as programs within specific disciplines.
PROFICIENCIES FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN LEARNER-CENTERED SCHOOLS
LEARNER-CENTERED LEADERSHIP

Through inspiring leadership, the administrator maximizes learning for all students while maintaining professional ethics and personal integrity.

The administrator guides the learning community in the development of a vision that reflects students' needs for academic achievement and success in life and makes that vision tangible for others through positive action. The administrator encourages the collaborative planning, implementation, assessment, and ongoing modification of strategies to achieve this mission. While continually striving to expand the base of support for the learning community, the administrator also creatively allocates resources such as money, time, facilities, technology, and volunteers. In addition, the administrator uses innovative governance structures and methods to further the mission of the learning community.

As a risk-taker, the administrator not only encourages innovation but also expects and handles the ambiguity inherent in the process of school change, including that involved in continual assessment and ongoing improvement. The administrator also consistently examines and questions routine ways of doing things.

To foster a continued commitment to the vision of the learner-centered community, the administrator empowers others not only by delegating authority but also through team building, creative problem solving, and the development of consensus. To support this effort, the administrator involves others in the selection and the delegation of roles of staff members. So that others respond from a sense of mission, the administrator encourages self-management and facilitates the development of leadership among all members of the learning community. The administrator builds relationships within this community and seeks to enlarge it by including parents, businesses, neighborhoods, and other kinds of resources.

The administrator exhibits and encourages the highest standard of professional conduct and bases daily decisions on ethical principles. In addition, the administrator ensures that the Code of Ethics and Standard Practices for Texas Educators is followed and uses an understanding of legal issues to make sound decisions.
LEARNER-CENTERED CLIMATE

The administrator establishes a climate of mutual trust and respect which enables all members of the learning community to seek and attain excellence.

In a learner-centered community, an atmosphere of openness and mutual respect fosters optimal academic, social, and personal growth for all community members. Within this open environment, people not only share resources but also a dynamic exchange of ideas. To continually assess and improve this climate, the administrator seeks and uses feedback from the members of the learning community.

While encouraging others to creatively solve problems, the administrator celebrates innovation and accomplishments, acknowledges excellence, and views unsuccessful experiences as opportunities to learn. The administrator models and supports responsible risk-taking so that all community members take chances and try out new ideas. As a result, every person in the learner-centered community teaches, encourages, and learns from others.

The administrator shares responsibility for the well-being of the entire learning community. In addition, the administrator acts appropriately to ensure the safety and welfare of community members while they are in school and also removes barriers that impede success for any person.
LEARNER-CENTERED CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

The administrator facilitates the implementation of a sound curriculum and appropriate instructional strategies designed to promote optimal learning for all students.

The administrator applies a thorough understanding of human development, learning theories, and educational philosophy to the structure of the curriculum and to the implementation of appropriate learning experiences. The administrator is also aware of influences such as social issues, political forces, and future trends on curriculum and instruction and understands their implications for life-long learning.

The administrator employs collaborative planning processes to facilitate curricular change. While recognizing the interests and needs of learners, members of the learning community select, modify, and design developmentally appropriate curricular materials. The administrator also incorporates technology, practical arts, liberal arts, and co- and extra-curricular activities into the comprehensive curriculum. To create an environment in which students learn how to learn, the administrator encourages all members of the learner community to use critical thinking, creativity, and problem solving as tools that build a greater understanding of the world.

The administrator systematically assesses curriculum and instruction to ensure that both are continually updated and adjusted to achieve optimal student learning. To support members of the learning community, the administrator encourages a variety of learning experiences, facilitates effective use of time and resources to benefit all community members, observes classroom instruction in order to support teacher and student goals, and collaboratively plans for systematic instructional improvement. Additionally, the administrator encourages teachers to integrate assessment and teaching to ensure that relevant learning opportunities are provided for all learners. The administrator engages all members of the community in sharing knowledge about the curriculum and learners to ensure continuity as students progress through the school system.
LEARNER - CENTERED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The administrator demonstrates a commitment to student learning through a personal growth plan and fosters the professional development of all staff in the learning community.

The administrator actively promotes the growth and wellness of every individual of the learning community. Based on the learning community's vision, the administrator works with the school staff to create a comprehensive plan for professional development and encourages participation in appropriate activities through the allocation of time and other resources. The administrator also schedules time for staff members to reflect, to work together, and to plan for their own professional growth. The administrator uses ongoing assessment to ensure that professional development activities are based on the changing needs of the learning community and that they are effective in promoting student learning.

In the interest of improvement in education, the administrator uses self-assessment to identify areas for professional growth. To enhance teaching and learning, the administrator pursues professional development activities such as attending local, state, and national conferences; staying current with professional literature and research; and visiting other campuses. As a result, the administrator develops an identity as a professional, interacts with other professionals, and develops a personal commitment to growth which is aligned with student, campus, district, and state needs.
EQUITY IN EXCELLENCE FOR ALL LEARNERS

The administrator promotes equity in excellence for all by acknowledging, respecting, and responding to diversity among students and staff while building on shared values and other similarities that bond all people.

The administrator is committed to a diverse learning community in which all members learn to live and work together while holding high expectations for the pursuit of excellence. The administrator ensures that all members of this learning community have an equitable opportunity to achieve. Recognizing that a diverse population enhances the learning environment, the administrator respects all learners, is sensitive to their needs, and encourages them to use all their skills and talents.

While honoring and appreciating diversity in the learning community, the administrator also emphasizes how similarities foster unity among all people. In addition, the administrator actively seeks to eliminate racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination in the learning community.

Because the administrator views differences as opportunities for learning, cross-cultural experiences are an integral part of the learner-centered community, and the cultures of school families are affirmed. In addition, the administrator follows changes in demographics to better understand the community and uses this information to make decisions about contemporary conditions. As a result, all members of the learner community develop an appreciation of diversity, an awareness of common needs, and the ability to communicate and work collaboratively toward common ends.
LEARNER-CENTERED COMMUNICATION

The administrator effectively communicates the learning community's vision as well as its policies and successes in interactions with staff, students, parents, community members, and the media.

As an effective communicator, the administrator demonstrates the power of language in self-identity, expression, and influence. The administrator continually practices active listening and encourages honest and open communication. Communicating with empathy to a variety of audiences, the administrator shares decision making, seeks consensus, and resolves conflicts by capitalizing on knowledge of group processes and the differences that occur during any group effort.

In addition, the administrator recognizes that schools are part of the public domain and responds to the public's right to know through a systemic plan for communication developed and implemented by all members of the learning community. Through effective oral and written presentations, the administrator clearly defines what is expected and hoped for in order to accomplish the school's mission.

As a spokesperson for public education, the administrator uses technology and establishes formal and informal networks to explain and enhance the vision for the school. The administrator accepts responsibility for the flow of communication among various groups that affect and are affected by educational policies and seeks to shape these policies at the local, state, and national levels. The administrator assesses the needs of various groups and the social, political, and economic aspects of the community at large. Recognizing the impact that mass media have in shaping opinions, the administrator proactively influences the media to enhance the learning community's mission.
## SURVEY OF TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR PROFICIENCIES

Mark only one response to an item. If you work in more than one capacity or are assigned to more than one type of campus, respond according to the assignment in which you predominantly function.

- Darken each bubble you choose completely.
- Erase completely any entries you change.
- Avoid making stray marks.

**INCORRECT MARKS**

1. Your gender is:
   - O Female
   - O Male

2. Your ethnicity is:
   - O African American
   - O Hispanic
   - O White
   - O Native American
   - O Asian or Pacific Islander
   - O Other

### Current Professional Assignment

3. You currently work in education service center region:
   - O 1 (Edinburg)
   - O 2 (Corpus Christi)
   - O 3 (Victoria)
   - O 4 (Houston)
   - O 5 (Beaumont)
   - O 6 (Huntsville)
   - O 7 (Killeen)
   - O 8 (Mt. Pleasant)
   - O 9 (Wichita Falls)
   - O 10 (Richardson)
   - O 11 (Fort Worth)
   - O 12 (Waco)
   - O 13 (Austin)
   - O 14 (Abilene)
   - O 15 (San Angelo)
   - O 16 (Amarillo)
   - O 17 (Lubbock)
   - O 18 (Midland)
   - O 19 (El Paso)
   - O 20 (San Antonio)

4. You currently work in a:
   - O Public School System
   - O Elementary School
   - O Middle School
   - O High School
   - O District Administration
   - O Other
   - O University (or other teacher preparation program)
   - O Academic Areas
   - O Teacher Education (including alternative certification program)
   - O Administration
   - O Other

5. You are currently assigned as a:
   - O Teacher/Faculty
   - O Administrator
   - O Counselor
   - O Other (central office, curriculum coordinator, etc.)

6. Indicate your total number of years of experience (including 1993-94) in the capacity you indicated in Item 5 (for example, the total number of years you have been a teacher, including years you taught at other campuses). Count partial years as full years.
   - O 1 - 4 years
   - O 5 - 9 years
   - O 10 - 14 years
   - O 15 - 19 years
   - O 20 years or more

**PLEASE CONTINUE**
The document contains a questionnaire asking respondents to rate the importance of various proficiencies for teachers and administrators in Texas. The proficiencies are listed and rated on a scale from 1 (no importance) to 5 (very great importance). The scale is provided at the top of the page:

- 1 - no importance
- 2 - little importance
- 3 - moderate importance
- 4 - great importance
- 5 - very great importance

The questionnaire includes the following proficiencies:

**Teacher Proficiencies:**

1. **T1**. The teacher possesses and draws on a rich knowledge base of content, pedagogy, and technology to provide relevant and meaningful learning experiences for all students.

2. **T2**. To create a learner-centered community, the teacher collaboratively identifies needs and plans, implements, and assesses instruction using technology and other resources.

3. **T3**. The teacher responds appropriately to diverse groups of learners.

4. **T4**. While acting as an advocate for all students and the school community, the teacher demonstrates effective professional and interpersonal communication skills.

5. **T5**. The teacher, as a reflective practitioner dedicated to all students' success, demonstrates a commitment to team, to improve the profession, and to maintain professional ethics and personal integrity.

**Administrator Proficiencies:**

1. **A1**. Through inspiring leadership, the administrator maximizes learning for all students while maintaining professional ethics and personal integrity.

2. **A2**. The administrator establishes a climate of mutual trust and respect which enables all members of the teaming community to seek and attain excellence.

3. **A3**. The administrator facilitates the implementation of a sound curriculum and appropriate instructional strategies designed to promote optimal learning for all students.

4. **A4**. The administrator plans and engages in professional growth opportunities which enhance teaming for all students.

5. **A5**. The administrator promotes equity in excellence for all by acknowledging, respecting, and responding to diversity among students and staff while building on shared values and other similarities and differences in the community.

6. **A6**. The administrator effectively communicates the learning community's vision as well as its policies and successes in interactions with staff, students, parents, community members, and the media.

The respondents are asked to rate the importance of each proficiency to the performance of a public school teacher or administrator.
Teacher and Administrator Proficiencies Survey

SUMMARY REPORT

The State Board of Education has directed that proficiencies for effective performance of public school teachers and administrators in Texas be defined. In fall 1993, the Texas Education Agency conducted a survey of approximately 10,000 Texas educators to validate the set of proposed proficiencies.

Background

The set of proposed proficiencies was developed in 1992 and 1993 through a statewide process involving hundreds of Texas citizens. Many Texas educators, including public school teachers and administrators, faculty from teacher preparation programs, and representatives from professional organizations, as well as business and industry representatives and others, participated and provided input during the development. Meetings and forums were held in cities across Texas. Over 600 educators, half of whom are public school teachers, attended the forums.

Attachment 1 is the list of the proposed teacher and administrator proficiencies. For reference in this document, the five teacher proficiencies are numbered T1 through T5, whereas the six administrator proficiencies are numbered A1 through A6.

Validation of job-related information, such as the proficiencies or skills necessary for effective performance of a job, is appropriately done by surveying the opinions of individuals who are actually performing that job. For this purpose, 5,500 surveys were mailed to public school teachers in order to validate the teacher proficiencies and 2,500 surveys were sent to public school administrators to validate the administrator proficiencies.

To assess the viewpoints of individuals working in training new educators for certification, approximately 2,000 surveys were sent to educator preparation programs at universities and alternative certification programs.

Teachers and administrators were asked to rate each proficiency based on their response to the following question:

HOW IMPORTANT IS THE PROFICIENCY TO THE PERFORMANCE OF A PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER [OR ADMINISTRATOR] IN TEXAS?

Respondents indicated their ratings using the following scale:

1 = no importance  
2 = little importance  
3 = moderate importance  
4 = great importance  
5 = very great importance

The ratings that teachers and administrators provided for their own proficiencies were the primary focus of this survey. However, to collect additional data about educators' opinions and to minimize cost in producing and distributing the survey, one survey form was produced which listed all five teacher proficiencies and all six administrator
proficiencies. Survey respondents were encouraged to rate both sets of proficiencies, not merely the ones that apply to their own current role (i.e., teacher or administrator).

Survey Results

The number of educators who indicated a rating, percentages who responded at each rating point, and mean ratings are reported for each proficiency.

Attachments 2 and 3 provide summaries of survey responses for public school teachers, public school administrators, and staff from educator preparation programs (i.e., faculty and administrators from teacher education and alternative certification programs, and university academic-area educators who work in preparing candidates for certification).

Attachment 4 indicates data for all educators who responded to the survey. There were 555 surveys returned on which respondents did not indicate the type of setting (e.g., public school campus, university teacher preparation or alternative certification program) in which they are currently working. Data for these 555 individuals are included in Attachment 4, but not in Attachments 2 and 3.

Mean ratings and distribution of responses by ethnic groups are very similar and show no significant differences among overall ratings by Hispanics, African Americans, and Whites.

Teacher Proficiencies

For the proposed teacher proficiencies, Attachment 2 shows that public school teachers rated all proficiencies high. Mean ratings range from 4.4 to 4.6. The percentages of teachers who responded that the proficiency was of "great importance" or "very great importance" (i.e., rated it a "4" or "5") were also high, ranging from 89.4% (proficiency T2) to 95.5% (proficiency T1).

Administrators also gave strong ratings to the teacher proficiencies, with mean ratings that are slightly higher (.1 to .2 points higher) than the means indicated by teachers. There are some differences between teacher and administrator ratings in term of distribution, although in most cases these are not significant. Proficiency T3 shows the greatest discrepancy, with 75.0% of the administrators rating it as being of "very great importance" compared to only 63.0% of the teachers indicating the same rating.

Educator preparation personnel also indicated support for the teacher proficiencies. Mean ratings range from 4.4 to 4.8.

Attachment 4 shows that overall ratings for the teacher proficiencies were high.

Administrator Proficiencies

Attachment 3 reports survey responses for the proposed administrator proficiencies. Public school administrators gave strong support to every proficiency, with mean ratings of 4.5 to 4.8. The percentages of administrators who responded that the proficiency was of "great importance" or "very great importance" (i.e., rated it a "4" or "5") were also very high, ranging from 92.5% (proficiency A4) to 98.1% (proficiency A2).

Teachers also gave positive ratings to the administrator proficiencies, although their mean ratings are slightly lower than the means of the administrators. In comparing the distribution of ratings, Attachment 3 indicates some interesting differences. For example,
there are 4 proficiencies (A1, A3, A4, A6) where the differences between the percentages of administrators and teachers rating that proficiency a "5" was seven percentage points or more.

The biggest discrepancy was for proficiency A3 which states "The administrator facilitates the implementation of a sound curriculum..." The percent of administrators (76.6%) who rated proficiency A3 as being of "very great importance" is almost 12 percentage points higher than the percent of teachers (64.7%) who gave the same rating.

Teacher preparation educators also indicated high ratings for the administrator proficiencies. Mean ratings range from 4.4 to 4.8.

Overall ratings by all respondents, provided in Attachment 4, show support for the administrator proficiencies.

Qualitative Data

A form for submitting comments was provided in the survey packet. Although use of this form was optional, 313 respondents sent comments about the proficiencies. Most comments reflected careful thought and consideration of the proficiencies.

Generally, comments were favorable, with educators strongly supporting the proficiencies. Some comments were positive statements about the sets of proficiencies as a whole, while other comments directed support at individual proficiencies or aspects of proficiencies.

Many comments praised the proficiencies but were also critical in nature. For example, some comments showed educators' concerns that the proficiencies may be too idealistic and possible not attainable in the classroom or the campus environment, or may not be achievable unless the present level of professional and financial support is greatly increased. Other comments contained mixed reactions about education or teaching in general.

Attachment 1 lists the proficiency statements, on which respondents were directed to base their ratings. The survey booklet also contained text which further explains each proficiency. Many comments from respondents focused more on the nature or the specifics of the explanatory text than on the proficiency statement itself.

Examples of comments include:

- Proficiency T5: "Inservices and workshops are greatly anticipated and enjoyable because the thirst and quest for new "tricks" in unquenchable. Updated files, current techniques, and interaction with peers ensures progressive thinking and maintenance of the most important job in the world — educating children." (elementary teacher)

- Proficiency T1: "Excellent Classroom instruction should be geared to real-life experiences. Students' opinions should always be valued." (middle school administrator)

- Proficiency A2: "The establishment of a climate of mutual trust and respect is the greatest proficiency an administrator can acquire. To develop a quality school, this climate must prevail throughout the learning organization." (middle school teacher)

- Proficiency A1: "The leadership idea strikes me as needing a number 10 on the scale. A school is successful "because of" or in some cases "in spite of" its administration. There needs to be a method to evaluate by teachers (fairly) so the principal can correct conduct or
practices. Note: My personal feeling is that all these ideas are of very great importance. We should expect nothing less of ourselves as educators." (elementary teacher)

• Proficiency T4: "I consider interpersonal communications the most important skills for both teachers and administrators. With growing emphasis on shared decisions, school as communities of learners, climate of trust, etc., these skills are becoming even more necessary. However, if I rated the eleven proficiencies in terms of the level of development currently offered in university preparation programs — and most other preservice and in-service programs — I would rate development of interpersonal communication skills as receiving by far the least attention." (teacher education faculty)

• Proficiency T5: "What does a teacher do to demonstrate a commitment to learning? We have teachers who leave classes to go to workshops. I personally believe the teachers should be with their children. This leaves nights, Saturdays, and summers. Most teachers want to learn more, but our energy is limited." (elementary teacher)

• Proficiency A1: "Superman can do this, and perhaps only Superman." (middle school teacher)

• Proficiency A3: "I feel very strongly about this, but I don't feel it can be left to campus administrators. Not all campus administrators are curriculum specialists, but some are. Basic curriculum should come from the central administration such that it's consistent throughout the district. Teachers should be able to make adaptations to meet individual students' needs." (elementary teacher)

• All teacher and administrator proficiencies: "All are vague because they try to include too much!" (teacher education faculty)

• All teacher and administrator proficiencies: "Are the teachers and administrators still going to be assessed based upon a pencil and paper test?" (teacher education faculty)

• All teacher and administrator proficiencies: "I rated every single proficiency as having very great importance because I felt they were excellent. However, for teachers to possess these proficiencies we must provide adequate support! To begin, we must ensure that institutions of higher education address these proficiencies through coursework. More importantly though, we must ensure that current public school teachers are provided plans of action and specific strategies/methods by which to achieve these proficiencies. ISD inservice programs should be required to formally address each proficiency. Likewise, we must equip our administrators to provide relevant and helpful instructions to teachers. Our system has failed in the past by mandating that teachers do certain things, but then not providing them with a plan and options of how to achieve what has been mandated. Treat our teachers the way we expect them to treat our students!" (teacher education administrator)

Survey Demographics and Return Rates

To validate the proficiencies, 9,910 surveys were distributed. An overall response rate of 35.6% (3,528 surveys returned) was obtained.

The 3,528 respondents comprise 11% African Americans, 15% Hispanics, and 73% Whites and educators of other ethnicities. Sixty-three percent of those responding are female and 37% are male. Most respondents have lengthy experience in education: 34%
reported they have from 10 to 19 years of experience in their current role, and 32% reported having 20 or more years of experience in that capacity.

Of the 9,910 surveys mailed out:

- 8,000 were sent to public school educators. 2,465 surveys were returned (30.8% response rate).

- 5,500 surveys were sent to teachers, with 1,377 returned (25.0% response rate). Teachers returning their surveys comprise 13% African Americans, 17% Hispanics, and 68% Whites (compared to 8% African Americans, 14% Hispanics, and 77% Whites teaching in public schools in 1992-93). Of those who responded, 52% reported they teach in elementary schools, 20% in middle schools, and 27% in high schools.

- 2,500 surveys were sent to administrators, with 897 returned (35.9% response rate). Administrators returning their surveys comprise 10% African Americans, 15% Hispanics, and 73% Whites. Of the 897 administrators, 37% work in elementary schools, 16% in middle schools, 22% in high schools, and 24% in a school district central office.

Within each role group (teacher, administrator), the survey sample was drawn to be representative of the populations in the public school districts. The sample was stratified according to type of campus and ethnicity. Distribution of surveys according to geographical regions was similar to statewide public school populations.

- 1,910 surveys were sent to state-approved teacher preparation programs (1,660 to teacher education programs and 250 to alternative certification programs). 508 were returned (26.6% response rate).

There is no database available for selecting specific faculty members in these programs; consequently, each program received a batch of surveys. Teacher education deans were requested to equitably distribute approximately 75% of their surveys to teacher education personnel and 25% of their surveys to academic-area faculty who work in preparing candidates for certification. Alternative certification program directors distributed the surveys equitably among all educators in their program.

Of the 508 respondents, 66% reported they work in teacher education and alternative certification programs, 25% are in academic areas, and 9% are in university administration and other areas. These educators comprise 3% African Americans, 6% Hispanics, and 91% Whites and others.

Additional Information

Additional information about the survey is available from the Texas Education Agency, Division of Educator Assessment and Appraisal at (512) 463-9525.

Note: Because of missing responses to demographic data and proficiency ratings and the rounding of percentages, individual numbers in this report may not sum to total.
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LIST OF PROPOSED PROFICIENCIES

Teacher Proficiencies
T1. The teacher possesses and draws on a rich knowledge base of content, pedagogy, and technology to provide relevant and meaningful learning experiences for all students.

T2. To create a learner-centered community, the teacher collaboratively identifies needs and plans, implements, and assesses instruction using technology and other resources.

T3. The teacher responds appropriately to diverse groups of learners.

T4. While acting as an advocate for all students and the school, the teacher demonstrates effective professional and interpersonal communication skills.

T5. The teacher, as a reflective practitioner dedicated to all students’ success, demonstrates a commitment to learn, to improve the profession, and to maintain professional ethics and personal integrity.

Administrator Proficiencies
A1. Through inspiring leadership, the administrator maximizes student learning while maintaining professional ethics and personal integrity.

A2. The administrator establishes a climate of mutual trust and respect which enables all members of the learning community to seek and attain excellence.

A3. The administrator facilitates the implementation of a sound curriculum and appropriate instructional strategies designed to promote optimal learning for all students.

A4. The administrator plans and engages in professional growth opportunities which enhance learning for all students.

A5. The administrator promotes equity in excellence for all by acknowledging, respecting, and responding to diversity among students and staff while building on shared values and other similarities that bond all people.

A6. The administrator effectively communicates the learning community’s vision as well as its policies and successes in interactions with staff, students, parents, community members, and the media.
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RATINGS FOR TEACHER PROFICIENCIES, BY ROLE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Group and Proficiency</th>
<th>Percent Who Rated It...</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Preparation Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale: 1= no importance  
2= little importance  
3= moderate importance  
4= great importance  
5= very great importance
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RATINGS FOR ADMINISTRATOR PROFICIENCIES, BY ROLE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Group and Proficiency</th>
<th>Percent Who Rated It...</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Preparation Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale:
1=no importance
2=little importance
3=moderate importance
4=great importance
5=very great importance
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RATINGS FOR ALL PROFICIENCIES, BY ALL RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Group and Proficiency</th>
<th>Percent Who Rated</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Proficiencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrator Proficiencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale: 1=no importance  
2= little importance  
3= moderate importance  
4=great importance  
5= very great importance
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INTRODUCTION

Historically, the system of accountability was process oriented—designed to evaluate traditional teacher education programs. Teacher education programs now extend beyond the traditional college of education baccalaureate program.

There is now a need for performance indicators which are appropriate to evaluate diverse programs. Appropriate performance indicators must possess at least two qualities.

1. They must identify those attributes which are important to quality teaching.

2. They must allow for an accurate method of measurement.

The purpose of this document is to outline institutional indicators which can be used to determine the quality of teacher preparation programs in the state of Texas.
ExCET

ExCET - is one of the indicators that is used as a formal mandated state exam used for teachers certification purposes.

Everyone has to take Professional Development test and at least one content area exam.

What kinds of information is reported to the institution and what it means to the institution.

1. These data can be used to normatively evaluate programs and denote whether the curriculum is aligned to the performance indicator as set by state.

2. Can be used to verify concurrent validity of all measures of institutional performance.

3. Can be used to identify professional development opportunities including university faculty in all content areas.

4. Can be used to tell whether curriculum of program is researched based.

5. Basis for decisions on resource allocation--Time, fiscal, human

The aforementioned is only appropriate if the ExCET exam is aligned to new performance standards mandated by the state. The ExCET shall be used as one of the many equal indicators in making the decision on who is certified as a first time teacher in the state of Texas and institutional performance.

As standards and indicators change faculty should be apprised and given professional development opportunities in those areas.

Use demographic data as recruitment tool.
Portfolio

A. Definition

A tangible record of experience that shows the progress of the professional educator beginning with teacher preparation.

B. Possible components
1. Student observation reports of field experience.
2. Observation reports of mentor teachers and supervisors.
3. Evidence of instructional planning.
4. Video tape.
5. Reflective journal.
7. Evidence of experience in working with diverse populations and environments.
8. Case study works.

C. How it can be used:
1. Personal growth.
2. Personal resource.
3. Fulfill institutional requirements for certification.
4. Employment purposes.
(Flip chart)

Portfolio

Awareness
Collection
Diagnosis
Actualization

Institute for Performance-Based Accountability 1/21/94

(Flip chart)

Portfolios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student produced</td>
<td>Elective/guided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointly produced</td>
<td>Collegial/Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution produced</td>
<td>Comments/testimones/judgments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Teaching
• Plan and prepare
• Student evaluation
• Professional attitude
• Community activities
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POST-GRADUATE ACTIVITY

Performance-based accountability system should include indicators that measure post-graduate activity that can be linked to the teacher-preparation program. Post graduation data is essential in measuring effectiveness of teacher preparation programs. The criteria should include the following:

- Classroom observation reports
- TTAS scores - Disaggregated by criteria
- Percentage of graduates who are hired to teach
- Percentage of graduates who remain in the profession after 3 years, 5 years
- Percentage of graduates who earn graduate hours/degrees
- Percentage who get National Board Certification/professional license
- Evidence of participation in teacher induction program
  - Performance evaluation by mentor
  - Feedback from graduate about how program prepared them for teaching
- Percentage of students who participate in discipline-based professional organizations
- Evidence of participation in collaboration of institutions with school personnel and graduate
- Percentage of graduates who earn awards, grants, recognition
- Percentage of students who assume leadership roles (lead teachers, department chair, curriculum, etc.)
STUDENT EVALUATION/ATTITUDE

The evaluation process should include the following areas:

1. Validity
   a. The evaluation should pertain to the proficiencies for learner centered schools
   b. Internal criteria versus external criteria (post graduate data)

2. Formative to help students remediate early enough for improvements.

3. Student summaries - Tell as much about the students as well as the programs involved.

4. Assessment - A means to an end, not the end itself.

5. Portfolio - Should show growth, instead of simply a check list

6. The evaluation should continue from classroom to the field experience.

7. Keep a journal from the beginning of teacher education program to the present and for a number of years to come.

8. Evaluation of effectiveness of supervising teacher, during and after.

9. Course evaluation might include broad program evaluations.

10. Attitude toward:
   a. The process
   b. Climate
   c. Courses
   d. Their role in the process
   e. How well do they fit in the classroom.
   f. Post-graduate assessment of the teacher education program
RECRUITMENT/RETENTION DROPOUT

1. Show evidence of successful recruitment plan.
   - Paper trail of contacts beginning with middle school/Jr. high
2a. Support of high school FTA (Future Teacher Association)
   - provide speakers/program
   - scholarships to students

2. Show evidence of high percentage rate of successful retention of student:
   - mentoring
   - socialization
   - tutoring
   - development of minority scholarship
2a. Decrease the percentage of dropouts
   - provide support services
   - determine reason
   - determine if re-enter same program or different
CUSTOMER/PARENT SATISFACTION
(Define/Describe)

The customer may be defined as the school district or employing entity of the student. Parents are
the parents of students in the school district. Degree of satisfaction refers to the satisfaction of
administration, mentoring teacher, supervisor with graduates of Teacher Education programs.

Can measure by: Interviews, observations, degree schools are anxious to hire other students from
the institution.

Teacher preparation program sends questionnaire to campus principal and to mentor teacher.

The information will be used to determine the programming strengths/weaknesses. Builds
strengths and remediate deficiencies.
OBSERVATION/PROGRESS REPORTS
(Define/Describe)

Observation/progress reports refers to preservice reports for any field-based experience:

- Personal Observations
- Video Observations
- Self-Assessment

Reports based on periodic formative conferences with supervising teachers

Used to advise student of his/her own progress;

Used collectively to improve or enhance institutional programs:

- Staff Changes
- Curriculum changes
- Additional field experience
CAUTION

While the ideas/suggestions listed above are possible criteria for indicating success in evaluating institutional indicators, keep in mind that few, if any, of the criteria are "stand alone" signals of mastery or competency. Many of these determiners of success are multifaceted and may have many extraneous variables attached to them. You may also wish to consider each criterion in combination with other criteria offered.

Allow for some degree of flexibility and local autonomy when selecting evaluative criteria. The success of your program depends on your ability to modify the teacher education so that it reflects the needs of your community.
COMPONENTS FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

- ExCET-pass rate average, aggregated by % of program completed at that institution

- TTAS or other classroom observation report based upon the same teacher proficiencies.

- ACT/SAT of entering TE students and exiting TE Students (pre-and post test usage)

- Institutional Report (designed by that institutions) aggregating Outcomes Assessments such as: a) student teacher Self Appraisal of Preparedness on Proficiencies, b) cooperating teacher/supervising teacher report on proficiencies, c) reporter interviewers response to student interviews

- Planning system which integrates learner-centered proficiencies, participation by practitioner and needs-based info.

- A curriculum developed from performance standards that focuses on student needs and student performance.

- An instrumental program which combines university based and field based components and involves classroom teachers.

- Instructional personnel with academic training and practical experience in K-12 teaching.

- Resources that complement performance and field based programs.

- an administrative commitment and support system that encourages performance based program and activities
## Educator Excellence Indicator System -- Prototype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ExCEI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* First time taker</td>
<td>75% of all subgroups passing</td>
<td>1994-95 only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Subsequent taker</td>
<td>85% of all subgroups passing</td>
<td>1995-96 standard to be phased in over the 1993-95 school year; and 1996-97 full implementation of standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cumulative taker</td>
<td>90% of all subgroups passing</td>
<td>1994-95 evaluation instrument development; 1995-96 to be pilot year for indicator; and 1996-97 full implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-completion entity evaluation&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>1995-96 to be pilot year for indicator; and 1996-97 full implementation of standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Rate</td>
<td>Comparative Productivity Measure</td>
<td>1995-96 to be pilot year for indicator; and 1996-97 full implementation of standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Appraisal System&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>To be determined based on 1995-98 baseline data</td>
<td>1995-96 to be pilot year for indicator; and 1996-97 full implementation of standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Quality Measures&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>1994-95 School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Effort</td>
<td>Comparative Productivity Measure</td>
<td>1994-95 to be pilot year for measure (aggregate data); 1995-96 full implementation and collection (student level data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Effort</td>
<td>Comparative Productivity Measure</td>
<td>1994-95 to be pilot year for measure (aggregate data); 1995-96 full implementation and collection (student level data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Completion Rate</td>
<td>Comparative Productivity Measure</td>
<td>1994-95 to be pilot year for measure (aggregate data); 1995-96 full implementation and collection (student level data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Retention</td>
<td>Comparative Productivity Measure</td>
<td>1994-95 to be pilot year for indicator; 1995-96 standard to be phased in over 1993-95, and 1996-97 full implementation of standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Indicators are to be calculated for all subgroups as a percent of total students within each subgroup. The 1995-96 standards are to be implemented and fully phased in over 1993-95 and 1994-95 school years.

<sup>2</sup> Indicators are to be calculated for all subgroups as a percent of total students with a given characteristic within each subgroup. The 1995-96 standards are to be implemented and fully phased in over 1993-95 and 1994-95 school years.

<sup>3</sup> Indicators are to be calculated for all subgroups as a percent of total students with a given characteristic within each subgroup. The 1995-96 standards are to be implemented and fully phased in over 1993-95 and 1994-95 school years.

Educator Excellence Indicator System (EEIS) indicators and standards apply to all educators regardless of subject and certification area.
### Educator Excellence Indicator System — Prototype

**ESC Focus Group Comment Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (By Subgroups)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Guidelines (Calculation)</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExCET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First-time taker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsequent taker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cumulative taker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-completion entity evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Appraisal System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Approval</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Quality Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program Completion Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 year rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 year rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Use reverse side for additional comments*
Educator Excellence Indicator System — Prototype

Glossary

An Educator Excellence Indicator System (EEIS) will be established with indicators that include evidence of the preparation program's ability to produce educators who demonstrate the proficiencies aligned with student learning standards as an accountability system for professional educator preparation programs.

Comparative Productivity Measures — are indicators that list statistics about an educator preparation entity that will be compared with the institute as a whole, Education Service Center Region, the state, and, where appropriate, national statistics. Performance standards are to be developed based on local social and economic conditions, entity improvement plan (self-study), entity objectives, and entity mission and goals.

Quality Measures — are performance indicators. Quality indicators reflect how proficient are the educators produced by the educator preparation entity. Quality indicators are to be compared to performance standards.

Recruitment Rate — is the total number of students accepted and enrolled in the entity's educator preparation program divided by the number of persons who apply for admittance. Formula: ((Admitted/Applicants) * 100).

Program Retention Rate — is the number admitted into the program, who do not drop out, divided by their admission class cohort. Admission class cohort is persons accepted and enrolled in the educator preparation program. Formula: ((Cohort enrolled/Cohort) * 100).

Program Completion Rate — is the total number of "completers" divided by their admission class cohort. "Completer" class cohort refers to students who have met all program requirements including internship, passed all required ExCETs, and are recommended for certification.

First-time Takers — are those persons who take the ExCET and are identified by the educator preparation entity as eligible to take the ExCET. Passage rate is the number of first-time takers passing the ExCET divided by the number of first-time takers.

Subsequent Takers — are persons who take the ExCET after having previously failed it at any point within the last three years. Passage rate is the number of subsequent takers passing the ExCET divided by the number of subsequent takers.

Cumulative Pass Rate — is the total number of passers divided by the total number of first-time takers plus subsequent takers who pass. Formula: (((first-time takers who pass + subsequent takers who pass) / (first-time takers + subsequent takers who pass)) * 100).

Placement Rate — is the total number of the "completer" class cohort identified as being employed by a Texas public school as reported in the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) within 12 months of completing an educator preparation program, divided by their "completer" class cohort. Formula: ((Completers/Cohort) * 100).

Professional Retention Rate — is the total number of the "completer" class cohort identified as being employed by a Texas public school district as reported in PEIMS three and five years after completion of an educator preparation program, divided by their "completer" class cohort. Formula: ((Completers who get jobs/Completers) * 100).

Post-Completion Entity Evaluation — is the mean composite evaluation rating of responses from the Educator Preparation Completers' Attitude Survey.

Local Quality Measures — are the program approval requirements. Approval requirements are evidence that the educator preparation program's performance plan is based on the proficiencies.

---

1 The Educator Preparation Completers' Attitude Survey to be developed.
# Accountability System for Educator Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (by student groups)</th>
<th>Standard/Goal</th>
<th>Guidelines (by student groups)</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accreditation Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ExCEBP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First-time Pass Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below apply to all student groups</td>
<td>Below apply to all student groups and indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cumulative Pass Rate</td>
<td>≥ 90% passing</td>
<td>Standard criteria apply to entities and programs with 10 or more enrolled</td>
<td>Below apply to both indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Appraisal System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be determined based on 1997-98 baseline data</td>
<td>To date: developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995-96/1996-97 pilot year for Appraisal-System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997-98 Appraisal System phased in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998-99 full implementation of Appraisal System into Accountability System for Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) indicators and standards apply to all educator preparation entities and the certificates they offer.
## Accountability System for Educator Preparation

### Page 2 of 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (by student groups)</th>
<th>Standard/Goal</th>
<th>Guidelines (by student groups)</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Equity Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention in the Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up Provision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey of Perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ancillary Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Standard/Goal</th>
<th>Guidelines (by student groups)</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention in the Profession</strong></td>
<td>To date development</td>
<td>([Completers cohort employed three years after cohort] / [Completers cohort] * 100)</td>
<td>1993-94 pilot year for indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up Provision</strong></td>
<td>To date development</td>
<td>([Completers cohort employed five years after cohort] / [ Completers cohort] * 100)</td>
<td>1993-94 pilot year for indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey of Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>To date development</td>
<td>([Completers cohort employed four years after cohort] / [Completers cohort] * 100)</td>
<td>1994-95 pilot year for data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Profile</strong></td>
<td>Number of Completers</td>
<td>Number of Completers who get jobs</td>
<td>1994-95 pilot year for data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention in the Profession</strong></td>
<td>To date development</td>
<td>([Completers cohort employed two years after cohort] / [Completers cohort] * 100)</td>
<td>1994-95 pilot year for data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) indicators and standards apply to all educator preparation programs and the certificates they offer.
Accountability Standards, Accreditation Status, and Implementation Schedule

Percent Passing ExCET\(^1\) for all student groups\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Accredited</td>
<td>Accredited</td>
<td>Accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Accredited Review</td>
<td>Accredited Warned</td>
<td>Accredited Warned (Intervention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>(Intervention)</td>
<td>(Intervention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Use of Ancillary Indicator data may be used for "Recognized" accreditation status.

*Note: The table indicates the criteria for accreditation status based on the percentage of students passing the ExCET. The accreditation status changes based on the percentage of students passing, with different implications for different years.*
Certification Area Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>002 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (ELEMENTARY)</td>
<td>016 ENGLISH (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>015 READING (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004 ELEMENTARY COMPREHENSIVE</td>
<td>014 COMPOSITE SCIENCE (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013 KINDERGARTEN</td>
<td>019 LIFE/earth SCIENCE (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARCARE</td>
<td>020 CHEMISTRY (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005 EARLY CHILDHOOD</td>
<td>021 EARTH SCIENCE (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATES</td>
<td>022 PHYSICAL SCIENCE (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017 KINDERGARTENMASTER</td>
<td>023 BIOLOGY (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014 EARCARE</td>
<td>024 PHYSICS (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING RESOURCES</td>
<td>025 COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016 READING SPECIALIST</td>
<td>SOCIAL STUDIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017 COACH</td>
<td>024 COMPOSITE SOCIAL STUDIES (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018 EDUCATIONAL DIAGNOSTICIAN</td>
<td>025 GOVERNMENT (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019 SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>026 GEOGRAPHY (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020 ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>027 ECONOMICS (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021 SUPERINTENDENT</td>
<td>028 HISTORY (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINE ARTS</td>
<td>029 PSYCHOLOGY (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031 ART (ALL LEVELS)</td>
<td>030 SOCIOLOGY (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026 ART (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>BUSINESS AND TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032 MUSIC (ALL LEVELS)</td>
<td>031 INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027 MUSIC (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>032 VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028 SPEECH COMMUNICATION (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>033 VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE: PRODUCTION (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033 THEATRE ARTS (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>034 VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE: HORTICULTURE (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034 DANCE (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>035 INFORMATION PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>036 BUSINESS (COMPOSITE) (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037 PHYSICAL EDUCATION (ALL LEVELS)</td>
<td>037 BASIC BUSINESS (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038 PHYSICAL EDUCATION (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>038 BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039 HEALTH EDUCATION (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>039 SECRETARIAL BUSINESS (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>046 MARKETING EDUCATION (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040 CEREBRAL PALSY SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041 VISUALLY HANDICAPPED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042 SEVERELY AND PROFOUNDLY HANDICAPPED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043 SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED AND AUTISTIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044 SPECIAL EDUCATION - SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045 SPECIAL EDUCATION - HEARING IMPAIRED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGES</td>
<td>LANGUAGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047 ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE</td>
<td>017 ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046 SPANISH (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>048 SPANISH (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045 FRENCH (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>049 FRENCH (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044 GERMAN (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>050 LATIN (SECONDARY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043 ITALIAN (SECONDARY)</td>
<td>051 FRENCH ORAL PROFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042 FRENCH ORAL PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>081 SPANISH ORAL PROFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual certification areas (ExCET test) with less than 20 students taking the tests for the ASEP reporting period are grouped to a subject area.
Implementation Schedule


Accredited
70% or more of all first-time takers passing the ExCETs.
70% or more of each first-time taker group (ethnic, gender) passing the ExCETs.
70% or more of cumulative takers passing the ExCETs.

Accredited (Review)
Less than 70%, but greater than or equal to 50% of all first-time takers passing the ExCETs.
Less than 70%, but greater than or equal to 50% of each first-time taker group (ethnic, gender) passing the ExCETs.
Less than 70%, but greater than or equal to 50% of cumulative takers passing the ExCETs.

Accredited (Intervention)
Less than 50% of all first-time takers passing the ExCETs.
Less than 50% of each first-time taker group (ethnic, gender) passing the ExCETs.
Less than 50% of cumulative takers passing the ExCETs.

1998-1999 School Year

Accredited (Recognized)*
90% or more of all first-time takers passing the ExCETs.
90% or more of each first-time taker group (ethnic, gender) passing the ExCETs.
90% or more of cumulative takers passing the ExCETs.
Appraisal System performance standard.**

Accredited
Less than 90%, but greater than or equal to 70% of all first-time takers passing the ExCETs.
Less than 90%, but greater than or equal to 70% of each first-time taker group (ethnic, gender) passing the ExCETs.
Less than 90%, but greater than or equal to 70% of cumulative takers passing the ExCETs.

Accredited (Warned w/Intervention)
Less than 70% of all first-time takers passing the ExCETs.
Less than 70% of each first-time taker group (ethnic, gender) passing the ExCETs.
Less than 70% of cumulative takers passing the ExCETs.

1997-1998 School Year

Accredited (Recognized)*
90% or more of all first-time takers passing the ExCETs.
90% or more of each first-time taker group (ethnic, gender) passing the ExCETs.
90% or more of cumulative takers passing the ExCETs.

Accredited
Less than 90%, but greater than or equal to 70% of all first-time takers passing the ExCETs.
Less than 90%, but greater than or equal to 70% of each first-time taker group (ethnic, gender) passing the ExCETs.
Less than 90%, but greater than or equal to 70% of cumulative takers passing the ExCETs.

Accredited (Warned)
Less than 70%, but greater than or equal to 50% of all first-time takers passing the ExCETs.
Less than 70%, but greater than or equal to 50% of each first-time taker group (ethnic, gender) passing the ExCETs.
Less than 70%, but greater than or equal to 50% of cumulative takers passing the ExCETs.

*Use of ancillary indicator data may be used for Recognized accreditation status.

** Standard for this indicator has yet to be established.
Glossary

Student Population Groups—student demographic categories including Male and Female, African American, Hispanic, White, and Other (Native-American and Asian)

Accreditation Indicators—performance measures specified in Texas Education Code § 13.037(b). Accreditation indicators reflect the proficiency level of the educator prepared by the entity. And thus, are compared to performance standards to determine the accreditation status of the entity.

First-time Pass Rate—the total number of the current year’s first-time takers who pass the ExCET by test divided by the total number of the current year’s first-time takers by test. First-time takers are those persons identified for the first time by a state-approved educator preparation entity as eligible to take the ExCET by test.

Cumulative Pass Rate—the total number of first-time takers from the prior year plus subsequent takers who passed the ExCET by test in the prior year—or current year divided by the total number of first-time takers from the prior year by test. Subsequent takers are last year’s first-time takers who have previously failed it. Formula: ((prior year’s first-time takers who pass by test + subsequent takers who pass by test) / prior year’s first-time takers by test) x 100).

Ancillary Indicators—measures provide an entity comparative data, with subsequent comparison to the institution as a whole, the education service center region, the state, and, where appropriate, the nation. Development of performance standards is based on local social and economic conditions and the entity improvement plan.

Retention in the Profession Rate—the total number of the “completer” class cohort identified as employed by a PreK—12 school district and reported in the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) within 12 months of completing an educator preparation program, divided by their “completer” class cohort. Formula: (completers employed/completer class cohort) x 100)

Follow-up Provision—the mean composite evaluation rating of responses from the Educator Preparation Completers’ Attitude Survey administered one, three, and five years after internship.

Retention in the Profession Rate—the total number of the “completer” class cohort identified as employed by a PreK—12 school district and, reported in PEIMS three and five years after completion of an educator preparation program, divided by their “completer” class cohort. Formula: (completers employed/completer class cohort) x 100)
PROGRAM APPROVAL FORMAT

Following are instructions for entities seeking approval to deliver educator preparation. Once an entity has submitted a written proposal to the CSTP, it will be scheduled to provide a presentation of its program.

I. The Written Proposal

A. Shall provide a succinct overview of the proposed educator preparation program, describing the results of transition (if applicable).
   - Chart Old Program–New Program

B. Shall address the Program Approval Framework clearly and specifically.

C. Shall be a maximum of 45 pages in length, including appendices.
   - Appendices
     - shall provide assurances that certificates are matched to ExCET competencies/educator proficiencies/recommendations of learned societies
     - shall provide a list of all certificate programs offered
     - shall provide any other supporting evidence

D. Shall be submitted according to CSTP timelines, at least thirty days prior to the CSTP meeting.

II. Presentation

Utilizing the CSTP Program Approval Framework as a guide, the entity seeking approval will use its choice of media (e.g., representatives, testimonials, video) in demonstrating its effectiveness in preparing educators (Product).

The presentations will be 30 minutes in length, with time for questions from reviewers to be determined.
C. Evidence of a variety of teaching and learning experiences integrated into the delivery system.

D. Evidence of an ongoing, comprehensive performance assessment system for educator candidates.
   - multiple measures
   - traditional and performance assessment of proficiencies

For Section III. below—

For Program Commitment and Resources, the entity seeking approval must give evidence of Product, to include but not be limited to the following:
- Matrix to indicate partners' contribution to support program
- Matrix to indicate responsibility of each partner

III. Program Commitment and Resources

A. Evidence that the sponsoring entity has the commitment and capacity to deliver an effective program:
   - qualified and sufficient faculty and staff
   - financial support and resources
   - responsible governance/administrative structure

B. Evidence of collaborative partnerships and shared accountability for program design, delivery, evaluation, and professional development.
   - role and responsibility of each partner
   - contributions of each partner

For Section IV. below—

For Program Equity, the entity seeking approval must give evidence of Product, to include but not be limited to the following:
- System in place to recruit and retain underrepresented populations
- Number of individuals from underrepresented populations recruited and retained in the program
- System in place to select for admission into the program
- Number of programs to meet critical personnel needs in Texas public schools (i.e. Special Education, Bilingual Education, English as a Second Language, Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education)

IV. Program Equity

Evidence of equity in recruitment and retention of educator candidates, especially among underrepresented populations.
• recruitment efforts
• selection and admission process
• retention and support programs
• licensure
• retention in the profession
• meeting critical personnel needs in Texas schools

For Section V. below--
For Unique Program Characteristics, the entity seeking approval must give evidence of Product, to include but not be limited to any area of the rule under which approval is sought which has not yet been addressed above.

V. Unique Program Characteristics
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