

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
\*\*\*SPECIAL MEETING\*\*\*  
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
350 MAIN STREET  
MALDEN, MASSACHUSETTS  
Monday, March 27, 2000  
4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD  
OF EDUCATION PRESENT:**

Mr. James A. Peyser, Chairman, Dorchester  
Dr. Roberta R. Schaefer, Vice-Chairperson, Worcester  
Ms. Patricia Crutchfield, Southwick  
Mr. William K. Irwin, Wilmington  
Dr. Abigail Thernstrom, Lexington

Dr. David P. Driscoll, Commissioner of Education & Secretary to the Board

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD  
OF EDUCATION ABSENT :**

Mr. Charles D. Baker, Swampscott  
Dr. Edwin J. Delattre, Boston  
Dr. Judith I. Gill, Boston  
Mr. Marcel LaFlamme, Monson

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Maryellen Coughlin, Registered Professional Reporter

**TEACHER CERTIFICATION**

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Good afternoon everyone. Thanks for coming. I apologize for the late start. Hopefully, we won't have a late finish, but by the same token we want to have a full discussion about the issues before us.

I want to thank Board members for being here. I am particularly grateful to those representatives from the schools of education who are here to have this conversation about proposed changes to the certification regulations both in terms of the standards and the process. Commissioner, I'll defer to you initially, and then we can turn it over to Deputy Commissioner Sandra Stotsky for a brief introduction and background on where we are in this process and what some of the basic elements of the proposal are. Then, we can have an informal interchange and discussion about concerns anyone around the table might have about the paper before us.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I'll be very brief. It seems it was a good idea to put out a concept paper in advance of trying to develop regulations and something formalized for public comment. This brought about a great number of positive results, including a good dialogue around the state about these various issues. We received a great deal of input, much of which has caused us to change several things that were in the original concept paper. Sandy may want to emphasize those. I think it's certainly important not to rush it this because it has such tremendous ramifications for institutions of higher education and for the candidates themselves. I would even say for the entire future of public education, because we face such significant challenges in trying to attract qualified, capable teachers. I think it's been good, Mr. Chairman, to have had this interim step, and I'll turn it over to Sandy to talk about the things we've already learned, and then open it up to our guests to bring up their various issues.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Thank you. Let me first introduce the deans who are here: first, Dean Bailey Jackson, from U. Mass. Amherst; then, next to him, is Dr. William Dandridge from Lesley College; Don Pierson, from U. Mass. Lowell; Ronald Cromwell who is at Bridgewater State College; and Mary Brabeck who is the dean at Boston College. Let me welcome you all here.

We very much appreciate your being here for this dialogue that we had laid out in a letter of invitation that we sent to you a couple of weeks ago at the Commissioner's suggestion. We thought that before the document actually is written into regulation language, it would be useful for us to talk with the Deans' Council so that we could clarify, if need be, any of the

issues that might have been of concern in the many letters that we received from schools of education throughout Massachusetts.

Let me first say that we received over 600 responses to our request for public comment on this concept paper, or a pre-draft as it also might be called. We very much appreciated all of these written comments, many of which were extremely detailed and thorough, particularly from the schools of education, because they had so many different issues that they could comment on in the proposed regulations. We suggested to the Deans' Council that we would like to have them come here for a dialogue with the Board of Education.

In return, before this meeting we were invited, my staff and I, to come to their meeting, last Friday in Worcester. We agreed, after a very profitable and productive meeting, that this would be the first in a series of meetings with which we might discuss the proposed regulations, and lay the groundwork for future collaboration. I think that is probably all that I would want to stay at this point, because I would really like to have the deans discuss whatever they would like to see raised as some of the concerns, issues or questions, however they wish to bring this up before the Board.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** If I could just interject. I hope that the format of this would be that people feel free to interrupt one other and ask questions and really have a discussion as opposed to a presentation format. So let's begin.

**MR. JACKSON:** This is probably the most formal part of it. We were invited to come and have a discussion, and as such, we didn't come with prepared presentations. We wanted to interact with you on some of the issues that were raised in the letter by Sandra Stotsky. What I wanted to do was to provide a little bit of a context under which the deans operate. It's been about five years since the group was put together. And actually, it came together as a result of a meeting between then Commissioner Antonucci and then Deputy Commissioner Driscoll.

We had a long meeting in Amherst. It was a very productive meeting. The challenge was put out by the Commissioner to see if we couldn't come up with a group that could be used as a sounding board by the Department when policy issues came up that involved higher education. We wanted to make sure that whatever the forum was that it included both public and private institutions. Now, at the time, we thought this was a great idea. I asked Bill Dandridge to represent the private sector, and we talked about how we would begin to pull this forum together. The problem was there are some 63 units in the Commonwealth. If you count all the colleges and schools and departments it is a large group to pull together.

So what we decided to do was to pull together the deans of the schools and colleges of education. There are 11 that currently sit on the Deans Council. We try to reach out to other units so that we are representing the issues in higher education with regard to all facets of education and issues that the units are concerned with. We've been meeting for about five years, on a monthly basis, but occasionally we meet with other groups. We've met with the Commissioner a few times, and we've met with some legislators. We've jointly sponsored conferences, the MCAS conference and so on, which turned out to be quite an important conference, in the Commonwealth. Our primary agenda is to make sure that we continued in that work.

One of the things that we continually discuss or explore are different ways to make sure that the communication is open between all of the players in the Commonwealth who are concerned with education reform. In some sense, this meeting is long overdue. We're really glad to have this particular discussion with the Board and the Department because it begins to close a loop. We look forward to the ongoing conversations that the Deputy Commissioner mentioned as part of that whole process. So let me stop there and get right into the meat of the issues that we want to focus on here.

The issues that were posed to us were: the multiple issues around routes for certification, issues around pedagogy and content in the professional preparation, and then the third, the many roles of schools of education in that process. As I said, we don't necessarily have prepared speeches, but there are many tapes that we could run on each of these issues. I'm hoping that this will go back and forth and you will stop us and push us as the conversation moves on. So let me start with Bill Dandridge.

**MR. DANDRIDGE:** Good afternoon. I'd like to start with the first question that was presented to us, the desirability of multiple routes to licensure. I assure you that if there are 60 institutions preparing teachers, there are probably 62, 64, probably 120 variations on the theme as you go from campus to campus. So the issue really is, at the end of the day if we are concerned about making sure that we are sending forward fully prepared and certifiable teachers, regardless of the route

that they take, they should be held to the same standards. I think that's the point that we've been trying to make. We feel that some of the more traditional programs, in some ways are over-regulated. All we're saying is that we think that the gate, however it is defined, should be consistent for all candidates who come forward through the Department of Education seeking certification. That's it in a nutshell.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Under the draft here, there would continue to be three levels of certification. One of the questions I have has to do with whether the same standards need to apply to all three levels or should the same standards apply to the final level of professional certification, since that's the place where this equality of standards, if you will, is most important. In the earlier stages, there may be room for more flexibility or difference.

**MR. DANDRIDGE:** Speaking just for myself on this one, I think that at the initial stage, I think we want to be sure that whenever we're sending someone forward that we can be comfortable in assuring the public, parents and others that they have met a certain standard or bar. You can certainly build above that as one progresses through the stages of certification. Whatever standards you set at the initial stage, regardless of the route that one takes, we think it's important that they be consistent.

**MR. PIERSON:** To augment that comment, we feel that for a person to have primary responsibility in a classroom that it's important that that person have demonstrated not only subject matter knowledge but some pedagogical competence before being entrusted with the care of children. The damage to children can be as great from not knowing how to handle groups of children or understanding developmental levels of children as it can be in any other profession. In terms of terminology, for people to enter a classroom without some demonstrated competency in both subject matter knowledge and pedagogy, that the terminology should be a permanent. In no other profession does one enter with a temporary license. Not even in the driving can you pass a written test and then drive out on the road to see if you have any accidents. Some supervised practice is required. In terms of entry to the classroom, certainly through alternate routes, we need to be creative, as the Department is doing quite successfully, to recruit new talents into teaching. However, I also feel that that should be somewhat market driven. Where we have the shortages in math, science, and languages, those should be the areas where we are particularly focusing the alternative routes. We don't need more elementary teachers or English, history teachers, so why make it easier for people with any Bachelor's Degree to enter those fields?

**DR. SCHAEFER:** I believe it's U Mass. Amherst that has been working with Department on the program for those who are getting the \$20,000 signing bonus.

**MR. JACKSON:** That's Lowell.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** Oh, Lowell, okay. Do you feel confident that that program is providing the kind of training that the teachers need in order to enter the classroom?

**MR. PIERSON:** We're confident that six weeks is much better than nothing. I think that it's not as good as having a full semester, but we're confident that that level is a minimum, I would say, for people who have the outstanding competencies that these people have. I feel too that major changes of this sort should be based upon research and that we should be following the graduates from the bonus program as well as the other routes in terms of initially their test performance, their success in getting jobs, their retention in the field. Ultimately, the bottom line to get to the highest level of licensure should be the children's performance. I feel that that's what's lacking currently. In terms of access and accountability ultimately that's the only accountability that counts. Until we have a focus on that, I think we're misusing to some extent the term performance and accountability.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** Obviously, I came in late, and perhaps my questions are going to make that evident. You say we have a sufficient number of English and history teachers, but we don't have a sufficient number of highly skilled, academically, English and history teachers. We want to try to pull in to the profession the academically gifted students who are not going into teaching. There's no temporary license in any other profession. Well, that's not exactly true. I mean, I would call doctors who have to go through an internship and a residency, for instance, in effect temporarily licensed. My real question is: What are the implications of what you're saying for alternative certification? I've been going around looking at a variety of schools. The best principal I have seen in recent months is not certified as a principal, but came up through a very different route. What are the implications of what you're saying for alternative certification?

**MR. PIERSON:** Personally speaking, I was a principal through an alternative route myself. I didn't spend years teaching and have a full year of a teaching supervised practicum. I think the implications are to be market driven, to have the high standards for everyone entering the profession. A person entering an alternate route should demonstrate, regardless of academic background, an ability to teach effectively before being fully entrusted with a classroom. One of my worries, for instance, is that schools who have the resources can recruit the top people now. The disparity will increase because of schools with fewer resources hiring people who become available rather than who are best qualified.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Let me ask you another question related to this. It has to do with the distinction between a student teaching or a practicum and an induction program. In part, at least as conceived up by this document, an induction program would be a substitute for that kind of student teaching practicum experience. Why isn't that a good thing? Is it a good thing? What constraints or guidelines would you apply to it?

**MS. BRABECK:** I'd like to speak to that, if I may. First of all, I think we have to separate two issues that we're talking about here. One is what do teachers need to know in order to provide instructions to kids. The second is what do we need to do to prepare teachers. They're separate issues, and I think we have some knowledge about each of those. In fact, I think we could probably sit around and decide what we want in terms of the outcomes for teachers who are entering at any of these levels and agree on that. I think we have less agreement on what it takes -- and we agree because there's some information. There's not enough information about this, but we know some things about what teachers need to know. We know less about what programs do the best job preparing teachers. That is why my colleagues are saying-- let's look at this, let's take this moment to assess the options that may lead to the outcomes that we want. In a sense we are engaging in a naturalistic experience. We are saying we are going to try some alternatives, and let's look at what difference it makes, and that could inform what all of us around this table do.

The other issue is whether or not the process for training future teachers is best in the hands of the professionals who are engaged in that activity and at the site where those teachers will be working. I'm a product of the teacher core in inner city Minneapolis back in the '60s, and I went through a very intensive program that was located in the schools. I had a cooperating teacher. I had a teacher core director. I had a cadre of other students who were like myself out of liberal arts colleges and ready to go but not very knowledgeable. So I had a community in which to try to learn a very complex craft. If those things can be provided, I think that they may very well prove to be very successful, so I think the answer is it depends.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** I guess the obvious question then is, well, okay, where does that leave the schools of education?

**MS. BRABECK:** Well, I think it leaves us in some ways exactly where we are with a little more information. I mean, it leaves the schools of ed. providing some important pieces of what's needed in this enterprise of teacher preparation. Some of it has to do with providing the knowledge base. Some of it has to do with helping students develop a conceptual framework for understanding their craft or their profession. Some of it has to do with helping them master content knowledge and learn ways to translate content knowledge that they hold as an adult into accessible knowledge for a child. Those are some of the things off the top of my head. I will think of others. There are things that are done in schools of education that are not done elsewhere that future teachers benefit from. Part of that is engagement in the process of understanding the craft of teaching.

**MR. DANDRIDGE:** There are examples of alternative routes that are collaborative efforts between schools of education and schools. Some of those activities you're supporting through your Eisenhower Goals 2000 grants. It would be well worth the effort to evaluate those efforts to see whether the graduates of those particular programs, being measured by the performance of the children that they serve, is any different. We have right now an option for schools that wish to create an alternative certification program. There's only one I believe that has gone through that route, and I had the good fortune to be the chair of the Department of Ed. Review Team that conducted that site visit. One of the lessons learned there is here is a community that has really redesigned itself to become a learning laboratory for both children and adults. It is unlike many of the schools that we encounter, but they've made a conscious, consistent effort. They have 70 years of experience and something that they've worked on over time. So we have some existing examples within the Commonwealth. It would be interesting to engage them in the conversation and to look at the effects of their programs to see whether their graduates are making a difference. Those candidates at the entry level, at least for me, should be examined with the same criteria in terms of whether we are prepared to attest to the public that they have the skills, the knowledge base and the ability to do the job that we would like with children.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** But when you say the same criteria, what do you mean, what's the list of things?

**MR. DANDRIDGE:** Well, what you're saying right now, the one principle criteria that you have out there is the certification test. There may be other measures that could be developed over time. But at least if that's the yardstick, then I think we all ought to be sort of moving in that same direction.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** But I don't think the discussion draft would derogate from that requirement for all people coming into the profession. So all people coming into the profession would have to have a Bachelor's Degree and have passed the requisite tests associated with the area of certification. So when you say level playing field, is that what you mean -- or common standard, is that what you mean? Or is it, for instance, a sum requisite number of hours of education courses?

**MR. CROMWELL:** Just to respond a little bit to that, I think the concept paper does treat the programs differently, even though it does say that they're going to look at the test results for all programs. In one case it says whatever you bring, if you pass the test, we will say that that was a good program for you to have completed to enter, that would be the oversimplification of the alternate. For the other programs, it's a very detailed list of things that need to be in place if it's to be approved, and then the test results are reviewed. So in that sense, it is different. You say deregulation is important as a concept in that we will hold institutions accountable to the test results publicly. To have the programs approved, you define lots and lots of things they have to do, but that's very different for the alternate routes.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Although the alternate routes suggest that if you come in with a B.A. in something, you haven't done education work. You haven't done a practicum. Maybe you weren't even planning to be a teacher until last week when you took the test. You passed the test and would now come in with a temporary license as opposed to the initial license that you get if you come through the traditional path. So there's a distinction made in terms of the quality or level of licensure for those people who come in with lower level at least credentials. And I think, Bill, you may have been using a term of art when you said initial licensure as opposed to the temporary licensure. I'm just trying to make sure that we're clear about the extent to which there is either equity or lack thereof with respect to that level of licensure, initial licensure, as opposed to the temporary which is granted -- which is entirely designed to be a lot looser, if you will, a lot more open.

**MR. CROMWELL:** While I agree with Mary that we need to do more work in regards to research about what programs work well, there is a body of work that suggests alternate programs are less likely to produce teachers who affect positive things in classrooms and/or stay long term. Unfortunately, those who receive these kinds of certificates tend to also be in most-at-risk classrooms, inner city and other places. I'm new to this state, so I'm learning.

The temporary licenses are clearly much more in effect in inner city, and they usually are people who have been grandfathered in or allowed in through some what appears to be less rigorous process and do not usually stay long term. Now, it's oversimplifying the research to say that it's only because of that. The Hunt report or the Darling-Hammond Commission report suggest there can be alternate routes that are very rigorous in which there is a community of learners and scholars who are brought together to bring to bear all the necessary things to help that person succeed. But it needs to be as rigorous and demanding, as it would be in a school of ed. or in a traditional program.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** It is kind of an apples and oranges comparison. If you have an in-school/in-district induction program, in many respects, it may be far more intense and rigorous than you will find in the student teaching or practicum experience. The student teaching and practicum experience has its pluses and its assets. But, by the same token, it's missing perhaps some of the community learners and intensity that you find in a well-structured induction program. So the question is, in my mind: How do you establish some kind of guideline for what constitutes an acceptable induction program so that -- so that when you get through your temporary license period and you're ready to furnish a licensure, you have gone through comparable experiences. Even if you can't line them up on the page and say they're identical, which is I think the art that we're trying to wrestle with.

**MR. CROMWELL:** And at least from my perspective, I agree that they should be comparable. They don't have to be exactly the same, but they should be equally rigorous and evident to everyone that they are, and currently I don't see that in the draft paper, as it were.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** It seems to me we've got an empirical question on the table here: What are the data that indicate the effectiveness of teachers going through one route versus another one? What is the literature out there that consists of

scholarly work, real integrity that can begin to answer that very fundamental question. Now, you mentioned a commission report by -- headed by Linda Hammond-Darling, what is that?

**MS. BRABECK:** National Commission on Teachers in --

**MR. PIERSON:** Teaching and Learning.

**MS. BRABECK:** Teaching and Learning.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** That's the National Commission on Teaching and Learning. And you mentioned something else.

**MR. CROMWELL:** The Governor Hunt report.

**MS. BRABECK:** Right, and there are a couple of empirical studies that have been done on this going back to the '70s. Karen Zumwalt, who is now dean of Teachers College, did some work in this area. There's not a lot of empirical work on it, but what it suggests exactly what Ron was saying, that those who go through a traditional program are more likely to stay for a longer period of time. It's particularly in the math and science areas that those who are through alternative routes have a more difficult time in classrooms. And the third area that is more problematic for those who have gone through an alternative route is in the area of working in urban schools, particularly when you have diversity of learners, linguistically diverse, and the special needs.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** One thing that's not clear to me in those studies is the extent to which A) people leave the profession because they are inadequate to the task or they get frustrated for other reasons, which may say something really completely different. And, B) how do we attract to the profession people with higher degrees in content knowledge and how do we get them to stay for more than two years?

**MS. BRABECK:** Sadly, the two kind of contradict each other in that the brightest are the quickest to leave.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** In the math and science, the question is whether they are leaving because they're frustrated with the teaching or because they have so many other opportunities that other content areas just simply do not have.

**MR. CROMWELL:** I think the issue about how do you attract the brightest is -- attracting is the wrong word. Induce maybe.

But the issue is really market driven. That is when students do very well in college and various programs, they have many more options, and salaries in many school districts are not as competitive as in other places. So it is not the function of what I do as a dean in my school related to those students. It's related to the options that they're given. Our students are going to job fairs now, and our education students -- and in fact, our chemistry education students are going to the job fair and being told to come. Very promising people that we thought were going to be great, are apparently moving into some work in industry with good programs. They are doing good things and are going to be paid significantly more than they might have been paid had they gone into a district. So the question is about what colleges, at least public colleges, can do related to scholarships and how we can encourage people into teaching.

**MS. BRABECK:** We don't know a lot from the research on alternative routes. But one of the things we do know is that people are more successful when they go in to contexts similar to the one that they know, and we know this from studying private school. You know, you look at the private high schools and the private elementary schools. If you take somebody from one of the private schools from Andover, for example, and that person goes out and gets a liberal arts degree and returns to Andover, that person is more likely to succeed, knowing the context, knowing the community, knowing the learners, than he is likely to succeed in another context. So it's experience matching with context that makes a difference here too, which raises a major question about what we're going to do about urban schools.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** But I'm bothered by the whole notion that the test of attracting good people into the profession is how long they're going to stay. You could argue that there are a lot of very bright students who will have other alternatives in life, but if they will come and teach for a certain number of years until they decide what it is they want to do when they grow up, as it were, you know, that we'd be better off.

**MR. CROMWELL:** I certainly agree with the concept of attracting people who think being in schools is a mission and go there like they would to Peace Core or something.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** Exactly.

**MR. CROMWELL:** The leaving is related. Sorry. People are waving. The issue related to leaving is that they leave with less than a year, except they go in and you hire multiple temporary people in one year. It's not that they're there for one or two or three years and then leave. It's that they're really temporary.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** But I suspect Jim is right on that, that that is a story of multiple factors including the work conditions that they find when they arrive.

**MR. CROMWELL:** I agree, and so the challenge then is to design programs that specifically help people deal with those very challenging situations. I don't think all schools of education are doing a great job preparing people for urban situations and/or the most at risk schools, but there are some very fine programs in schools of ed. There's a coalition that's working with Boston that's attempting to do some things related to preparing, but it's a different kind of preparation. It is in fact dealing with how do you deal with all these things that will really get to you that are separate from dealing with how do you teach well and have the students really learn.

**MR. PIERSON:** I think one of the implications for a successful induction program is to have clear standards and to have a cadre of people that can enter together to help change the culture of that school. This is one of the considerations we've been discussing with the interim superintendent in Lawrence with respect to this summer's bonus program. Starting now working with the mentor teachers and the cadre of candidates who would enter together with the team. An alternative to isolated individuals being stuck in a survival mode in which teachers don't have enough release time to observe other models of teaching or to get the mentoring which they need. One of the risks with people coming in without a sufficient variety of models of teaching is that we know that people tend to teach the way they were taught. While they may be bright, they bring with them their history of how they were taught 30 years ago.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Is the basic principle or assumption underlying certification that people doing the hiring are not capable of making the judgment themselves about whether a person is over a certain threshold or, if they are capable of making the judgment, for a variety of practical reasons, they choose to ignore those minimum standards. Can you comment about the capability of the field of principals and superintendents and people hiring teachers to discern the difference between a good teacher and a bad teacher, a potentially good teacher and a potentially bad teacher? What's the basic justification for pursuing this beyond establishing minimal threshold requirements?

**MS. BRABECK:** I think, in part, it is knowing the reputation of the institution that someone comes from. I look at that whenever I look at any applicant no matter what the job is, what's been their set of experiences that brought them to this job. A set of experiences from one place is different from another place, so we assess institutions all the time. I assume principals do also. David, you know this from experience yourself -- they work very hard to make the best hiring decisions based on all the knowledge available to them, including transcripts, including performance in courses, including work that students present to them. You know, sometimes principals ask for examples of their teaching, videotapes, lesson plans, whatever, and then they monitor to see whether or not they made a good decision or not. When they don't, it's their job to move on that.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** So why, if I'm this principal, why do I need the state to essentially certify that someone like this is good enough.

**MS. BRABECK:** You know, this is a question I ask myself as a dean all the time. We are fully accredited and we go through a rigorous process with the state every five years, and every year we check in with the state. I think those things keep us all on track. I actually think that accreditation and oversight from external bodies serve a function, and it's not always pleasant to go through the process. I sometimes think I'm engaged in more bean counting than is actually necessary. Every time we're forced to look deliberately at our program, our program gets better. So I think it's of value intrinsically.

**MR. CROMWELL:** I was a principal and I hired people. It depends on the area. I was a principal, and for the positions we dealt with hundreds of applicants. It was a screening mechanism because then I could say these people did at least these

things and had these kinds of experiences with children, and so it narrowed the pool significantly. It gave me confidence that they had at least that experience, then I could judge from the finalist group which ones I felt best matched the school. Principals can make the judgment with parents and teachers being involved about the qualities of a good teacher. It is more complicated if there isn't some indicators there for them to fall back on, like a degree, or a certificate, years of experience, or references of people that saw them work in the field with students. All of those help make the judgment possible when you have a complicated process. You could do it without it, but it would require significantly more time, because there's a lot more that you have to check.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** Yes, even now, we're talking about a Master's Degree as being a requirement, and I wanted to ask what your thinking was on that. Are we on the right track saying that there are alternatives to that, and will that help any in terms of attracting people?

**MR. CROMWELL:** I'll start, and we may all want to talk about the Master's Degree. I'm new to the state, as I said. I think the choice to not require a Master's Degree as one of the final indicators of a professional license is not the best direction. I think as a profession it says a lot about us if we say we doing further graduate work is important and that it prepares people to be better at the profession, especially given what other professions do and the importance of what this profession does with children. I certainly would always argue that we are served better when we require a masters as the end product for a license.

Returning to how we attract people, I don't want to sound like I'm an economist, but I will reiterate the statement, I really think it's market driven. I think if the salaries were where they needed to be in a profession that required people to do the kind of work that teachers do that you would attract good candidates. Many of the teachers who are there now are in fact very good, so I'm not suggesting they're not. But we would be attracting better people, it seems to me, if the market was better and the salaries were better.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** Well, in the absence of being able to pay people what you think they should be paid, should we then be requiring a Master's? Or would it be better to -- since the salaries, even if we raise them some percentage, will not be what kids are getting when they come out of, an ivy league school and hired as consultants earning \$60,000. We need to be realistic about that. In the absence of being able to do that, and you don't have to get a Master's to be a consultant, should we be requiring that for somebody who wants to teach?

**MR. DANDRIDGE:** I think there are several ways to respond to it. One is I'd be interested in looking at the experiences of other states that have similar requirements to see whether in fact the pool of candidates has changed one way or the other. I agree very much with Ron in the nature of having a structured support period of reflection after one has had some classroom experience is very, very important. I think if we're trying to send the right signal that this is indeed a profession, not just drop in, drop out, but for the majority of people who want to make a lifelong and career-long commitment to this, I think that a Master's Degree is absolutely important.

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** We're talking about a Master's Degree, what does that look like? What are we talking about for a teacher?

**MS. BRABECK:** You're talking about different things. For some people you're talking about additional content mastery to further their deep understanding of their discipline. For other people we're talking about another level of certification, special education or reading specialist or moving beyond their current skills. It depends on what it is that students need at that time. And for some we're talking about entry level into the profession.

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** At the Master's level.

**MS. BRABECK:** At the Master's level, because they didn't do at the undergraduate level, and they're looking for some professional preparation that will make them successful in the classroom. But we have both undergraduate and graduate at B.C. And when the Holmes Group first came out with their recommendation that Master's prepared candidates are better for the profession and better for the classroom because they come with the deep content knowledge and then they have their additional professional preparation at the Master's level, we took a serious look at what we should do. Should we drop the undergraduate program? Should we go the way a lot of other universities were going, and offer it only with a Master's Degree? We were convinced, not by the data, because we didn't have it, but by the argument of the faculty and by some



knowledge from development. We looked at what was happening with our undergraduates who are in the classroom from sophomore year on. They have three years of professional preparation. They're taking their arts and sciences courses at the same time, and so the professional preparation and then the content knowledge are together for three years. And you look at their performance, you look at who's getting hired, you look at what's happening in the classroom, and we decided not to get rid of the undergraduate program.

Now I'm looking at the LECT data. And guess what, Master's students are doing better in LECT. I'm looking at the five-year evaluation that we do of our graduates every year, and we also do an evaluation that asks us -- teachers to evaluate our graduates. I don't have that data yet. But the graduates in the last five years, you're not seeing a difference between the Masters and the undergraduates in terms of who's getting jobs and who's still in the classroom later. Although, there's some national data that shows that if they're Master's prepared they do stay longer because they've made a decision at a different level. So there's an argument for keeping it, for getting rid of it.

**MR. PIERSON:** I'd like to comment on our experience in Lowell, in that we feel that our experience has been very clear around phasing out the undergraduate education program for a Master's only. The data are clear in terms of the teacher test results in which about 50 percent of the undergraduates were passing the teacher test. We have 98 percent of the Master's Degree students. The percent that are hired in schools is about the same. About half of the undergraduates actually went into teaching, whereas the Master's Degree candidates the average age is 30, most had tried something else before, and nearly 100 percent all did. And likewise, the feedback from principals in terms of survival and those that are outstanding teachers is the same magnitude. While I feel that the highest level of licensure should be obtained through, again, the performance of the children, regardless of the degree, I do feel that for the past five years the perception that eventually everyone needs to get a Master's Degree in teaching. Observations over the past ten years and change in the past five years, have had a dramatic effect in terms of the focus for teachers to reach higher in their professional development. Moving from sampling workshops here and there, to having an integrated program has made a major impact in terms of the quality of educational preparation.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** But isn't there a difference between recognizing the value of a Master's Degree and having it as a requirement? My general sense is when you establish something as a requirement, you've now elevated form over substance, and you do damage to the quality of the programs because now what really matters is that you got the box checked rather than you learned something. That's why I'm intrigued by the approach that's being taken in the discussion draft. The focus around certification, professional licensure, ought to be your performance in the classroom. And while there is, I think, some discussion, and hopefully that will include student work and student achievement as a component, there are a lot of reasons why that's difficult to do. At a minimum that there should be some direct observation, evaluation of whether a person actually is successful in the classroom. If there's a correlation between people getting Master's Degrees and doing well on that assessment and evaluation, then I would assume a lot more people are going to pursue the Master's Degree. To the extent people are either able to do it without that or to some extent that they're able to avoid these sort of programs which are not necessarily very rigorous or not well connected to classroom practice, that they may actually do better by spending their time in other ways.

**MR. JACKSON:** Actually I was just going to add yet another testimony. At Amherst we have graduate and undergraduate, and like Mary, we have considered dropping the undergraduate program. We had the similar kind of results that Lowell had with the teacher test where the graduate students clearly outperformed the undergraduate students. But I want to use this as an opportunity to transition into some of the other topics we have because our time is running out.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** We have a couple of concluding comments.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** There were a couple of other things that I wanted to pursue on this. There seems to be an implication, and maybe I'm wrong on this, that at one time we had a better cadre of teachers, more qualified. I'd like to know, are there any data to indicate that people who were more qualified were going into the profession in a former period than now?

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** It sounds like the good old days.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** Well, I'm asking it, because, I mean, I think there's an implication running throughout this that -

**MS. BRABECK:** ETS has looked at how people in teacher education stack up against people in other professions. We don't have the longitudinal data that I know of. I don't know of anything that's looked at the quality of teachers that has a measure of quality that's been used over time. ETS looked at GRE's for people entering various professions today and physicians and engineers are at the top, and then after that come lawyers and teachers, and then there's a whole bunch of people that are lower. I'll get you the article if you would like to see it. It's really quite interesting.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** But we are having difficulty attracting people to the profession now and staying and so on, and, you know, Abby alluded to where I was going with this. It seems to me that, you know, at one time, of course, there were many more women who were going into teaching because other professions were closed to them. I think that we need to do a marketing job of attracting them back into teaching. You're reading more and more about women who would like to be able to have a profession and at the same time have a family, and be able to look after that family well. It seems to me that this is something that we really ought to take advantage of it.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** I don't have any problem with marketing; I don't think that's going to do it. I also don't have any problem with paying teachers more. I believe in paying teachers more, but I don't think that that is the bottom-line problem here.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** There are Harvard PhD's that settle for jobs at a very low pay in communities they don't want to live in. Although I believe in paying teachers more, we've got a much larger problem in the teaching profession in terms of our desire to attract academically gifted students. And I just looked at a recent ETS document on average SATs for incoming teachers, and it made me want to cry. I mean, you know, the scores were terrible. These were average scores. And I don't think, frankly, that that's going to change until a whole lot of other elements in the teaching profession alter.

**MS. BRABECK:** I don't know which one you're looking at, but there's a difference between applicants and those who are accepted. One function education programs serve is kind of a windowing out of people. And I don't know how other people are experiencing this, but at B.C. our applications actually are up, and the quality of our students is judged by SAT's in our graduate program.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** But B.C. is not your average school.

**MS. BRABECK:** But I'm talking trend.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Mr. Jackson, let me turn it back over to you. Shift us somewhere else.

**MR. JACKSON:** Actually I was going to use this discussion as a way of shifting us into the issue of roles of schools of education, because as Mary already said one of our roles is the kind of sifting through. And I would want to reiterate what she said, we found the same things at Amherst. We thought that all of this was going to really hurt. It has hurt in some ways, but in other ways we've gotten more applicants and stronger students. But the thing is, coming back to this issue of roles of schools of ed., I just wanted to make my own sort of pitch that one of the roles of the schools of education is not just in the preparation of teachers and counselors and special educators and so on, but part of our role is the development of the programs that are going to do that and also the assessment of those programs.

We're missing an evaluation of all of the different routes to certification. I think that we all need to know whether or not the traditional mode versus the immersion mode versus the bonus mode, works best. That's the kind of information that I would imagine superintendents would want to know and principals would want to know as they try to determine who to hire.

We have a job fair, as I'm sure most campuses do, that's coming up. Each year it seems to get bigger and bigger, and we get more and more superintendents and students there. The competition is getting to be pretty strict. We hold a pre-session for all the superintendents and principals who want to come to the job fair, and basically they interview us on the quality of our program and the people who are coming. We want to know something about the jobs and the kinds of students that they're looking for. But the point is not just to talk about the interaction but to suggest that that's information that we use in the construction of our programs and the revision of -- adjustments of the programs that we offer. So I think that, and this is just as a way of starting out this discussion, I would like to keep in front of us the notion that schools of education are not

just in the business of sitting back, receiving new guidelines and trying to implement them. We're trying to figure out how to influence those guidelines to improve education reform in general.

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** Is one of the roles of schools of education also to create programs that support new teachers in the field? That was a trick question. And what do we know about the success of those programs?

**MR. JACKSON:** I paid a lot for that question.

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** That's right. What works, what's working for us?

**MR. JACKSON:** There's an in-service role, if you will. Whenever I speak to graduates as they're getting ready to go out to teach, one of the things that I try to instill in them is the notion that we're still there for them, that it's an ongoing process. They're going to have trouble no matter how good we are the first year, and that they need to know that they can come home, as it were, and get some support, so that's another function.

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** I'm looking though at formal programs and formal connections for first year --

**MR. JACKSON:** Do we have them?

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** -- second year, for new teachers? No?

**MS. BRABECK:** There's not much.

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** Okay.

**MS. BRABECK:** I mean, at my institution there's not much, and part of it is the institutional support --

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** So the individual can come home?

**MS. BRABECK:** That's right.

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** There's no necessarily outreach into the local school districts to support -- for instance, mentoring programs?

**MS. BRABECK:** There's coaching and those kinds of relationships.

**MR. JACKSON:** Yes, one of the things that we're trying to do is to develop a mentoring program. This is what brings us back to the masters, using the national boards as sort of an incentive, because the thing we know about the strengthening of the profession is that a lot of it has to do with the quality of the master teachers that are on site. We know that a lot of the people on site would like to have more support but can't get out to do that, and so one of the things that we're trying to do is to figure out some way of connecting that need to the national boards and to the -- as a way of enhancing the development of the junior -- quote, junior faculty or junior staff in the schools. There's a project currently going on for the training of inner city teachers.

It's a coalition between seven schools and the department, and it brings together the schools of education, the arts and sciences, the professionals in the school and members of the community, and this is a model that's being developed that you see in place all over the country now. Again, it's another one of those models that needs to be evaluated as they move on. But I think that it points out yet again another role of the school of education.

In the past, schools of education were the guardians of pedagogy but also distant from everything else. Sometimes we get a push -- the push of education reform is to drop the schools of education and run to the arts and sciences and go content, content, content. I don't think it's either or. It's some combination of both. But it's not a matter of the schools of education adopting arts and sciences or the arts and sciences adopting pedagogy. It's a matter of both bringing together what they know. In order for this thing to be complete, we need to have the professionals out in the field, but the right professionals

out in the field. We need to have what I'm calling the master teachers. And how do we know if they're master teachers? And so what I'm suggesting is, and I think was in the plan that you had initially, the 60 --

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** The 12to 62 Plan.

**MR. JACKSON:** 12 to 62, thank you. The plan to adopt or bring in or build on. The national boards as part of that for the certification, if you will, of master teachers is a beautiful model, all right, and that there are different variations on that model that need to be looked at. But, again, I come all the way back to the original point, and that is that we need to be about the business of assessing all of the --

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** Yes, I agree. I absolutely agree.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** You mentioned the distinction between arts and sciences and the schools of education. I think it is a fair statement to say that the legislative intent on the change in '93 was to ensure that teachers coming out of teacher preparation programs had a balance with more content and less pedagogy than they were getting, or the perception of what they were getting. And in that context, as you know, they did away with the requirement or, to put it differently, they said you had to have a degree, if you wanted to be a teacher, in the arts and sciences. Now, I guess in practice that means there are lot of students coming out with a double major, the art and sciences and education. There are others who are coming out with other kinds of degrees which have a very large education component to them even though they may not be the area in which the degree is granted. Anyway, my question is related to part of the proposal here which becomes somewhat more restricted in terms of the kinds of majors that would qualify.

So the law said you've got to have an arts and sciences major, but we'll style it on what's an arts and science major. What this document is trying to do, among other things, is to try to clarify, what is an arts and sciences major. I know this is a matter of some concern, so I'd love to hear some commentary on it.

**MR. CROMWELL:** Again, to go back to the initial statements that some of us made, this is an area that seems extremely regulated where others are not as regulated. It seems regulated on an assumption that may not be true, which is that those majors do in fact better prepare, at least if we talk elementary level, that they prepare elementary teachers better than other majors, and I'm not sure that that's true. Certainly I would support very strongly that programs be approved that have rigorous content in those areas, but that does not necessarily mean a major in those areas. In fact, at my institution if you were to major in one of the sciences, you would take 60 or 70 credits. You might not take any -- very little in the other areas. While that might be a good thing to have that person in an elementary school cause they'd have the science background, that could help the others, it wouldn't truly prepare that person to be in a self-contained elementary classroom. I think that would be true of the ones that you've selected. Although we had the conversation with Sandy about the reasoning behind it, that it was connected to the frameworks, and these were the major subject areas and content that would be taught. That seems logical and makes sense, it's just defining it as a major. It may be better to design a program that ensures that that content is mastered -- that all of those contents are mastered, which would not necessarily mean a major in any one of those. I mean, at least from my point of view it would make much more sense. Otherwise you get into some real hassles about how you prepare elementary teachers to teach all of those subject areas if you select that they have to be in one of those majors. The easiest, at least at my campus, to do that would be in English and in history since those majors tend to have less credit requirements as defined by the arts and sciences faculties in those disciplines than the others.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** Well, I mean, those of us who would argue for the importance of concentrating as an undergraduate in one subject would say that that concentration increases the chances that a teacher will have an intellectually disciplined mind as opposed to be kind of skimming lightly over many subjects and coming out a bit of a dilettante. But the point really goes back to, it seems to me, the essential question here, which is can you look at teacher preparation outside the context, the larger context of what schools are all about and how they're organized. I would argue in response to your comment about the well-trained science teacher who hasn't had that much history, well, that may be true, but it also may be true that elementary schools need science specialists and that these self-contained classrooms are a mistake because our kids aren't getting adequate math and science training in the early years particularly. There's a larger problem here of looking at any of these questions, and specifically the teacher preparation, in an isolated way.

**MR. CROMWELL:** I just want to clarify, and then I'll let the others speak. I'm perhaps of the group more supportive of the selection of those majors than some of my colleagues. I understand the value. I just am not sure that it logically prepares

people. I do think it suggests, as you said, some academic rigor that might not have been represented by some of the majors currently at some colleges. I mean, I think it makes sense. It's just I'm not sure it's the best.

**MS. BRABECK:** It also will perhaps limit the pool of applicants of students coming from other states who are prepared and committed to the teaching profession but don't have a major in that particular area.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** Well, you could deal with that separately. You know, what do we do with teachers coming from other states.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I think the thing that I'm interested in is trying to understand this term of the pure, shall we say, alternative certification routes where you decided in your senior year or three years out of college that you wanted to be a teacher. Now are we going to essentially force you to go back and get enough credits to accumulate a major in one of the appropriate subjects? That's the question I'm interested in. I don't know the answer to it. Personally, from my own opinion, I don't know what the right answer is.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** Why isn't the question also-- you're thinking about teaching in your sophomore year of college, what is it you have to do in order to be a candidate or to leave that as an open option?

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I mean, again, I do think that if you know you want to be a teacher by your sophomore year, there's -

**DR. THERNSTROM:** No. Thinking about it. Is it a possible option?

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I think we're in a very interesting area in terms of trying to define an arts and sciences major at a level that ensures that students are getting a rigorous academic preparation. At the same time, one that doesn't create arbitrary constraints that may limit the field. I'm not talking about limiting the field, in that, we could have a million candidates if we just lowered the standards, but simply saying that it is possible to get a rigorous academic preparation in academic majors that may in fact not neatly map into the ones that we'd list. And I don't know how to create the right balance to ensure that we're not giving license to just do whatever you want and at the same time don't restrict people from doing things that actually make sense.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Could I just add a couple of comments here? First of all, we are trying to have a forum on April 5th. I think in Worcester at Holy Cross. We just finalized that today. We will discuss new roles for providers and the elementary license. This is going to be open for anyone to come to and we're trying to get a lot of input on that one particular question. Two actually, because these are two of the largest issues that have been raised by the people from higher education. We are encouraging those who've been particularly concerned about the elementary license to think about different ways of structuring a major that would include several of the liberal arts areas that are taught in the elementary school for different models. We would really like to see some different models offered that would give us that strengthening of those basic subjects, and we're open to hearing more about some possible models that we could consider. We certainly have not in any way said one must have a major in a single subject for any of the elementary school licenses, and have encouraged some way of thinking of at least the major subjects being brought together. So we are open to thinking more about how to strengthen it while not putting too much of a burden on current schools. Let me also just pick up very briefly the research piece that we've been discussing in different ways here. This is something the Department is now just beginning to do, to develop a very fledgling research and evaluation component that needs to really be developed much more, particularly with these new routes. I know that Don Pierson and Janet Stetson and I met together a couple of months ago to talk about a collaborative effort with institutions of higher education in a more long range research effort to look at the results of different routes, and this is something we do want to do much more of, some rigorous way of collaborating in that piece.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Now was there a third category?

**MR. JACKSON:** The other category was actually the second. I skipped over it. It was a pedagogy and content discussion which we focused on a little here. I would say, in case all my colleagues are rehearsing their lines, that we did talk a lot about this during our meeting with Sandy and her staff on Friday. I think we came away feeling a lot better about this new iteration of the concept paper, more appreciation for the importance of the pedagogy. As she just said, we need to think about

different ways of making sure that we're bringing together the pedagogy and the content, whether it's in elementary or at other levels. But generally we feel like we're moving in the right direction. Do you all want to add anything to that?

**MS. BRABECK:** I'll just add one thing, and it is related to your third question, which is the roles of schools of education. I've been thinking about what will be lost that is currently in schools of education when people pursue the alternative route. It could be organized differently. It could perhaps be delivered on site. But the things that would be important to build into these alternative programs would be something about assessment. How you construct your test and how you assess what you're doing in the classroom. How you use standardized test data to examine what teaching you're doing and what students are learning, including the MCAS. It should all be related to knowledge about diverse learners. We've worked in a school in Allston/Brighton where there are 41 different languages spoken in the homes. I think that mathematics and reading, particularly the elementary level, requires knowledge about strategies to instruct students. And call it method, call it pedagogy, but if you don't have it you're not going to be able to teach those kids math and reading.

Then there's this area that I call conceptual frameworks, a way of framing your craft, your profession, and thinking about what's happening within your classroom. Schools of education get at that through philosophy and through theory courses, but they're aimed at trying to give somebody a way of framing what is happening that provides them with a lens for assessing the impact of what they're doing and the reasonableness of what they're doing.

Then the last thing that we do that I think needs to be built into it is the thing that I think you're paying most attention to, and that is the reflection of practice. How do you build in those experiences that last somebody developmentally as they go through this process of learning how to teach? I'm convinced that happens over a series of years. How do you build in the reflection so that there's true learning that occurs as they experience what they will?

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** Well, there's the notion of reflecting on the technical aspects of the practice, which teachers do quite willingly, and then there's all the other stuff that needs to be reflected on, including social interaction, connecting, not only with students but with colleagues. I'm very much a supporter of Master's Degrees for teachers because very often that's the door into larger aspects of thinking about the art and the philosophical underpinnings and the social skills and all of the things that, you know, often are not put on the table.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I want to throw out a challenge. People know how much respect I have for the institutions that are represented here and for the hard work and the difficulty that everybody has in this room, but I feel a great need to push the envelope and try to open up different challenges. I see, for example, the day when we're not going to have enough teachers. I mean, we're seeing that now, but we're certainly going to see it in the future big time. Anecdotally you could go back and forth and so forth and so on. What I'm trying to do is introduce different avenues and different tools that we can have as a stake for the education of our kids. I don't have a quarrel with a master's degree particularly. The system is set up that way. You get a master's degree because your local district gives you an extra 10 percent or whatever it is and so forth. There are counteracting issues here that are perpetuating the status quo. Try and join me to set the stage for those that come after us 10 years from now to look at different ways that we can see to it that we are out in the marketplace attracting people.

Now, there are obviously other factors well beyond, but I don't want to dismiss the notion that someone can come into an inner city school with a bachelor's degree, having passed the test, and I'll put them in Room 103. Now, there's a risk, sure, but so what. We've got teachers there, we've got administrators there, and hopefully we have you people who are helping us. I think you have to get in other businesses, and we got to find you ways to get there. We've got case study seminars with 750 beginning teachers, in their second or third year in their schools, who don't have the support systems. You've acknowledged here, you know, they go on. Why shouldn't you be in that business? Why shouldn't you be in the business of helping schools? You know, the district-based stuff. We've talked about all these consortiums we've had over the years. We got to get very serious about that.

The reason why there were complaints of content back in 1993 was because we had elementary teachers that didn't know mathematics. And that's anecdotal, but it happens. There were people teaching mathematics that didn't know mathematics, and we can't have that. We've had a gay old time talking about why we should have a master's degree, why we have schools of education and why you should not have majors and have a potpourri of whatever. And all of that is fine, but I want to go to the other end of the spectrum. What are we going to do to add to it, not to subtract from it or divide it, but how do we add to it? How do we provide alternative programs? You know, no school of education created Teach For America. That was

somebody that came forward and said, we're going to try something different, and it seems to have worked. I'll agree with you about the data and the empirical evidence and so forth. Our bonus program absolutely should be held to scrutiny. But, if we get 900 candidates, and they all have the kind of background they have, and then we bring them in and give them a teaching lesson, we're probably going to be pretty successful. Just as you are in your Master's Degree programs, you're going to have people -- 98 percent are passing the test. And if you can pick and choose the way many of the private colleges are today, you're going to get what you're getting in public college. The SAT scores are going off the charts everywhere year in and year out. Talk to the high school kids today or talk to high school guidance counselors about kids that use to get into XYZ institution, you can't get them in anymore. I don't want all of Peter Nessen's great work to go by the board. We need your help in different ways of looking at how we attract the best and brightest in the schools, how we get them into urban areas. When Stanley Koplik interviewed people after the teacher test situation and talked to a number of those first year teachers, their comments were about the tremendous gap between what they learned and what they experienced when they went into schools. We all know that. And back to your analogy about the driver's license, Don, I always say you learn to drive after you get your license, not the weeks you go to XYZ driving school and then have the state policeman take you around the cones. It's two weeks after that when you're out there on 93 trying to go three lanes to the left that you learn.

**MR. PIERSON:** But I don't want to be on the road when you're doing that.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I just want to throw out the challenge. I don't want our attempts to provide alternatives, to provide different ways of certification and to look at this entire field as a way of being critical. I think that those days are gone. We are in two businesses. On the one hand we, as a Department of Education, certify, oversee, and approve programs, and then on the other hand we try to do this market driven thing. You know, we hit you with one hand saying you got to have four more psychology courses, and then on the other hand say you don't have to have psychology at all, so. But that's our job. Our job is to open up the front and see where it is in the marketplace. We've got a whole series of other responsibilities to try and make the conditions better, to try and see to it that local school districts do a better job in the way in which they recruit and interview. And so that's happening, I think. Many new teachers now have to submit writing samples and do lessons and so forth. But I don't want us to get into this position where things are following off the table because we're over here and we're over there. I don't want to limit our possibilities because I don't think the field of education is going to have that luxury. And I think there are terrific people.

In fact, as you talk about, Bailey, there is the job fair. It probably hasn't been since the '60s, that that great group is all going to retire and wants the early retirement bill, to make it worse, which may be coming out in a couple of weeks. I haven't seen this kind of enthusiasm for teaching since that time. You've had your numbers, but even your numbers have been down. But now our bonus program, people are calling all the time saying, boy, I'm thinking of a career in education. So hopefully we can take advantage of that and find different ways to do it. I agree with the quality. There's no question about it. I mean, we've got to see to it, but it can be after the fact. We really need to get serious, and I would love to have you join us. I don't want to leave here with, "Yeah, everything is fine, whatever." I want a whole series of new initiatives that also add to what you're doing that will drive the whole profession up.

**MR. JACKSON:** I think that we don't have any problem joining in on and accepting that challenge. The driving testing, that did make me nervous. I have a 15-year old daughter who's threatening to get a license, and that should put fear in the hearts of everybody.

I do want to come back to the other side both with regard to the issue of the roles of schools of education and the issue of assessment. It's really critical to us in higher education that we be able to make the case for whatever we do back home. And, as you know, our feet get held to the fire based on data and evidence that what we're doing can withstand the scrutiny of the evaluator. We know that we are in, as I call it, an R & D business. We're responsible for the development of programs and strategies and tracks and new methods and means for educating, but we're also responsible for determining whether or not those things work. And if they do work, to figure out how to disseminate them. It's that whole process that we in the schools of education are engaged in.

I think we need to be at the table when the issues are raised, when the problems come up, not just when the problems have been identified and solutions have been rolled out. We need to be up-front at the beginning, because then we can not only be engaged, we can offer our expertise with regard to the development of the right kind of strategies. That's the point at which you want to begin to think about the evaluation, at the front end, not after we've already put the programs out there

and we're trying to figure out why the kid knocked over all the cones in the road. We want to know whether or not we have a good shot at the beginning. I can speak for my colleagues here. I assume that we'll be continuing to do that with you and with Sandy and continue the dialogue as it's appropriate for the Board.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Anyone have any closing brief comments?

**MS. BRABECK:** Thank you for this discussion.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Thank you all very much for coming. It was very productive and helpful. Thank you very much, and let's do it again.