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>> McCASLIN: Welcome to the Professional Development Speaker Series.
The National Dissemination Center for Career and Technical Education is pleased to welcome Michael Petrilli from the Office of Innovation and Improvement in the U.S. Department of Education. Michael's presentation is entitled "Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge."
Following Michael's presentation, a panel, including Pat Ainsworth, assistant superintendent and director of Secondary, Postsecondary, and Adult Leadership Division for the California Department of Education; Josephine Scott, executive director of Curriculum and Staff Development for the Columbus Public Schools; and Susie Whittington, associate professor for Career and Technical Education associated with the Department of Human and Community Resource Development at The Ohio State University, will present the implications of teacher quality from their perspective.
For those of you in the audience, both on-line and here in the audience, we are looking forward to receiving your questions, and they will be addressed after the panel members' comments. If you would like to address a particular presenter with your question, please indicate to whom you are requesting that it be answered.
So with that, Michael, welcome to our Professional Development Speaker Series.
>> PETRILLI: Great.
Thank you, Mac.
And thank you so much for the invitation to be here today.
I really appreciate it.
You know, sometimes we -- we tend to think that people might be getting tired of hearing about No Child Left Behind, but I'm glad to see that there's still interest out there.
As you may -- may or may not know, there are certainly places around this country where people still have a lot of concerns about this law. And, in fact, there was a column in the New York Times about six months ago, and it read -- it said, "In all the world, the loneliest people must be that handful of men and women dispatched by the Bush administration to wander the country, defending the new No Child Left Behind Act, talk about friendless."
Now, I can tell you it's really not that bad, but it's nice that with this technology, the Webcast will be doing the wandering for me.
And we do hope to have a good discussion today, both about the No Child Left Behind Act at large and give some background on that law, but specifically how it impacts the provisions around highly qualified teachers, and I look forward to our panel discussion, as well.
So what I'm going to do today is to provide, again, a nice broad
overview of the law.
I want to help you understand, what was Congress thinking when they passed this law?
I know in recent weeks and months, a lot of people have asked those questions.
What were they thinking?
And I want you to understand what this historic piece of legislation is trying to achieve.
And then I also want to talk about specifically highly qualified teachers, as well as some specific resources that are available from the United States Department of Education around highly qualified teachers.
Throughout this presentation we're going to be talking about the requirements in the law.
And one thing that I think is important to point out right away, especially since we are talking at the Career and Technical Education Center, is that most of these provisions do not apply to most vocational teachers.
When it does apply, it is when the students that are taking their courses are taking those courses for academic content, but it's only teachers of core academic content for which these provisions do apply.
And we'll talk in more depth about that a little bit later.
At the very beginning, let me first plug a couple of things that I hope that you do check out.
The first is that recently the department came out with a teacher tool kit, and I'll hold it up here.
And perhaps the Webcast folks will be able to link to it as well.
It's at www.ed.gov, and what it does is it tries to put in one user-friendly place all of the requirements around highly qualified teachers, as well as some other background of No Child Left Behind, and we've found it something that people find very helpful.
As those of you involved at the state level know, we've also been very busy in the last few months doing visits to many state Departments of Education through what's called our teacher assistance corps.
What we are trying to do is to make sure that states have a firm grasp of what these qualified teacher requirements are and that they have a real partnership so that we can work together to make sure that we address these challenging requirements.
It's a voluntary visit, but many states have invited us to come, and I believe we've visited almost half of the states so far.
So if we haven't gone to your state capital yet, we'll probably be coming soon.
So let me start again by talking about the No Child Left Behind law and help you understand again, where did this come from?
Why did Congress feel it was so important to pass this law?
First of all, it's important to understand that this was very much a bipartisan law.
From Democrats as liberal as Senator Ted Kennedy to a conservative
president, President Bush, there was wide support for this legislation.
In fact, an overwhelming proportion of Democrats and Republicans voted for the law in the House and the Senate.
And what were they trying to address?
What was the problem that they were trying to fix?
I think it's also important to understand what kind of country were they trying to get us to be, and how are our schools going to help us get there?
So what's the problem?
To put it simply, as I think we all know, today in our schools our children still are not learning enough.
They're not learning enough when we compare our schools to other countries, around the world.
And there's also an enormous achievement gap that plagues us.
One way that we know that our students aren't learning is by recent data.
A couple of months ago the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development released a new report comparing American test scores to test scores around the world, and what they found was that we are falling behind more and more.
American students read, write, and do math generally at lower rates than students in Asia and in Europe.
And as shocking as that is, especially because the report also found that we're still spending a lot more than many of these other countries, what's even more shocking is when we look at the data within our own country.
What really gets me up in the morning, as big a problem as this gap between the United States and other countries is, it's really the gaps that exist right here in our own country, the gaps that exist between minority students on one hand and their nonminority peers.
We have some PowerPoint slides that I think you can see out there on the Webcast, and I want to go through a couple of them that really show this -- this very disturbing picture.
The first one shows the four-year gap in reading.
Now, when you look at this gap, you're looking at achievement scores on the national assessment, whites, African-Americans, and Hispanics.
But look carefully, because those gaps may not look very big, but indeed what this chart is showing is the gap between white 8th grade students and African-American 12th grade students and Hispanic 12th grade students.
In this country today, we have at least a four-year gap in reading between our minority students and their peers.
What this means is that the average African-American or Hispanic 12th grader, who is able to get to the 12th grade and graduate, has lost out on four years of their education, right?
And we know it's even worse than that, because we know that many of these students aren't reaching the 12th grade to begin with.
Now let's look at the next slide, and it's very similar again, but this is in math, another four-year gap. It's actually more than a four-year gap in math. It's even worse in mathematics. Again, enormous differences in achievement in this country. Now, some people will say, "Look, you know, these are just test scores," right? "This certainly doesn't measure everything that matters in education. This isn't what education in our schools are all about." And that's very true. These don't measure everything that's important. But we also know from research and from experience and from common sense that reading and math, that literacy and numeracy are extremely important in determining the options that people are going to have when they enter adulthood, and we know from research, for example, that you can predict with great accuracy how much money someone is going to earn by looking at their reading ability in elementary school. And we know we can predict with great accuracy, again, the chances that somebody will be living in poverty or end up in prison or end up with a substance abuse problem by looking at how well they can do arithmetic in middle school. These things aren't everything, but they certainly matter an awful lot. And the United States Congress and President Bush looked at these gaps and looked at this situation and said, "Look, we have got to do better than this."

Now, the good news is, we also have a lot of evidence that says that if we can close these gaps in learning, that we can close a lot of the other gaps that exist in our society today. The good news is that today in 2003 somebody who has the same skills and the same knowledge will earn roughly the same amount, no matter what the color of their skin or where they came from. Now, that's huge progress that we've made in this country. As all of us know who've studied history, it hasn't always been like that. So that's great progress as a country. What this means is if we can close these gaps, then we can close gaps in poverty, we can close gaps in income, we can close those other inequities in our society. Therefore, this really is the great civil rights moment and movement and issue of our day, is closing this achievement gap in learning. But what can schools do to close the gap? Many people will argue, "Look, you know, this gap exists before people even reach school."

When we look at little tiny little kids before they even come into kindergarten, we know that some these gaps exist, and that's true. They do exist.
And of course we know and we've known for a long time that achievement is related to poverty and other aspects that schools don't have any control over.

But, again, there's some good news here.

We also know that schools, with the right focus and with the right effort, can close this achievement gap.

Because we also know that if we wait for poverty to go away, if we wait for other things in our society to change in order for us to change this gap, we're going to be waiting a long time.

Schools can close this gap, and we know that because we can point to individual schools across this country that are closing this achievement gap today, schools like the KIPP Academy in Gaston, North Carolina, a rural school, really in the middle of a very rural -- very rural area in North Carolina, very poor students, minority students, high-poverty population.

And even so, and it's a fairly new school, 100% of its students passed the math portion of the state test recently, and 99% passed the reading portion.

Now, again people will say, "Look, of course you can point to a school here and a school there that is getting miraculous results."

We've all heard the stories, we've seen the movies, you know.

But certainly there's not very many of these schools.

Well, an organization called Education Trust, wonderful advocacy organization, wanted to find out, how many of these schools are there?

So they pulled the data together, and they developed a tool that you can try yourself.

It's at www.edtrust.org.

And they wanted to know, okay, let's find schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, but also high achieving, and putting those criteria in, they were able to find almost 5,000 schools across this country that are closing the achievement gap and getting results with kids that other schools in some cases have written off.

Now, if we can do it with 5,000 schools, we can do it with 50,000 schools.

But what's the secret?

How do we close that gap?

How can schools -- certainly, teachers and schools, everybody is working so hard, and yet we're getting these results with this enormous gap.

What can people do?

Well, a few ideas that I want to go through today.

First of all, we talk a lot about creating a culture of achievement in our schools.

We talk a lot about using teaching methods that work.

We talk about making sure that our neediest students have high-quality teachers.

None of this is rocket science, but putting it into action can be difficult.
So, first of all, a culture of achievement. What do we mean by this?
My boss, Secretary of Education Rob Paige, talks about this all the time.
As you may know, before coming to be Secretary of Education, he was superintendent in Houston Public Schools. He's the first educator to hold his position, and certainly the first superintendent to have this role.
And during his tenure in Houston, Houston schools made an impressive progress over time in reading and math and other areas. And he knew that before you got into all of the policies and accountability and everything else that we talk about in education today, you had to worry about the culture of the schools, what was going on.
When he talks about culture, he talks about the values, beliefs, and assumptions that people share, without even knowing it. It's the stuff that's all around us, and yet it's invisible.
And in many schools, when Dr. Paige has gone on and to see what's going on, he sees a culture of failure. Some of these schools have a culture that says, "You know, there's nothing we can do for these kids. Until you start sending us different kinds of kids, kids that aren't so poor, kids that are getting more support at home," until you change the kind of demographics that they're getting, you know, there's nothing that we can do.
Now, don't misunderstand me, we understand how difficult it is in education today to take students that do come from very difficult backgrounds with very few supports and be able to help them achieve at high levels, but it can be done.
A colleague of mine a few years ago went on a visit to many schools across the country that serve a high-poverty population, and he was in one school that was in the Mississippi Delta. And this is one of these amazing schools where a few years ago their test scores were in the toilet, and now, after a few years, suddenly almost all of their students are achieving at high levels. And he went in, my colleague, and he wanted to ask the principal, "What's going on in this school, what happened?"
And, again, this is a rural school, Mississippi Delta school, and the principal invited my friend over to his house. And they walked around their house after dinner, and the principal started to have -- had a few chickens out back, and he was feeding the chickens.
And he said, "You know, a couple years ago our attitude was the way we taught, it was a lot like feeding chickens, you know. We felt like we were responsible for teaching, and we would take our lessons and we would sprinkle them there, and we would sprinkle them there, we would sprinkle our teaching here and there, and if the kids picked it up and got it, then, great."
But if they didn't, you know, we went home at the end of the day knowing that we had done our job. We had done our teaching."
He said, "What's changed is now we don't stop teaching until we know the kids have got it. The focus is now on learning instead of teaching. The focus is now on making sure that we have solid evidence that kids are achieving before we move on. And we make sure that those students have all the support and all the help they need until they get it."
Now, it's simple. It doesn't sound like rocket science, but what it is is a very different culture. It's a culture of achievement that says, "We, the adults in this school, are going to take responsibility for the achievement of these students, and we're going to do whatever it takes to make sure that they get it."
Now, what else? Using teaching methods that work.
Now, again, this doesn't sound like a big deal. But, unfortunately, in our education system, for so long we've been so caught up in ideological battles over teaching methods and pedagogy that we've lost sight of making sure we're using methods that work for our students. The best example of this is in reading, where we've had these -- these horrible wars for so many years about how to teach kids how to read. We've had people out there saying, "Look," you know, "kids learn how to read naturally, just like we learn how to speak naturally." Yet we didn't have a shred of evidence to show that that was the case. We have these battles that go back and forth. And other fields that have made a lot of progress in the last 50 years, like the field of medicine, those kinds of ideological and political debates have given way to scientific evidence where we say, "Look, we've got to use the scientific method to have rigorous studies to get at some of the answers that we need." Now, that's never going to give us everything we need in education. We're never going to have a scientific answer to what should kids learn about American history, right? There are always going to be moral and political and philosophic questions. But when it comes to a question like how can we help young children learn how to read, that is where science can't help us. We're very fortunate. We now have 30 years of good science from the National Institutes of Health that can help us understand what it takes for virtually every young child to learn how to read, and now we've got to put that kind of information into action. To do else-wise is nothing short of committing malpractice.
But, again, this is very difficult for us to do in our schools today. For example, again, in the reading area, some teachers will say, "Look, I don't like to use these teaching programs that have the phonics and phonemic awareness and vocabulary and on and on, because it feels very scripted, and it takes away my creativity." And I understand that many of our best teachers came into this field because they wanted to use their creativity and reach out. But if this is what works, especially for our neediest students, to make sure that they can learn how to read, the most essential skill, then that's what we've got to do.

We've got to put the needs of the kids first. And, finally, Number 3, and really the topic of the conversation today is around teacher quality. We know it's so important to make sure that our students have access to highly qualified and effective teachers. You all know -- common sense tells us that the most important aspect in education is the teacher, and we now have solid research to show that as well. And yet, systematically, time and again, we give our neediest students, our poorest students, our minority students, our students that need the most help, and we give them the least effective and the least prepared teachers, in general.

I want to show you some more slides. This, again, comes from Education Trust, that organization I talked about, and these look at the teacher quality gap. We talked about the achievement gap, now the teacher quality gap. Look at this first one. Poor and minority students get more inexperienced teachers, in terms of the new teachers, right out of school, right? More classes in high-poverty, high-minority schools taught by out-of-field teachers, teachers who do not major in a subject that they're now teaching. High-poverty schools get more lower scoring teachers.

This is, I believe, from Texas, where they were able to break down the teacher certification exams and find out where various teachers were going, and the teachers that barely passed the test were much more likely to end up in the high-poverty schools. And, finally, that African-American students are much more likely to have ineffective teachers.

This is from Tennessee. Now, why is this happening, and why does this happen in community after community, I suspect in your states and in your districts, too, where we take, you know, the best teachers that we've got, and they tend to get to work with the most affluent kids, right? Why do we have -- somebody once told me in education it's a very strange thing, that your status is largely determined by the kinds of kids you teach, and you tend to have a higher status if you teach wealthier students, right?
This is crazy.
Who did we get this way in our education system?
Why is this happening?
Well, a couple of things tend to happen in every place around the country that lead to this result.
First of all, most local school districts in the teacher-union contract, it says teachers with seniority have the option to have first dibs on open jobs in the district.
We also know that teaching in these high-poverty schools is extraordinarily difficult and exhausting, and oftentimes the teachers in those schools don't feel like they have the support that they need. And almost every place there's also no additional funding, no additional salaries or bonuses to teach in those high-poverty schools. So then what happens?
Well, in a typical district, a position will come open in a more affluent school.
The teachers with seniority who are teaching in the high-poverty schools will look at that position and, no fault of their own, say, "You know what, I'm going to take a shot at that."
They get that job, and then suddenly it's that high-poverty school who then has to recruit, and it's now June, July, August, and they're scrambling, and they're the ones who hire the teachers on emergency waivers or the teachers that come right out of the ed schools.
This happens all over our country.
Now, it gets even worse.
If it was as simple as that, that would be bad enough, but another factor makes it worse.
It's a budgeting issue.
in many school districts we budget based on teacher slots or FTEs or average teacher salaries.
So what happens?
We have one school over here that's mostly teaching the more affluent students, where all of their teachers are more experienced.
Let's say they're 20-year veterans; they're getting paid $50,000 a year.
And you have another school over here across town, much more high-poverty school, and they're going to have all rookie teachers, and they're making $25,000 a year.
Now, they each have 20 teachers, right?
And that's how the district allocates its budget, but you're actually spending twice as much on the affluent kids as you are on the poor kids.
Again, it doesn't make any sense.
And, finally, we got more news about a month ago from the New Teacher Project, which is nonprofit organization that does a lot of work with school systems, urban school systems around the country, and they did a study to try to find out, why do these systems struggle so much to get enough talented people to come into their systems?
And what they found out was really surprising. Especially in places where they've been doing some work on recruiting strategies and advertising strategies, they could get thousands and thousands of people to apply for these very difficult jobs in our inner-city schools.

But then what happens?
People would apply in December or January, and they wouldn't hear from the district for months and months.
Their application in some cases got lost.
But more likely what would happen, not because of any kind of incompetence of the central district level, what would happen is that there were policies in place that delayed the hiring time lines so late that those districts couldn't even begin to make teaching offers until the summer, again, because the union contracts have provisions that said that teachers didn't have to give notice that they were leaving their schools until late into the spring.
Then, at that point, the process started where teachers with seniority had first dibs on those jobs.
Only after that was all done could the district offer incoming teachers a position, and then it was June or July or August.
And many of these teachers, especially the most qualified ones, by then had already given up and accepted a job in the suburbs or decided not to teach altogether.
Again, tragic.
All of them fixable.
And that's the good news.
All of this is happening because of policies that we can change.
But we've got to make these changes at the local level.
And for some reason, in community after community, it hasn't been happening.
So let me summarize what I've said so far.
The achievement gap is the greatest cause of inequity in our society.
And if we can close that achievement gap, much of that inequity would go away.
We would all have -- we would have an America that all of us would feel very, very proud of.
We know how to close the achievement gap.
We know school by school that we can do it by making sure that we have a culture of achievement, using teaching methods that work, and making sure all of our teacher -- all of our students have highly qualified teachers.
Yet time and again, school systems in many cases do not put the policies into action that we need.
Now, let's do a little thought experiment here.
Pretend that you are a member of the United States Congress.
You hear from your constituents every day about how important education is to them.
They are willing to spend more money, more of their taxpayer dollars,
but they desperately want their schools to be improved. And you've been in Congress, and you know that you have given hundreds of billions of dollars over the years to the education system, and yet we still have these glaring achievement gaps. We also see -- we look out across the country, and you know that there are real solutions, solutions like making sure our neediest kids have highly qualified teachers, and yet we see that in community after community, our school systems are not able to put those policies into place; that clearly we're going to need something that's very bold, that's very strong, and that really does change the status quo.

Well, what do you do?
I think you end up passing the No Child Left Behind Act, again, the largest reform of federal education policy in at least 35 years, a historic bipartisan accomplishment and a sign that our nation has said, "Look, we desperately want our schools to improve, and that means that we need big changes to happen, and we are not going to be satisfied until all of our students are achieving at high levels."

No Child Left Behind is designed to be a tough law, and it's designed to get school systems to start making these tough decisions and start making these changes in order to make sure we can close these achievement gaps.
It does this by creating incentives for systems to do this. And it also does this by -- by instituting some mandates, including highly qualified teachers.
So what does it do?
First of all, the centerpiece is around accountability for results. It says that every school in this country is going to be held accountable for making sure that the achievement of all of its students is increasing. And we want to make sure that within a generation of students, within 12 years, that all of our kids are proficient in reading and math. I found it interesting that over the summer the Supreme Court came out with their University of Michigan affirmative action decision, and they said that -- that system could still stand; however, they said that within 25 years, they expected to no longer need to have that remedy; that the achievement gap would be closed.
Well, they've set a 25-year goal. Congress and the President have set a 12-year goal. But the goal is to make sure that all of our kids can read and do math.
That's what it basically comes down to.
Now, what No Child Left Behind does is it requires every state to set academic standards in math and reading and to have annual assessments in Grades 3 through 8 and at the high school level, to make sure that educators are getting information constantly about how students are doing and make sure nobody's falling through the cracks. It also says that schools need to make sure that they are meeting targets for all of their students.
You can't just look at averages because averages can mask failure. We've got to look at individual subgroups within schools, African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, whites, students with disabilities, students that are learning English, and make sure that all students are meeting those standards. Now, that can be very, very challenging. And over the last summer and into the fall, all throughout this country, states have been announcing which schools are on their list of schools in need of improvement. And a lot of these schools have been shocked and communities have been in an uproar because there have been places that have been told for year after year that their schools are doing a great job, and suddenly they are told that their school needs improvement. I was in North Carolina this summer when the list came out in that state, and there were some newspaper articles from Chapel Hill. Now, this was a college town, a town that had been told for years and years that it had one of the best school systems in the state. And it did and does have one of the best school systems in the state, for most of their students. But lo and behold, because of No Child Left Behind, they now have information that they have a huge achievement gap in their schools, and this came as a shock at first. But after the shock wore off, the community started looking at those data and being able to say, "Okay, we have a problem here, and let's talk about how to fix it". And, again, I'm convinced that as that conversation keeps going on, they're going to look at issues around teacher quality especially and how to solve those problems. The -- the other way that No Child Left Behind creates incentives, other than by this accountability system, is by allowing parents to have more options and more choice. This is really meant to both shake up the system, but it's also meant to make sure that students that are in schools that have not met their standards do have options so that they don't fall behind. Schools that haven't met their standards for at least two years and, therefore, are in need of improvement under the law, those students have the right to transfer to a better public school within the school system. And if the school then goes another year without improving, those school -- those students then have the right to free tutoring after school or in the summertime or on Saturdays, and they can have a wide range of choices around that tutoring. Now, again, think that if you were a parent and you found out that your child's school has not been meeting its standards now for three years in a row, and your child entered that school at kindergarten but now is in 3rd grade, you better believe you're worried about them falling behind. And so this is designed to make sure that they get that extra help to
succeed while we're doing all the important work of turning these schools around and making them work.
Now, there are also a couple of old-fashioned mandates in this bill, and there are really two that I'll talk about, around reading and then around highly qualified teachers.
Now, we've talked about reading and the importance of using reading methods that work.
No Child Left Behind has a new $1 billion program called Reading First.
And what it says to states and school systems is, if you want this money, then you've got to use reading methods that work, and we know which ones that work, we've got 30 years of data from the NIH to prove it.
And then highly qualified teachers.
This law really goes so far in making sure that every child in this country has access to caring and qualified teachers.
And, again, go back to what we talked about here with the teacher quality gap.
Congress was looking at this situation across the country, saying, "How are we ever going to close this achievement gap? How are we ever going to meet adequate yearly progress in everything else if we continue to give our low-income students, our minority students, teachers who are not themselves qualified?"
So we want to make sure that in this country we are going to declare that there must be highly qualified teachers in every classroom that's teaching core academic content."
So what does the law require?
Three basics, three basics to the definition of a highly qualified teacher.
First, they must be fully certified or licensed by the state; second, they must hold at least a bachelor's degree; and, third, they must have demonstrate subject matter competence in the subjects that they teach.
Now, that looks pretty simple, but, of course, it gets much, much more complicated as we start peeling apart the onion and thinking about all the special cases out there.
But let me talk just about these requirements briefly again.
Why did Congress think this was so important?
We have a lot of evidence that the effectiveness of a teacher is the most important ingredient in improving student achievement.
Now, a larger question, though, is what does it mean to have an effective teacher?
How do you know?
Other than looking at test scores and seeing teachers who have been able to raise achievement in their classrooms, how do you know a qualified teacher when you see one?
Well, this is where the research starts to get a lot more contentious, but there's general agreement that academic competence is something
that's very important. This can be measured by tests of general cognitive ability or verbal ability, some studies that have shown that majors or performance on academic subject exams relate to achievement. So Congress wanted to make sure that that was in there, and that was very strong.

Now, this definition, again, is for teachers that are teaching core academic subjects. That's your general elementary school teacher, and that's also for middle school or high school teachers that are teaching a core academic content: Math, reading, science, history, geography, foreign languages, the arts, and so on. Now, it does not include, again, your vocational and career-technical teachers, unless -- and this is important -- unless the students are taking the courses for academic content. So, for example, if you have a teacher who is teaching auto mechanics and the credit is a vocational credit for auto mechanics, then that teacher does not have to meet these requirements.

You can continue to hire teachers who do not have a bachelor's degree or are not fully certified by the State, though certainly the State may have their own and probably does have their own requirements. However, if the school offers a class in auto mechanics that is designed to teach physics and are using the medium of auto mechanics to get to that academic content and the student is going to get a physics credit for that, then that teacher would need to be highly qualified as a physics teacher.

Now, we know that these requirements are very challenging, especially for small, rural schools, where a lot of -- one teacher is teaching a lot of different courses. We know it's challenging for special education teachers, especially at the middle school and high school level, where they may be teaching a roomful of students all of the different academic content areas. We know it's difficult in some high schools that are trying to do things in an interdisciplinary way, and so some of these requirements sometimes don't quite fit so well.

We -- and that's why it's so important that we are out there working with the states on this, because really, all of these requirements get interpreted and put into action at the state level and the existing state requirements and then down to a local level. And we want to make sure that we're good partners and find a way to uphold the intent of this law and also make it work in the real world.

Now, a few more details about these definitions. For new elementary school teachers, when it comes to demonstrating subject matter competence, how can they do it, basically there's one way, and that's they need to pass a test that is a broad test of all of the major pieces of the elementary school curriculum. What about for new middle and high school teachers? They have a few more options, they can major in the subject that
they're going to be teaching, or they can pass a test in that subject. Now, again, I want to point out, though, this is where it gets difficult.
If you have a teacher who is teaching math and science, they need to be highly qualified in math and science.
So that means they either need to have those majors, or they need to have passed those exams in order to be highly qualified as a new teacher.
And what about veteran teachers?
We know that there are many, many talented teachers out there, 20-, 30-year veterans who are working wonders in the classroom, and they've looked at this law, and they've said, "You know what, under these requirements, I am not highly qualified."
Well, what Congress did is that they developed something called HOUSSE for veteran teachers.
What that stands for is High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation.
And what this does is it allows states to develop a mechanism for veteran teachers to show their subject matter competence without going back and getting a major in the subject and without going back and taking an exam.
Now, it's up to the states to do this, and every state has approached this somewhat differently, but there are some commonalities.
In many states they have developed some kind of rubric that says, okay, the way you can demonstrate competence is first by showing the professional development that you've had in this subject area, and we will count your professional development credits or courses.
We will also look at the years of experience you have in the classroom and successful evaluations.
That can count up to half of these requirements.
If you served on a curriculum committee or a standards committee or aligning your own local curriculum to the state standards, doing that kind of work, many states have looked at that kind of work and said that can be a way that you can demonstrate subject matter knowledge.
What's happened in most places is that states have come out with their HOUSSE requirements.
Many veteran teachers look at that and say, "You know what, indeed I am already highly qualified because of the professional development I've taken, because of the courses I've taken, because of the work that I've done.
In other cases, it might mean that they need to go back and take a few more professional development courses.
But once those requirements come out, it really is, you know, in most cases something that is very, very doable.
So we're still maintaining those high academic standards, making sure that all of our teachers are well prepared, but also making sure that there are multiple routes through it.
For those of you listening out there at the local level, then, it's
extremely important that you go to your state department of ed folks or other folks at the state level that are involved in teacher quality issues and make sure that you understand what those requirements are, what the Housse looks like, any other ways that they are -- that they are interpreting the No Child Left Behind statute because it is going to be different.

There will be some commonalities, but different in every state. Now, that was a very fast whirlwind tour of No Child Left Behind. And before we go to the panel, just a couple more things that I want to touch on to help understand what we're trying to achieve here. The vision -- the vision is a vision that says, some day we're going to get to the point, and we want it to be within 12 years, where every child in this country is achieving at a high level, where every child in this country has access to a highly qualified teacher, who is prepared to be there, where those teachers have the support that they need to be successful, where our teachers in high-poverty schools, especially, have the support and the incentives to stay there and keep doing the important work that they are doing, so that 12 years from now, a generation from now, we can look at these charts and these data, and we can see that we have closed the achievement gap. But more importantly, we will be able to see that we have a nation that we can be proud of, because we have closed some of those other gaps in our society, the gaps that today keep too many of our students from having real opportunities.

And we really, again, appreciate all of your effort. We know that after all the policy and all the talk and all the rhetoric, it all comes down to what you're doing at the state and local level, what's happening in the classrooms, and we appreciate your dedication to leaving no child behind. We look forward to your questions. Thank you.

>> McCASLIN: Michael, thank you very much for your presentation on meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge. We will now ask our three panel members to see what they see as the implications for teacher quality. We're going to begin with Pat Ainsworth, who is a state administrator in California. So, Pat, your comments, please.

> AINSWORTH: Well, I'm merely overwhelmed. Michael opened the door to every aspect of No Child Left Behind, but let me -- let me just say that I -- we're very concerned in California about what I consider the unintended consequences of the highly qualified teacher. I won't talk about federal government trampling on states' rights and those kinds of issues -- not that we ever trample on local districts' rights from the state level, but this has -- this has come at a time for California that is fairly problematic. We already have implemented high standards, arguably the highest
standards in the country. We have assessments that are aligned to those standards. We have an accountability system that required annual growth for all students. And, in addition to that, we have statewide-adopted curriculum materials for K-8, we have professional development, and we have one of the most rigorous teacher credentialing systems in the country. We know that we're on the right track, as we've seen those students who have been in a standards-based instructional environment that I believe are 6th graders now. You look at their scores compared to the classes that preceded them, and they're substantially higher. So we know that our standards-based approach is working.

Then No Child Left Behind comes in and overlays this new layer that we're trying to sort out at the very time when we felt our system was going in the right direction.

As we look and we struggle through this highly qualified teacher issue, we think the HOUSSE provision is going to help us with our veteran teachers. We've developed a system of evaluation that we're confident the federal government will accept, many states have done this, and we'll be able to grandfather in those existing teachers. Our big concern is the future. New teachers absolutely need to be meeting this highly qualified criteria.

And from our point of view -- and I'm -- I'm head of secondary education, as well as alternative education and career-technical ed in California. We're very concerned about the model that is implicit in the federal law.

That model supports a very traditional, structured high school where you have a big high school with many people teaching and many varied content areas.

In fact, our high school reform efforts are moving in the opposite direction. We're going to more thematic, integrated approaches in our high schools that are erasing those kinds of traditional lines. We have over 1,200 alternative high schools in California, where teachers are teaching multiple subjects. Same with middle schools, where we have teaming going on, teachers working with whole groups of students in an interdisciplinary way. And in our career-technical ed, we have approximately now 2,000 courses approved by the University of California for academic credit, so quite a few career-technical education teachers also issuing academic credit.

We're worried that that model that imposes the traditional high school doesn't work for those other -- other systems. And Michael addressed that.
This is a very difficult issue, and what's most difficult is the time. It's already been implemented. Schools are coming to us saying, "What do we do," you know, "What do we do?"

We have alternative certification. We have all these different situations, but when you're in a court school in California and you're the only teacher at a -- at a juvenile hall, trying to get kids in and out of the system at all different times and trying to make something meaningful while they're there, there's no way that we can have that person credentialed in four or five subject matter areas.

So it's -- it's a big challenge for us, and I think we need to think through this unintended consequence because I'm worried that this really good intention of having highly qualified teachers might trigger the largest act of civil disobedience that we've ever seen, and, frankly, I don't want to see that.

I really think we all -- we need to step back and take a look at this law and say, "There are some things that we need to preserve, and there are some things we need to change." And so there's my two cents.

>> McCASLIN: Thank you, Pat.

Next we're going to hear the perspective of the local school person, and Josephine Scott is here to present that from the Columbus Public Schools.

Josephine.

>> SCOTT: Thank you.

Ohio is probably in a different position than California. We're in a different position in that Ohio, of course, does have state standards.

Many districts in Ohio -- because we've had a state test that has been one of the most difficult in the nation for many years for our students, many districts have developed aligned curriculum to go with that in those states that have teachers to be more effective in their teaching.

When I think about No Child Left Behind, and I think about that a lot anymore, but when I think about it, I think there are lots of pluses connected to No Child Left Behind, but I would also concur with Pat that there are some down sides to it that will have to be addressed.

I think one of the positives is that it does try to focus on an overall school improvement model; that it tries to get at the issue of in order for a school to improve, the academic success of every child in the school must improve, and that's a very good thing.

I also like that whole notion of a school being a culture of achievement, but I know that for many urban districts in Ohio, they are part of the Big 8 in Ohio, so I know that for a lot of them, the issue of poverty just sort of rides over a lot of the other kinds of issues.

I was interested, Mike, in your comment about this might very well be
the great civil rights moment in learning.
I was saying, "No, can't be," because there are too many things that it does not address.
One of the things that I think it does not address is the whole issue of a teacher who cares about the children that he or she teaches.
You can have a teacher who has all the content knowledge in the world.
You can have a teacher who understands every strategy there is that you can possibly teach and understands what concept those strategies best teach, in terms of effectiveness.
But if you don't have the high expectation for every child, a caring attitude about every child -- and I really want every child to be successful; I really want to provide an education that liberates children rather than allows them to basically have the same kinds of lives as adults -- it won't happen.
And while I think No Child Left Behind has the good intent of trying to say in 12 years all children are achieving at high levels, the reality is that in many classrooms children have teachers who are very much unlike them.
And when I say that, I meant economically, racially, gender, you name it.
And in many cases, those differences end up resulting in the connections not being made with children in the teaching process and, in many cases, there not being enough caring about the kids who are so different than maybe not all children are.
So I think those are issues that we still have to address.
I also thought about your comment about who are the teachers in our classrooms, and what do unions have to do with that?
And in our district, we have been fortunate to have worked with our union over the last six or seven years, I think it has been, so that we have gone out early in the school year and recruited at colleges for teachers, we give letters of commitment, which means that if you come, we hire you, so that we're not held down to let us wait until the vacancies to see what we have available.
And we always allow them in the very first round of our employment.
We do three rounds in the spring.
And so that has not really held us back.
The other issue you commented on was the whole issue of seniority.
And I know that these things exist in lots of places, but for Columbus Public that is not at issue either because about the same number of years ago we gave schools the right to interview candidates, and anybody can apply, you know, for the open position that a school has.
They can look at the pool of new folks who have been given letters of commitment or hired by the district, or they look at people in the district who want to transfer so that a seniority transfer is not a must for a school.
And in spite of that, we still are not nearly where we want to be in terms of having a quality, caring teacher in every classroom, who sets high expectations for every child in that classroom.
So those are some of the issues.
The other issue that's killing us -- and I literally mean killing
us -- we just had a conversation about this a couple of weeks ago.
We are so bombarded with testing that our teachers barely have
adequate instructional time.
You know, our lawmakers at the state level are coming up with laws to
give their interpretation of No Child Left Behind, and that's adding
on another layer of stuff that -- that districts have to deal with.
And so one of those examples is that we have these diagnostic tests
that are responding to state law that we are now getting into.
And we actually sat down and figured out how long it would have taken
a classroom teacher to give that at the first grade, where it has to
be one on one, and it ended up being the equivalent of 15
five-and-one-half-hour days to give one on one all parts of that test
to every child in a typical classroom of 25.
Now, obviously, that means that we have to find another vehicle to do
it because, first of all, you can't give one child a test and have 24
others doing whatever.
So -- so, I mean -- and it's not so much No Child Left Behind as it is
everybody trying to -- I don't know if that's true at your state --
where the state is trying to say, "Okay, what do we need to do to help
support this, to push it forward," and in the process of doing that,
creating something else that makes it more difficult.
So now we will have the achievement testing required by the State, and
our state is on that.
You know, we are giving the 3rd grade achievement test this year.
So we have that.
And so we'll have the achievement test for reading and math, Grades 3
through 8.
We'll have the diagnostics that we'll have to do for our K-1-2.
And then we already -- because Columbus Public Schools has always been
trying to get ahead of the ball.
So in addition to trying to create aligned curriculum, we also had
aligned assessments that we gave as a pre and a post, at the beginning
and end of the year to try to show growth, and we gave quarterly
within the year to make sure that teachers were teaching and kids were
really getting it.
And we aligned intervention and professional development and all of
those things to it.
So we're really into the curriculum alignment piece.
Well, then, that means, of course, we have a target assessment that
we're giving internally, and with our mobility in our district, we
have very high mobility, and many urban districts throughout the
country do, we're talking about a mobility rate that is like at 50%.
In some of our schools, it's almost 100% in a given school.
And so we have to have a way of ensuring that kids don't get the same
objectives being taught to them over and over again.
So we have pacing charts that define which ones are taught at which
time and so on, to try to give some structure to that and to try to control the mobility.
But when you're adding all of the assessments and all of the things that we already have that we need to do, because the achievement test will not give us that information, and it will not help us to keep that alignment in place, it becomes a struggle to have enough instruction time for kids who need it.
And we all know -- you made the comment, and we know it from our kindergarten benchmark assessments -- that kindergarten children come to us already way behind.
I always give the example, if this is the kindergarten gate here, then when children come to us, we have some who are way back here, some are like a 3-year-old kind of level, we have some here, some here, some here, some here, and obviously we have some who are way beyond that.
But that means that for the ones who are not here we need actually more instructional time than we already have in the school day, the supplemental services or after school, Saturday, proficiency institutes, whatever, in order for them to get the additional time they need to not only do a year, but also make up for the behind.
And that means that rather than losing time to testing, we need to be gaining time, and that's very -- that's going to be very difficult and challenging for us to do.
So, so that we can also hear from you, I'll save my other comments.
>> McCASLIN: Thank you, Josephine.
Next we're going to hear from a teacher educator.
And, Susie, we would like to hear your comments.
>> WHITTINGTON: I've tried to frame comments, Michael -- I went through and tried to number them in no particular order, about six kinds of issues, and certainly there are many others, and I'm just going to just tip this, really based on my own personal experience of what we have been trying to do in our department in preparation of our teachers.
And I'll put these in -- credentialing in sort of two different pieces, a retainment, a diversity, a teacher testing, a focus on learning, and a curriculum piece, basically.
And I'll try to hit those each very quickly so that we can move into some of the questions I know have been coming from the viewing audience.
In the credentialing piece for teacher educators, this hit at the same time that universities are pushing us to decrease the number of credits in which students should be enrolling for completing a degree program.
So at the same time that, for example, they now have to have an increased demonstration of competency in their subject area, which at a university the interpretation of that oftentimes is an additional course or coursework -- so demonstrating competency which could be interpreted as increasing coursework hit at the same time universities were saying, "These students can't be here for 196 hours in a quarter
program; it's got to be 190," and so those are hitting up against each other, causing a struggle for looking at a BS curriculum totally and saying what will a BS program look like, knowing that the university is going to maintain what they believe to be general education credits required for a university degree graduate, and we're trying to work around that.

So, of course, that's one of the things.

Coupled with that, sort of, in terms of the credentialing piece, is the certification piece itself, which because we know we have teachers in classrooms who are not certified in the area in which they're teaching, but we don't want them to have to leave those classrooms and bring in a new teacher in this movement, that means we have to have alternative means for certifying the teachers who are already in place in those classrooms.

We've already been doing alternative certification in -- in various means with bringing people out of industry and other types of avenues. But with having teachers we know already in classrooms and trying to meet this law, we have to have additional alternative means for certifying those teachers who are already in those classrooms.

A retention issue.

Because the students who tend, in the research, anyway, and in the data, appear to be students who are students of color, students from potentially less socioeconomic status in their homes, potentially -- at least in the research, that's showing where the gap tends to be -- there becomes a trust issue, and that population of students leaving schools, there is a piece of research out there, a line of inquiry, that talks about those being trust issues, and retention, then, of our teachers becomes even more important for that population of students who tend to return to school because they trust a teacher that's there or have found an alignment in some way with a particular teacher that reaches the needs of that population of students.

And so there's a line of inquiry developing on this trust issue in maintaining those students in classrooms, which retention is always an issue in teacher education that's not going to go away, and, in my mind, this has increased that, and the research is beginning to take place.

A diversity issue.

Again, the same population of students tends not to be the population of students who comes to college and then becomes teachers.

And so teaching students unlike ourselves, that has to be a curriculum issue in developing what we need for our teachers in teacher education at the undergraduate level.

And, as an example of that, in our department we've offered a fourth field experience that falls at the end of the sophomore year, for us to have our -- our students to have a nonformal experience with students unlike themselves.

That is a teacher education issue in that that means that we are adding credits, again, to a curriculum that is already full, in the
university's eyes, and trying to make that work. But a diversity issue because those are not the students who are like those of us who come to college and are then put in front of those classrooms. So finding ways to teach students unlike ourselves and understanding those students.

Teacher testing. We are now in our curriculum spending time -- just like classroom teachers are having to take time to prepare their students for the testing that has come as an accountability issue as part of this law, we are doing the same thing.

Our teachers now have to be prepared to pass tests for licensure, and that's either going to come out of time in our curriculum, or they're paying for that as workshops, etc., outside of their university time, and a lot of them don't have the money they need to stay in school, let alone buy a $150 workshop to help them get ready to pass a test kind of a thing.

And so it falls to us, we feel, to help them prepare for that teacher testing that has come along as a part of the highly qualified teachers and how do we measure that, and testing has become a piece of that interpretation on how that will be done.

Our focus on learning, as opposed to teaching. We've always had a focus on learning, of course, but in this particular case, one of the places in teacher ed that that comes to play is in our planning and how we are teaching our teachers to plan for the classroom time that they will have with the students, working in the accountability pieces, and, in particular, at the end of each of our objectives, our teachers are being taught to have their students -- present to their students an opportunity for those students to show them they've learned the material in more of a mastery learning prior to moving on to the next objective. So, again, that has been a change in our planning of our teacher education curriculum and something that's happening with them. And the last piece I would share would be in curriculum development. Again, because of the high stakes testing that's taking place with the students -- which this is a second layer for us, but I have to prepare those teachers to prepare those students, and so we're looking at the second layer, but it's still affecting what we do in teacher ed programming. When we are doing our curriculum design, we are now having our students search in the science databases and in the math databases, for example, for the competencies that can be reflected in what we're teaching and that that be built into the curriculum design that we are doing for the courses we teach. My students aren't math and science teachers, but they are now searching the databases in science standards and math standards for making sure that those are worked into the curriculum design that we're doing in undergraduate teacher preparation in my teacher ed
discipline. 
So those are some places where the law has affected what we're doing on a daily basis in our teacher education program. 

>> McCASLIN: Panelists, thank you very much for your comments. Before we move to the questioning, though, I wondered, Mike, if there are any comments you would care to make regarding these comments that have just been made. 

>> PETRILLI: Well, so many good comments, and I think it's so important to have panels like this with all these different perspectives represented because this is a big, huge, thousand-page federal law, but as it impacts reality is through the state and local policies and teacher preparation, and so that's so important. Well, just a few things, first of all, to Pat's concern about the new teachers, I understand that concern as well. We have been -- when we talk to states, encouraging them to use this opportunity to look at their entire certification and licensure system and to say, "look, you know, are there some things that you need to streamline, are there some things that you need to do differently?" In some states, over time, you know, through legislation or other thing, you know, different pieces get added, you know, somebody decides in the state legislature, well, there really should be a course on that or a course on this, and suddenly you look, and it's all these credit hours. You know, can states take this opportunity to look and say, "Look, what is really essential? What are maybe some new things that we need to add, but what are some other things we need to subtract, and how can we can make sure we're not creating barriers to a lot of great people who may want to come into teaching, but there are just too many barriers before them?" Josephine, I'm really excited to hear about what you're doing in Columbus because it sounds like we may want to use you as a model, you know, especially around recruitment and around changing some of those policies around seniority. I've heard of a few other urban districts that have been able to make those reforms as well. I know in New York City, in their most recent contract a few years ago, they gave authority to the schools to make those decisions as long as the teachers had a role in hiring, and that was a way that they got that compromise. And I think that's, you know, all moving in the right direction and good to see that kind of progress. It's so important that the schools themselves, you know, have that authority to bring in great people and to build a team and to build that culture and to get away from this mind-set that they just get sent somebody and then, you know, like all these teachers are just, you know, equal and can be plugged in. This is -- this is a much more professional way to get them. And Susie brought up so many great points.
I want to say we are certainly open to different kinds of alternate routes for those teachers that are teaching out of field. But I think the law has done a very good thing in reigning this issue of out-of-field teaching up.

We have some research that shows that it doesn't even happen for necessarily good reasons, you know, good reasons in that, you know, you can understand maybe an isolated school, way out in a rural community where they struggle to get teachers with all these certifications. But you can have places in big suburban high schools or other places where it might be a matter of convenience and scheduling, and it was just easier to give a teacher a physics class even though they majored in English.

Well, you know, the law says, "Look, you can't be making decisions based on that kind of expediency anymore," and I think this is going to go a long way.

And I also think that, you know, if teachers are willing to go back and pass a test or to look at the HOUSSE requirements, that we're going to be able to get a lot of these teachers to the point where they do have -- are highly qualified in several different areas. And finally, again, on the teacher testing, you know, we know from research -- we have such good research that teachers' general cognitive ability or verbal ability is linked to their ability to increase student achievement.

It's just a correlation. It doesn't mean that every single teacher needs to be able to do well on a test, but there is certainly a strong correlation there. And I think what that shows us is that we do need to have high standards for our teachers.

And a very good thing that's happened in recent years, maybe because of earlier federal legislation, is that many schools of education have actually upped their entry standards for their teachers. Unfortunately, there were a lot of places in this country where there were hardly any requirements for somebody to come into an education school in a big public university where it wasn't too hard to get into the university -- you know, there weren't requirements to get into the school.

Well, that's changed in a lot of places. That's tough because that means some schools of education now have smaller cohorts, and that's difficult financially and on budget issues, but that means that the quality that we're producing is going to be increasing, you know, because we should be having high expectations for people coming into those education schools just like we would in our other professional schools at the university level, and that means, you know, setting those high bars, and in some places where they require teacher testing before you even set foot in an education school, you know, as a way to make sure that there is some level of quality there, and I think that's important, too.
So really appreciate all these comments and look forward to answering more questions.

>> McCASLIN: Okay.

Well, during the next few minutes our speaker and panelists have agreed to respond to questions generated by our audience here at Ohio State and that are viewing us on the Internet. Earlier this week, I think maybe, I think, the end of last week, I received two questions.

We asked -- or had provided the opportunity for people to write us questions ahead of time, and so I'm going to reward this person by listing these questions first.

Reading these two questions, both have two parts to them. But the first one is, educators already go to a great deal of work to get and maintain their credentials, especially in isolated and rural counties which are hundreds of miles from a college or university. What are small, rural counties with necessarily small high schools and few alternative education schools and classes that have few students and a handful of instructors teaching three to five secondary school subjects each supposed to do to achieve NCLB compliance without losing those teachers?

And then the second part of it was can a longer time period or exceptions be granted for those in these unique types of situations?

>> PETRILLI: Okay.

Well, that's an excellent question, and we get that question a lot. We get it so much that Secretary Paige decided he needed to go out and really understand this issue better, and he took a trip to Alaska, and not to Anchorage, but the governor who escorted him wanted him to see real Alaska, and they went out to this isolated, rural village, they had to take a helicopter to get in and a dog sled from the helicopter pad into the school.

He met a teacher who basically slept in a closet in the school because there was no housing for their teachers, I mean, just the stories that -- and he said afterwards -- he gave some interviews to the media.

He said, you know, "I grew up in Mississippi, I'm from Texas, and I thought I understood what rural was, and I have a whole 'nother appreciation for rural now."

So we understand that this law, especially the highly qualified teachers piece, is extremely challenging to rural schools. You know, what we want to do is maintain the goal -- you know, the law makes it clear, the goal is to get all of our teachers to this highly qualified teacher status, and we want to work with states and districts to help get people there as best as we can.

You know, there are some new innovations coming out every day that are designed to help those rural schools.

For example, Western Governors University has an on-line teacher preparation program with on-line courses that people can tap into. The new American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence is also...
another way that people can get kind of a streamlined route to certification.
Idaho, for example, just came on board, and so some of their rural schools may take advantage of that.
So I do think distance learning and on-line learning, just like that's a big part of the solution for rural K-12 students, is going to be a big part of the solution for teachers.
But the principle of the law still stands.
It says, "Look, if we're going to expect all of our students to reach high academic standards, then we need to make sure that all of our students have access to teachers who can teach those standards."
And, again, I hope that when teachers look at the various options that they have, in terms of HOUSSE for the states, in terms of going back and taking the tests, you know, as some of the testing companies -- if they get to the point where they give the tests in more locations and maybe even on-line, you know, that we can get to the point where, you know, maybe you can't get five -- all five subjects, but maybe you can get three of them.
And we want to be moving in that direction, where certainly those students have access to teachers who do know their content matter.
And most of these teachers do know their content matter, and now it's just a matter of demonstrating it.
>> McCASLIN: Okay.
The second question that this person has -- let me go to the essence of it.
What do we do with an excellent teacher who has been teaching a vocational subject for 18 years that is now considered core and who does not have a degree?
It says there are union, liability, and other issues here, not to mention simply not wanting to lose a good teacher.
>> PETRILLI: Well, here I need to say that this isn't a federal issue because under the federal law, under No Child Left Behind, if they are teaching vocational, technical, and career education and their students aren't getting academic credit, then they, under the federal law, don't need to meet these requirements.
Obviously, states have every right to create their own requirements and have done so for many years.
So that's up to a state decision about, you know, what the requirements are for those teachers.
That was certainly not the intention of Congress, to make these requirements be mandated for those kinds of teachers.
>> McCASLIN: Okay.
>> PETRILLI: By the way, I wonder -- especially Pat, you know, from California, probably has a lot of experience with the rural issues as well -- if you've seen anything that has been helpful for some of those rural schools as they've struggled with this.
>> AINSWORTH: Well, right now we are exploring the on-line options. That's probably the biggest opportunity.
We would also suggest, there is a distinction in the federal law between the elementary -- you presented it here -- between elementary teachers and secondary teachers. Elementary teachers must demonstrate competence across a variety of subjects. But at the high school level, it's very specific. In each of the content areas you have to have a major or something specific, to the point where even social science is -- there's a distinction between geography, economics, history, and that's -- that's causing a lot of problems for us. It seems to us that there could possibly be some solutions. One would be to offer an option similar to the elementary school for these rural and alternative schools at the middle and secondary level, where -- or in interdisciplinary situations. That would be -- that would go a long way. Another suggestion would be to allow districts, instead -- to have -- when they hire new teachers, they will bring a good person in that may have competency in a particular area, into one of these schools and allow them a three-year or five-year period to develop and then HOUSSE them at the end of that time, in other words, use the HOUSSE evaluation at that point, for new teachers, rather than assuming that somebody can come in with all the bells and whistles up front, when really we know the teacher education programs don't have the time or the ability to do it all.

>> PETRILLI: Right.

>> AINSWORTH: But school districts -- if we're looking at a career, shouldn't we be thinking about building people over time, you know, building their competency and getting them to that highly qualified status? That's where our thinking is right now.

>> PETRILLI: Just one point, Mac, on the timing -- and I should have made this clear in the presentation -- the requirements are slightly different for Title I schools and other schools. For Title I schools, new teachers coming into those schools need to meet these requirements right now, actually, last year. But for all others -- for all other schools, it's by the end of the 2005-2006 school year, and for not new teachers in all of the schools. Again, they have until 2005-2006. So what you described is still possible in Title I schools -- non-Title I schools. But it is in the Title I schools where these new teachers need to be highly qualified.

>> McCASLIN: Another question we have, it says, "To what extent are students in various countries who are tested" -- I think we're referring back to the international comparisons -- "of the same age group? Are the students on the same career path, and are these really fair comparisons?"
PETRILLI: Yeah. My understanding is that this is an issue that's been raised and that they've worked very hard to make sure that these are fair comparisons. The ages are -- are approximately the same, and they've tried hard to make sure that it's not a situation where, you know, you've already peeled off the vocational kids from these kids, but that it is an apples-to-apples comparison.

These data, you know, consistently in different -- you know, there's a couple different international assessments that go on out there. There's the TIMSS, there's the new PISA, there's other ones, and they all come out with slightly different results, but there are certainly some commonalities that happen.

And the common news is that, you know, our younger students tend to do pretty well. As they get to middle school, they start to slip, and by the time we get to high school, we're really not -- you know, we're really in bad shape. And a lot of interest in what's happening in this critical late elementary and middle school years.

And certainly there is a hypothesis. It's hard to prove, but a lot of it comes down to teacher quality issues, especially in middle school, where we have not required, say, our middle school math teachers, to have subject matter competence in math.

You know, in many places in this country, you can have a general elementary or middle school certification, you know, maybe taken one or two math courses and be teaching 8th grade algebra. And in these other countries, almost as a rule, teachers teaching those kinds of courses majored in mathematics and were experts in mathematics.

So, again, we expect that No Child Left Behind will have a big impact on those kinds of issues, making sure that students, especially in courses like that, have access to people who've studied these subjects intensively.

>> McCASLIN: Another question. If we know that achievement gap is mainly due to poverty, why do we need to test all students? Shouldn't we focus our resources on the children of the poor?

PETRILLI: That's a really good point. You know, the truth is the achievement gap is not entirely explained by poverty. If you control for poverty, you take away about a third of the achievement gap, but there's still two-thirds of the achievement gap that remains.

There's a pretty well-known school system near here, up near Cleveland, Shaker Heights, that's a middle class, upper middle class community, very diverse, African-American and white students in the schools, and it's been the subject of a lot of study, and there's
still an enormous achievement gap in that school, and there's been a lot of debate about why is that. A new book just came out a couple months ago called "No Excuses: Closing the Learning Gap -- the Achievement Gap in Learning," by Stephen and Abigail Thernstrom, and they get into this in their book, trying to explain why is it that this achievement gap may exist, and, you know, are there cultural issues, or is it something that's just going on in the schools? I think the lesson in No Child Left Behind and what's happening across the country is that it's not just the schools serving poor kids that are getting identified as in need of improvement. It's especially the suburban schools and some of the other ones in smaller cities that, again, have been told year after year that they were doing well. Their average test scores were pretty good, but lo and behold, they have an achievement gap as well. And No Child Left Behind makes it clear that that information can't be hidden and swept under the rug any longer. So this is -- this is an issue that virtually every community in America is dealing with, and it's something that we all need to find solutions for. And, again, we think, you know, the components of No Child Left Behind get at many of the important issues around that.

SCOTT: I think the Shaker Heights example that you gave is one where I can sort of go back to a comment that I made about the caring, the whole business of relationship building with students. Ron Ferguson has done a lot of research connected to that and, again, looking at what is it that teachers need in order to reach every child, and a part of that has been connected to the Shaker Heights schools. And that's -- that whole issue of is the relationship piece there, the understanding of the cultures of children, you know, what that has to do with interactions and how one works with them, high expectations for them, even if they -- so your solid middle income, high middle income, do I have the same expectations for you that I do for other kids who are of that background? So I think that that was my -- why I said that No Child Left Behind looks at -- you know, especially in the article that you wrote, the content knowledge, the cognitive piece is very important; but we can't assume that that alone does it. It has to be evidenced to children that they're cared about and there is really a desire for them to be successful in order for all the kids to buy into the educational process. I think Shaker Heights is a good example of that.

PETRILLI: I would argue, though, that there's only so much training you can do. That's largely going to be a recruitment issue as well. We can look at charter schools across this country, especially the
KIPP schools, for example, where they don't have certified teachers, but they have found ways to get teachers who are passionate and committed.

And they are, you know, all kinds of diverse backgrounds, and they create a culture where those teachers have that.

>> SCOTT: Right. And so it's the passionate and committed, and I think that's the way -- I just want to underscore that we can't make the assumption that if you have the content knowledge, that assures that the progress of all kids will be there. They don't necessarily go hand in hand, although they frequently do. So --

>> PETRILLI: One more thing, Mac, on that that I think is important to point out as well is that, you know, a lot of our more affluent communities are the ones who tend to rail against standardized testing.

You know, you can see that in the Brookline, Massachusetts, and the other kinds of tony neighborhoods around this country, and they feel like their kids were doing fine, you know, and now all this testing is getting in their way.

I think what's important to remember is before this standards movement, you know, 10, 15 years ago, we had a situation where expectations were very different within a state, and the curriculum was very different.

We would have a situation where a student would graduate from an urban school system, let's say, with an A average, and then they would get to college and find out that if they had been across town or in the suburbs, they would have gotten a C average, and that's a matter of equity, you know, the nation committed itself and the states committed themselves to have common, high expectations for everybody, but that means everybody -- needing to have those standards and assessments for everybody is an important part of that.

>> McCASLIN: Okay, another question.

Some would argue that the failure of public education is the dropout rate, as high as 50% in some schools. How would you suggest we prepare teachers at all levels to deal with this dropout problem?

>> PETRILLI: I think that's a very good point, and that's why at the high school level, schools have to meet targets in terms of graduation rates, or else they can be identified as in need of improvement to try to make sure that this issue is an important part of the conversation.

I think we have a lot of work to do on learning about, you know, what -- best strategies here.

I think there's a lot of exciting work that you've all been involved with, that our Office of Vocational and Adult Education has been involved with, things like Talent Development School that Johns Hopkins has done.

I think there's some exciting models out there.
But I don't think we have one answer at this point. I think we're still in an area where we need to identify, you know, lots of different models that work. I would be interested in what the panel had to say.

>> WHITTINGTON: We introduced some research on dropout rates in our methodologies class, but we actually introduce it from the frame like you were talking about, Josephine, with caring about kids and what keeps kids in school and what's the root of that problem and how can I be a part of the solution, and really do frame it in esteem and caring about kids is our context.

And there would be others, but that's where we frame it.

>> SCOTT: Another part of No Child Left Behind is the whole focus on AYP and subgroups because I think what typically happens with the high dropout rate is that students stay in school until they reach the age that they can, but they have really been dropped from the learning long time prior to that.

And so if we could begin to look at what is the progress of every child in every subgroup each year as they come through elementary, making sure that they're learning -- you know, I know that a quote of Bill Sanders' research, you know, so what is the value-added that the child is getting from each year of schooling, and if we're seeing what we should see for each year of time that the child puts in, so that kids don't fall so far behind in any one content area that they end up sort of dropping out of school mentally early on, and then when they reach an age where they can do it legally, dropping out physically so the high school sort of takes a hit on it, but it really starts occurring much before then.

>> PETRILLI: Again, I keep talking about them, but they're just my favorite schools, the KIPP schools. At KIPP.org, if you want to check them out, it's a series of -- now they're up to about 20 schools around the country, and they are middle schools, and they start at either 5th or 6th grade, depending on where they are, and they tell their students coming in at that level, 5th or 6th grade that, you know, it's like a football game, it's the fourth quarter, and there's 10 minutes left on the clock, and we don't have a minute to lose if we're going to come up from behind and get you ready to succeed in life.

We have got to be thinking much earlier to get these kids on the right path.

In our office, in the Office of Innovation and Improvement where I work at the Department of Education, we support a program called Advanced Placement in Centers, and it provides grants to schools to do work from middle school through high school to get kids ready for a more challenging academic curriculum.

And I think everything we're learning is that, you know, this is -- the dropout issue is not a high school problem, and it's maybe not even a middle school problem, and we've got to be thinking about it early, early on.
>> McCASLIN: Okay. This question has to do with retaining qualified teachers. I know when I was department chair here at this university, and teacher preparation, that we oftentimes would lose some of our best and brightest teacher candidates because business and industry would hire them away, not at a higher salary, but with the fringe benefits. They would get a car, they would get an expense account, they would get a computer, and that adds up to quite an incentive to not teach. So what is the evidence to suggest that an issue relating to having highly qualified teachers is the need to retain the highly qualified teachers that we have or that we have in the pipeline?

>> PETRILLI: Absolutely. And we know, again, from research, unfortunately, that tends to be our most qualified are more likely to leave the classroom after just a few short years, which is something we've got to stop. Like I said before, you know, I think the issue is how do you retain teachers in some of these high-poverty classrooms? And I think -- you know, I think we need to be looking at combat pay or bonus pay for teachers and then provide those kinds of incentives to be there. And then we've got to look at everything we do in terms of school reform. We've got to have schools that are professional environments where there's support, where there's a culture of achievement, where the teachers get what they need. And part of that is breaking through some of the bureaucratic structures in our school systems that keep those kinds of cultures and environments from being created. So I think what we know is that teachers tell us why they leave a certain school or why they leave the profession. It's sometimes the money, but usually it's because of the teaching conditions. And they say that, you know -- and I know from personal experience, my wife who used to teach, other family, friends, you know, you hear people say, "Look, I was working my heart out, but it was an impossible job and I was getting no support, and no matter how hard I worked, you know, there was nothing I could do." We've got to create that whole school environment where teachers are part of a culture that's really working, and then I think many of them will stay.

>> McCASLIN: This individual wants to know are there other studies you can cite about teacher competency in addition to the 1996 cumulative and remedial effects of teachers on future student academic achievement? This person has been trying to locate research on this topic.

>> PETRILLI: There are a couple of good resources that I know about. Again, if you go to our Web site, www.ed.gov, and you find our...
guidance on the teacher quality provisions of the law, probably the easiest way is just to probably do a little search on our site under "Teacher Quality Guidance."
At the back of that is a teacher presentation that Dr. Russ Whitehurst, who was earlier on this presentation, had done that really looks at the teacher quality research and puts it all in one nice place and has a lot of good references.
That's a good place to start.
The National Council on Teacher Quality at NCTQ.org is another good resource and has a lot of good links, a lot of different information.

>> McCASLIN: Okay.
This one asks, what do you think the impact has been of the NCLB on increased coursework at the collegiate level affecting those considering pursuing a career pathway in education?

>> PETRILLI: Right.
Well, I'll start.
I think Susie got to this a little bit earlier.
Again, I think what the law's going to be moving people towards more and more is the idea that, you know -- as many states have already done, that at least at the middle school and high school level, people will be majoring in a content area and then getting a certification as well, but not majoring in education as much.
And that's already the case in many places.
That may start happening more and more at the elementary level as well.
We hope that the law and its requirement around certification gets states to be looking again at their requirements on certification, and in states where there are many, many requirements and many, many hours that it would take somebody to go through and get certification, that they'd look at that and say, "Look, let's boil this down to the absolute essentials, and let's really do some research and find out if there are some great people that are saying no to teaching because they just can't afford or don't have the time to take this many courses, but if we could winnow it down to the absolute essentials, they would say yes."
What's happening is in projects like the New Teacher Project and Teacher for America and others, they're getting some great people to say yes to the teaching profession.
And I think we've got to try to understand, why are those people saying yes to the teaching profession but not to the traditional teacher preparation programs, and what can we do to try to move some of those people into the traditional programs, you know, under the right kinds of -- the right kinds of situations?

>> McCASLIN: Okay.
While good in theory, do you honestly believe that all special needs students, notwithstanding the 1% with severe disabilities, can be expected to meet the standards?

>> PETRILLI: Yes, absolutely.
I met a man about a month ago who runs a school in Arizona that's half deaf students, and the other half are not. And he was describing -- he said, "You know, there's this huge achievement gap among deaf students in this country." He said, "You know, there's a huge gap in reading." Now, you think about that, and you say, "Now, why would deaf students not be able to read at the same level as other students?" And you start to wonder, what's going on? And I suspect that there may be situations where those students, because of the way that they speak, perhaps, you know, teachers have not had very high expectations for those students. So this law says, "Look, we really believe that all children can meet high standards and can learn, and we want to make sure, therefore, that we're aiming high and all schools are held accountable for the achievement." Yes, there are going to be a tiny percentage of students with severe cognitive disabilities where that's not going to be appropriate, but for most of our students with disabilities, they can learn math and learn reading just like other students can. >> McCASLIN: Another question on teacher preparation. What suggestions would you have for colleges engaged in teacher preparation, concerning the way they prepare future teachers? >> PETRILLI: Wow, that's a -- maybe we could come back and do that another time. That's a -- that's a big topic. Again, I think, you know, it's the same kinds of things we talk about for K-12. We've got to make sure that everything we're doing is research-based, and we've got to make tough decisions about what's essential and what's not. We've got to worry about requirements that may be serving as barriers to teachers, while also making sure that the essentials are there in the curriculum. That's my short answer. I'll come back and do another one of these for the long answer, if you like. >> McCASLIN: All right. This is the last question, I think. It says, "The No Child Left Behind was enacted in 2001. What progress has been made since that year, and can you identify what progress has -- and can you identify what progress has taken place?" >> PETRILLI: Sure. A lot of progress, huge progress. You know, first of all, last June, just about a year and a half after the law was passed, there was a Rose Garden ceremony with folks from every state, announcing that every single state and D.C. and the district -- and Puerto Rico had plans in place, accountability plans that had been approved by the Department of Education.
These plans spelled out what the states promised to do in terms of holding schools accountable for adequate yearly progress. That is historic.

When we had the other law, the previous law, the 1994 law, by the time we came into office -- you know, and six or seven years later, only 11 states had approved plans. So, you know, huge, huge progress in getting the states to step up and make this commitment to make sure that no child is left behind.

Lots of other progress as well at the local level, I mean, highly qualified teachers, you know, you've got states out there setting their requirements, coming out with their HOUSSE requirements. You've got the testing regimes on the way in most states and on track to meet all of the deadlines.

You've got students that are being offered choice in supplemental educational services. There is a ton happening.

And the money has gone out there, historic levels as well. I should point out before I go that funding has increased over 40% from the federal level since the President took office as a result of No Child Left Behind.

We know that comes at a very difficult time for the states, as a lot of the states are facing very difficult financial situations of their own.

But those resources mean that students are out there getting research-based instruction in reading and getting taught to high standards.

There is a lot going on, thanks to this law, and it's less than two years old.

>> SCOTT: I have to say we need a lot more than the 40%.

>> PETRILLI: We'll come back to that one as well.

>> McCASLIN: Michael, Susie, Josephine, and Pat, I would like to thank you for sharing your insights about teacher quality today. I would like to invite our viewers to join us again on December the 4th for our next scheduled Professional Development Speaker Series. The speakers will be Terry Herrera and David Majesky, who will be presenting Strategies for Increasing Math Achievement for Career and Technical Education founded on Evidence-based Criteria.

The presentation will begin promptly at 3:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time and will again be Webcast.

All presentations are archived on the www.nccte.org Web site, and we encourage them to make use of those in your professional development programs.

Thank you, and good afternoon.
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