FEDERAL ATTENTION TO TEACHER CERTIFICATION AND LICENSURE:
TWO POLICY CASE STUDIES

by

Penelope McGaw Earley

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in
Research and Evaluation

APPROVED:

K.T. Hereford, Chair

M.D. Alexander

J.C. Fortune

J.W. Garrison

J.A. Rohr

February 1994
Blackburg, Virginia
LD 5655
V8510
1994
V8755
C2
FEDERAL ATTENTION TO TEACHER CERTIFICATION AND LICENSURE:
TWO POLICY CASE STUDIES

by

Penelope McGaw Earley

Committee Chairman: Karl T. Hereford
Educational Research

(ABSTRACT)

Policy case studies are presented on two congressional proposals that, if implemented, may result in implicit or explicit federal government endorsement of particular standards for the licensure or certification of teachers. They are, (a) authorization for the United States Department of Education to award design and implementation grants for programs of alternative teacher credentialing, and (b) appropriation of federal funds to support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

A discussion of the genesis of each proposal, a review of the legislative history of these two measures, and analysis of supporting rationale for each is included.

Using an analytic framework based on the works of Deborah Stone and Thomas Green, it was determined that unresolved policy conflicts over teacher education governance and content led to federal attention to matters of teacher certification and licensure.
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CHAPTER 1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In this research, policy case studies\(^1\) are presented of two congressional proposals that, if implemented, may result in implicit or explicit federal government endorsement of particular standards for the licensure or certification of teachers. They are,

(a) Authorization for the United States Department of Education to award design and implementation grants for programs of alternative teacher credentialing, and

(b) appropriation of federal funds to support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

A discussion of the genesis of each proposal, a review of the legislative history of these two measures, and analysis of supporting rationale for each is included. Three

---

\(^1\)The term "policy case study" as defined by the author is used to differentiate this research from a traditional case study of an event or an individual (see Yin, 1984) and from a historical case study in which the primary ordering principle is time sequence (see Strauss, 1987). The unit of analysis for the policy case study is a concept as it moves from the idea generating stage through a government's deliberative process. If successfully executed the idea or concept becomes government policy. Ultimately, the policy may be implemented through one or more government sponsored programs. In a policy case study the concept, how it is defined and redefined, and analysis of supporting claims are more important than enumerating legislative and executive branch events. See Chapter 2 for discussion of the policy case study methodology.
questions frame the study.

Research Questions

1. Does federal support for programs to alternatively license teachers or to establish a system of national teacher certification constitute a departure from previous federal government policy and practice in regard to setting or endorsing standards for teacher credentialling? Attention to this point includes investigation of whether previous federal policies have dealt with matters of teacher licensure. Whether shifting teacher credentialling from the state to the federal level was part of the policy debate and legislative intent for these two measures also is considered.

2. How did two proposals regarding to the federal government’s involvement in teacher credentialling arrive on the public policy agenda? Consideration of this question includes detailing development of the support base for each measure and whether policy makers’ endorsement of one proposal indicated their endorsement of the other.

3. What justifications do supporters put forward for federal attention to each of these two measures and are these justifications compatible or contradictory? Related to this question is investigation of the range of research and information available to policy makers, which research was influential in the decision making process, and why.
Premises

It might be expected that consideration of the federal role in teacher education would be a significant feature of debate on legislation pertaining to the licensure or certification of these state or local employees. However, as the legislative history of the two measures that are the focus of this investigation will indicate, this was not the case. Furthermore, no evidence was found that state governments intend to relinquish their authority over matters of teacher licensure. Thus, the appearance of two teacher credentialling measures on the federal policy agenda appears to indicate a growth in federal authority rather than a shift in authority from the states to the national government.

The analytic lens used to study the alternative teacher licensure and National Board for Professional Teaching Standards legislation draws upon and adapts the works of Thomas Green (1983) and Deborah Stone (1988) (details of this methodology are discussed in Chapter 2). Both Green and Stone suggest that the heart of policy studies involves attempts to resolve value conflicts or policy paradoxes. The utility of this "highbred" framework for policy analysis is affirmed by this study. In addition, it is suggested that this methodology should be expanded to include conflict over policy expectations and conflict between values and
evidence. Further it is proposed that lack of attention to potential federal, state, and institutional jurisdictional conflicts create unresolved policy paradoxes.

John Kingdon’s 1984 study of agenda building presents a number of factors that may lead to the placement of an issue on the public policy agenda. Arguably, teacher education and federal policy regarding the licensure of education professionals is a very small issue in comparison with other domestic policy matters. For that reason it might be assumed that the movement of either the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards or alternative licensure legislation onto the policy agenda was the work of one or two highly placed decision makers. There is evidence to support the conjecture that policy influentials are important gatekeepers in the political process. However, the powerful role of the media in sustaining supportive rationale statements made early in the agenda setting process through the legislative process was an unexpected finding. For both teacher credentialling measures unsubstantiated claims found in local and national media were repeated during the legislative process. Within a relatively short period of time these unsupported rational statements gained legitimacy in the policy community.

One might expect that because both legislative measures address teacher credentialling those decision makers who
supported one would support the other and opposition to one would predict opposition to the other. As this analysis will indicate, this was not the case. Even though both proposals were enacted into law, support and opposition was not consistent among policy makers.

Those who suggest that the political process is basically rational presume that decision makers weigh data that is presented on both sides of the issue and select the option supported by the bulk of research and other evidence (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Fischer & Forester, 1987; Stone, 1988). As indicated in the policy case study of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards legislation, the majority of witnesses presented supporting statements on behalf of the measure. However, the statements tended to be almost identical and based on the hope that the standards board would be successful rather than research to support the premise. In this situation it seems that repeating a very targeted, although not necessarily empirically-based message, was a determining factor in the legislation’s success. By comparison, in the policy case study of legislation to support the alternative licensure of teachers it is revealed that there were no hearings on the matter and policy makers’ endorsements of the measure often were based on anecdotal statements from the media and other sources.
Delimitations

Federal government involvement in matters pertaining to the recruitment, preparation, and continuing professional development of teachers is largely uncharted history. In the first part of this study previous and current federal legislative actions regarding teacher education are reviewed. Primary and secondary sources are used for the review, supplemented by interviews with persons involved in education policy making from the late 1950s to the present. The review's purpose is twofold, namely (a) to determine if previous federal legislation attempted to establish or endorse standards for earning a teaching credential and, (b) to provide a context for more complete analysis and understanding of the two proposals under study. No attempt is made to present a comprehensive history of all federal initiatives in education. Rather, the review addresses only those federal legislative remedies that sought to influence how most teachers are prepared. (For example, federal programs to prepare bilingual, vocational, or special education teachers are not included because their provisions relate only to specific categories of teachers.)

Hawley (1990) points out that "policy made is not policy implemented" (p. 137). This review only includes descriptions of federal intent. Attempting to describe the various ways in which state education agencies, local
education agencies, institutions of higher education, or individuals may have influenced teacher preparation by their use of discretionary federal dollars is beyond the scope of this work.

**A Note on Teacher CREDENTIALING**

Language used to describe the credential or credentials a teacher must hold for initial employment, continued employment, or to advance on a school district's salary scale is problematic. State governments do not use common definitions to describe the credentials they award. Some states call the teaching credential they issue a certificate and others use the term license, even though in each case the process and authorizing agency may be analogous. A look at the requirements for an initial teaching credential in several states illustrates this point. Florida and Nevada both require a bachelor's degree from an approved teacher education program, a passing score on professional and subject-matter knowledge examinations, and a fingerprint check before an individual may be granted a teaching credential. However, Florida's initial teaching credential is called the Temporary Certificate and Nevada's is the Provisional License (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AECTE], 1993). Neighboring states Kansas and Missouri require new teachers to complete an approved program, have at least a 2.5 grade point average on their
undergraduate work, and earn satisfactory scores on the National Teacher's Examination. After meeting these requirements, teachers in Kansas receive an Initial License while teachers in Missouri receive the Professional Certificate I (AACTE, 1993).

AACTE's 1991 survey of state teacher education policies found that eleven states used the term license and 40 states and the District of Columbia used the term certificate. However, in articles about standards for teaching, it is not uncommon to see the words used as synonyms. On occasion the terminology is befuddled even further by the use of "accreditation" to describe the process by which an individual meets the requirements to be a teacher (see the 1988 Republican Platform, An American Vision). It is interesting that the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education Certification (NASDTEC)--an organization representing state licensure officers--also begs the definitional question. In their 1988 Manual on Teacher Certification (Mastain, 1988), which lists requirements for earning a teaching credential in each state, the standard or regular teaching credential is called a "certificate," even for the 11 states that issue a teaching license. When the NASDTEC manual describes a state's emergency, substandard, or limited certificate or license the term "credential" is used, again disregarding
the state-adopted terminology.

Given the use of different terms for similar state regulations and procedures, it isn’t surprising that references to teaching credentials found in federal legislation, testimony, government reports, and media stories vary. Federal legislation to fund the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and supporting testimony consistently used the term "certificate" to describe the credential the Board intends to issue, whereas legislation and testimony related to supporting alternative credential programs used both "certificate" and "license." This mixing of terms is confusing to readers and obscures the important consideration of the federal government’s authority over standards for a teaching license, a teaching certificate, or both.

It is beyond the scope of this study to attempt to untangle or bring sense to the teacher credentialing process or to explain why states elect to call similar teaching credentials by different names. However, calls for the national certification of teachers and the emergence of federal legislation to support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has brought focus to the need for more precise use of the terms certification and licensure (Jordan, 1988; Lilly, 1991; Shive, 1988; Shulman & Sykes, 1986).
Shulman and Sykes (1986) distinguish licensure and certification according to the body that issues the credential. They define licensure as the "process by which an agency of state government grants permission to individuals to engage in the practice of a profession, and prohibits all others from legally doing so" (p. 25). Professional certification, on the other hand, is awarded by a non-governmental agency or association and "its purpose is to assure various publics that an individual has mastered a body of knowledge and acquired skills usually in a particular specialty" (p. 25). According to this framework, teacher credentialling and authority over standards for teacher education programs either are under the realm of government or non-government agencies. Table 1 illustrates this framework.
Table 1
Governance of Teacher Credentialling
and Teacher Preparation Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government Realm/Authority</th>
<th>Professional Realm/Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory/Voluntary</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Teaching License</td>
<td>Teaching Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Teacher education program</td>
<td>Teacher education program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approval</td>
<td>accreditation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jordan (1988) points out that a state’s responsibility to license teachers is grounded in that government’s obligation to protect both children in public schools and the educators who teach them.

The United States Constitution does not mention education. Thus, the general principle of U.S. constitutional law is that responsibility and authority for public elementary and secondary education are functions reserved for each of the 50 states. An extension of this principle is that states have an active role in licensing teachers. The rationale for state educator licensing programs is twofold. First, compulsory education requires parents to send their children to school, and parents have a right to assume (a) that an adequate standard of care is exercised while their children are under the care of the school, and (b) that the educators possess knowledge and skills related to teaching. Second the license provides the educator with protection from arbitrary dismissal based on the contention that the person does not possess the knowledge and skills related to teaching. (p. 7)

For purposes of this study, the framework of government verses professional issuance of a teaching credential is adopted. In the definitions that follow and throughout this
research, the credential to be issued by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards will be referred to as a certificate. This is consistent with the Shulman and Sykes (1986) definitions and is the terminology used by the National Board to describe the credential it will issue. Again utilizing the Shulman and Sykes framework and Jordan’s 1988 discussion of state governments’ authority over teachers’ credentials, the term license will be used to describe the credential issued by a state government. These distinctions will help clarify actions discussed in the two policy case studies reported in this research. These definitions should be seen as particular to this study but may be useful in distinguishing the role of state governments and the role of professional organizations in awarding teaching credentials.

**Definition of Terms**

The definitions that follow are a synthesis of current research on teacher credentialing, meanings used by the teachers’ organizations, teacher education program professional organizations and their accrediting bodies, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

**Terms**

**A Teaching License.** A license is a legal document issued by a government agency attesting a person possesses a
threshold level of prerequisite skills or competencies to teach children of an age and in a field specified on the credential. Holders of a license legally may engage in a specified profession or occupation while persons without a license legally may not do so. Eligibility standards are established by the government unit that issues the license and licensure is the process by which government attempts to assure the public that an individual meets minimum expectations for performing an occupation. For teaching an individual may hold an emergency, provisional or some other form of "substandard" license. These credentials may be issued when the applicant meets some, but not all, requirements for a "standard" license. The particular terms for these types of credentials vary considerably by state, although all licenses generally fall into one of four categories: emergency (issued to meet a teaching shortage), provisional (issued to persons who haven’t completed all requirements to be a teacher), standard (issued to persons meeting basic or entry-level requirements), and professional (issued upon completion of additional professional coursework or successful years of teaching).

**Teaching Certificate.** A certificate is a nonlegal document issued by a non-governmental agency or group indicating that a person possesses certain competencies. Certification is based on standards established by members
of a profession. These standards exceed those established for licensure.

Because this study includes consideration of a proposal to create a national certification system for teachers that is administered by a non-governmental body, the distinction between credential standards set and administered by government and standards set and administered by a professional body is an important one. Although much of the legislation reviewed for this research uses the term certificate for either a state or professionally awarded teaching credential, the terms "Certificate" or "License" are retained only when they are used as proper nouns. In these cases, level of credential intended is explained in the text. When the terms are used as common nouns, the above definitions apply.

**National Board Certificate.** This refers to the proposed "advanced" credential for teachers to be issued by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. At the time the two policy case studies described in this research were conducted, holding a state teaching license was not judged to be an important prerequisite to sit for the national board certificate examination. Recently, the governing body for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards agreed that individuals applying for a national certificate should hold a state teaching credential
(of any kind).

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). This is a private corporation that plans to assess public and private school teachers and upon successful completion of the assessment process award them a National Board Certificate. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is abbreviated NBPTS. The NBPTS requested and received a sole-source federal appropriation to support their activities. This raises the issue of whether standards for the nationally recognized certificate proposed by the NBPTS will or will not be federally driven.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for three reasons. In terms of the number of authorized programs and level of funding for these programs, the federal government’s attention to teacher education has been relatively modest. Yet, over three million persons are employed in instructional roles in public and private schools. Education policy at any level of government may influence how these persons are recruited, prepared, and rewarded in their careers. State and local actions regarding such factors as teacher licensure, testing, or remuneration have been documented and analyzed, yet similar attention has not been given to federally legislated teacher education policy. This study begins to
fill that void.

The political science and public policy literature are dominated by research that emphasizes exploration of the processes by which issues are placed on the policy agenda, enacted, or evaluated. Work in this area often attempts to establish and employ predictive models to understand why certain policy decisions are made. The analytic methodologies developed to study these phenomenon have stressed the use of rational analysis and often emphasize government processes (Fischer & Forester, 1987; Stone, 1988). For this study, primary consideration is given to the ideas undergirding the two policy options under study and the manner in which they represent societal conflicts over governance of teacher education. The particulars of this analytic framework, which is based on the works of Deborah Stone and Thomas Green, link Green's (1983) notion of education policy as value clashes to the suggestion of policy paradoxes put forward by Stone (1988). This hybrid framework is then applied to teacher education policy, an area generally neglected in the policy literature.

Finally, the role of the federal government in the preparation of teachers has been modest, generally indirect, and primarily restricted to the last 30 years. A review of this history indicates that legislative measures have been used to encourage persons to enter teaching, encourage study
in certain teaching fields, and encourage institutions of higher education or local units of government to provide inservice opportunities for educators. However, jurisdictional responsibility and authority for the development of standards for earning a teaching credential, and setting criteria to recognize which colleges and universities may prepare teachers for the public schools, have remained with state governments. Documenting this history provides evidence that federal authority may be expanding into an area previously under the purview of the states.

**Organization of the Study**

The discussion in Chapter 2 outlines the methodology used for the two policy case studies and describes how the works of Stone (1988) and Green (1983) are used to establish a conceptual framework for analyzing the two legislative measures reviewed in this study. In Chapter 3 a historical context for considering current federal attention to teacher licensure is presented. Particular emphasis is given to federal legislation from 1958 to 1990. The two policy case studies are described in Chapter 4. Both case studies are included in a single chapter because events occurred simultaneously and a parallel presentation illustrates the lack of association between the two within the policy community. Within this Chapter, attention is given to
justifications put forward by the legislations' supporters. A literature review determines the extent to which these justifications are supported by research and is included in Chapter 5. This is followed by an analysis of the claims and justifications put forward for the two programs. Consideration then is given to the political paradoxes or value conflicts that were not addressed in the policy debate. The Chapter concludes with the presentation of alternative theories regarding the "staying power" of policy arguments put forward during a measure's agenda-setting phase, and the efficacy of expanding the categories of societal conflict proposed by Green (1983).
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

Methodology

The purpose of this research is to track the evolution of two measures as they moved through the federal policy process, explore decision makers’ assumptions about government policy in regard to teacher preparation, employ a specific analytic framework to study the two measures’ rationales, and generate new theories in regard to factors that motivate decisions in regard to the federal government’s role in setting credentialling policies for teachers.

Ann Majchrzak (1984) notes that the policy arena is as complex as the social problem itself (p. 15). Consequently, policy research needs to address both the substantive and process aspects of the measure or measures under study. She further points out that the researcher must determine if the study is to focus on a solution or solutions for a policy problem or on problem definition (p. 16). This research falls into Majchrzak’s second category in that it’s purpose is to provide new insights into the federal government’s role in teacher education. It is not about finding answers to policy conundrums, but instead to explore the consequences of policy decisions that ignore societal
paradoxes or, by a policy action, create new paradoxes.

Majchrzak (1984) contends that the complexity of the policy making process lends itself to an empirico-inductive approach. This is an "iterative process whereby information and model building are constantly interchanged" (p. 19). Although some general premises about the policy process guided the conceptualization of this study, its purpose was theory generation rather than testing the validity of a research hypothesis.

The Policy Case Study

This research employed a case study approach. Two legislative measures--legislation to provide federal funding to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and legislation to authorize federal support for the alternative licensure of teachers--constitute the two cases. For each, the various factors that influenced the policy outcome (passage of legislation) were studied. These influences included circumstances leading to the arrival of these measures on the federal policy agenda and rationale statements put forward in support of each proposal.

Yin (1984) suggests that the case study approach is appropriate when ". . . 'how' or 'why' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context" (p. 13). Strauss (1990) and Borg and
Gall (1989) identify "historical case studies" as a particular type of research in which time sequence is the ordering principle. For research on legislative measures, the sequence of events is an important component, but it need not be the primary organizing factor. Rather, the focus of the study is the movement of an idea onto the public policy agenda and the translation of that idea into a government policy. Thus, a policy case study will have a temporal component—the movement of the legislation that embodies a particular idea through the lawmaking process—and a substantive component—the consideration of the value clashes that emerge during the policy debate.

As noted previously, two legislative measures constitute the policy case studies for this research. The study begins with the first recorded reference in the public policy arena to each proposal. For both alternative licensure and national certification of teachers this discussion began several years before legislation was introduced in the U.S. Congress. The cases conclude in early 1992 at the beginning of the 102nd Congress.

**Methodology for Chapter 3: Historical Context**

To gather information on the federal government’s previous involvement in the area of teacher credentialing, enacted legislation from the late 1950’s (post-Sputnik to the present) is reviewed. Materials that constitute the
legislative history of these measures—such as: testimony, committee reports, or floor statements—also are considered, as well as articles or other documents describing programs created by the legislation. Because testimony and other parts of an act’s legislative history may be incomplete or colored by the biases of those who supported or opposed it, written documentation was supplemented by interviews with persons who served as congressional staff or program administrators from the Eisenhower administration to the present. The purpose of the document review and interviews is to ascertain if, and to what extent federal education legislation regarding teaching had as its intent establishing standards for awarding a teaching credential.

Persons interviewed were asked to reflect on events of several decades ago and, on occasion, their recollections were sketchy or incomplete. Thus, the interviews cannot stand alone. They are useful, however, in combination with legislative histories and summaries from secondary sources to establish a context for analyzing current federal proposals in regard to credentialling teachers.

Interviews for this section were conducted in Washington, D.C. from September to November 1991. One interview was conducted by telephone and one respondent was asked to review and critique section three, the historical context, after it was completed. The five persons
interviewed were selected because they were identified in the legislative history and in secondary sources as holding key positions in government, either as congressional staff or as part of the administration. Respondents were asked to identify others who should be interviewed. The interviews themselves were unstructured. Each respondent was asked to identify what he or she felt were "watersheds" of federal involvement in the preparation of teachers. From that point, the individual had the option of describing the history as he or she recalled it. At some point in each interview, generally near its conclusion, each respondent was asked to name any federal legislation that dealt with teacher licensure or certification standards. The interviews lasted from 30 minutes to two hours and one interview, at the request of the respondent, was tape recorded. Interview notes were transcribed within a day of the interview appointment. This transcription involved recording individual's statements as well as linking responses to previous interviews and generating new questions to be answered by other respondents or to be clarified by later contacts with the interviewee. Verification of events described in written documents or suggested by other respondents was noted. Areas of variance in responses were flagged and used for follow-up questions and further review of written documents. In advance of each
interview, the field notes from previous interviews were examined for the purpose of framing additional questions. Material from the interviews was then classified as to whether it was verified data, data that appeared to be accurate but needed further verification, or material that appeared solely to represent the personal opinion of the respondent.

**Methodology for Chapter 4: Policy Case Studies of Alternative Licensure Legislation and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Legislation**

A primary purpose of the policy case studies presented in Chapter 4 is to identify claims put forward by supporters for each of the two measures under study. A chronology of their emergence on the policy agenda is included. Because the introduction of legislation to support alternative licensing of teachers and legislation to fund the work of the NBPTS were in the legislative process at the time of this study, extensive materials were available on each. Furthermore, this afforded the researcher the opportunity for "direct observation" of congressional hearings on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and a federally-supported conference on alternative licensure (Yin, 1984, p. 85).

In addition to reviewing legislation, testimony and committee reports, public statements by supporters of these
measures were considered, as were journal and newspaper articles. From this review sets of claims or value statements were identified. As Yin (1984), points out, archival evidence, newspaper and journal articles, and records of congressional deliberations must be carefully scrutinized for their accuracy. One strategy for determining the accuracy of written materials is to search for consistencies and inconsistencies within the documentation. Another strategy is to interview key decision makers and their staffs. These interviews served three purposes (a) to provide a measure of verification for written statements by those interviewed, (b) to provide a measure of verification of the documentation of events in which those interviewed participated, and (c) to probe into decision makers’ rationales for their statements and actions.

For this aspect of the study’s data gathering, "focused interviews" were used (Yin, 1984, p. 83). A focused interview technique employs a certain set of questions "derived from the case study protocol" but is conducted in a conversational style and the interview remains open-ended (Yin, 1984, p. 83). These interviews were conducted in Washington, D.C. from September 1991 to February 1992. Respondents were chosen by two methods. First, a list of persons cited in the legislative histories either by name or
by position was established. These were current or previous Department of Education employees, or individuals holding positions in the executive branch (Office of Management and Budget or the White House Domestic Policy staff). Congressional staff members who were interviewed included persons on a member’s personal staff as well as senior committee staff. In the Department of Education, respondents ranged from civil service program managers to an undersecretary of education. Two persons who served at the assistant secretary level, but were no longer in government also were interviewed.

The second phase in respondent identification utilized what is known as a "snowball technique" (Kingdon, 1984). This involves asking each of the initial group of respondents who else should be contacted, and in this manner expanding the pool of contacts. In a political community, where an individual’s status often is determined by who she or he knows, the snowball technique has a major drawback: the snowball generally rolls uphill. That is, persons asked to identify others to be interviewed will tend to select individuals they perceive to be at or above their position in the larger political environment. Although this theory is untested, conversations with Washington colleagues and with collegiate administrations suggest it has validity. Two steps were taken to prevent getting interview referrals
with only very senior persons in the Department of Education and on congressional staffs. Interviews with individuals in the initial group of respondents began with the most senior Department of Education personnel and congressional staff. Because of their positions, if these persons identified others, they were generally of lower political status. Second, during each interview, respondents were asked "Who did the staff work on this issue?" or "Who prepared the briefing materials?"

In all cases the "focused interview" format suggested by Yin (1984) was used. Interviewees were assured that direct quotes or comments would be attributed to them only with permission. This seemed to be a particularly important caveat for persons who were part of the Bush administration at the time of the interviews. Eighteen interviews were conducted, five with congressional staff, nine with persons from the executive branch, and four with persons formerly in government service. Core questions used in each interview follow,

Core Interview Questions

1. What is/was the nature of your involvement with legislation to alternatively license teachers (or the bill to appropriate funds for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards)?
2. Was this measure, in your opinion, generally an executive branch or a legislative branch initiative?

3. Do you believe alternative licensure programs (national certification of teachers) is a good idea? (Or, does the member of Congress for whom you work believe this is a good idea?)

4. Why is it a good idea? If enacted, what do you expect it to achieve?

5. What evidence (data, research studies, etc.) is cited to support statements in response to question four?

6. Who in the Department (on the Committee) did the staff work on this issue? Were briefing documents used? Who prepared them?

7. Who else should I speak with regarding this issue?

During the interview, respondents were asked the core questions and others generated by the conversation, as well as questions provoked by information from interviews with others. Respondents first were questioned about alternative licensure legislation then about the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards legislation. Responses were recorded separately for each measure.

Interview notes were transcribed within a day of the interview appointment. This transcription included recording the individual’s answers to questions as well as linking responses to previous interviews and generating new
questions to be answered by other respondents or to be clarified by later contacts with the interviewee. Confirmation of events described in written documents or suggested by other respondents were noted. Areas of variance in responses were flagged and became the focus of follow-up questions and further review of written documents. In advance of each interview, the field notes from previous interviews were reviewed for the purpose of framing new questions. Material from the interviews was then classified as to whether it was verified data, data that appeared to be accurate but needs further verification, or information that appears to be the personal opinion of the respondent.

**Methodology and Analytic Framework**

After the interviews were completed the policy claims in the data were identified. A review of the literature was conducted to determine the extent to which educational research supports claims put forward for each measure. For example, a common claim for alternative licensure of teachers is it attracts minorities into teaching careers, thus helping the nation achieve a more diverse teaching force. Enrollment data and other studies of minority recruitment are presented to assess the strength of this claim.

The literature review for claims associated with support for the national certification of teacher is more
problematic. Although alternative licensure of teachers has existed in certain states and school districts for some time and a modest body of program evaluation literature has emerged, the idea of a national procedure to credential teachers, as proposed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, is new and untested. As a result, after supporting claims for the NBPTS were identified, in some cases proxies were selected and used for the research review. For example, NBPTS supporters suggest that school districts will recognize the competence of teachers holding their certificate with salary increases. Thus, excellence in an individual teacher, will result in higher individual remuneration. A proxy for looking at the relationship between teacher competence and salary level is merit pay.

**Analytic Framework.** Stone (1988) suggests politics is about recognizing and resolving paradoxes in society. A policy paradox may occur when government action or actions result in apparently contradictory policy interpretations. A segment on the television program *60 Minutes* in 1991 described the Mexican government’s effort to reduce that nation’s population growth by the distribution of contraceptive devices. Those interviewed for the television program pointed to reduction in the birthrate in Mexico as support for claims that the program is effective. However, reporter Mike Wallace pointed out that in reality the
population growth in Mexico hasn’t been reduced. This is because government-supported birth control efforts were put in place in tandem with expanded maternal and child health programs; the latter reducing infant and child deaths. Although the policy of the Mexican government is to reduce its population, paradoxically, a government health policy has contributed to a population increase.

During the 1992 general election, many persons called for term limitations for members of the U.S. Congress. In making this argument they suggest that members of the Senate and House of Representatives appear to believe they aren’t really accountable to the individuals who elected them. Term limitations, supporters suggest, would restrict elected officials’ time in Washington and make them more accountable to the citizens. The paradox in this proposal is that term limitations for members of Congress may result in the delegation of more power over legislative decisions to staff persons who have no accountability to the electorate. Often paradoxes that cannot be settled by citizens or elected officials—such as whether public funding of private schools violates separation of church and state—move to the judicial system for resolution.

Green (1983) submits that the tools of public policy are used to resolve conflicts between societal ideals. He suggests ideals may conflict in three ways. First, they may
conflict because ideals have multiple meanings. The first National Education Goal, for example, states that "By the year 2000 all children in America will start school ready to learn" (AMERICA 2000, 1991, p. 19). School readiness is a social ideal that may mean mental readiness, physical readiness, social readiness, or a combination of the three. Struggles over educational choice suffer from conflict of meaning. Chubb and Moe (1990) put forward an argument for school choice that is based on economic assumptions: the presence of a system where information is accurate, complete, and available to everyone at no cost. In this market consumers (students or their parents) will select the best schools, creating a competitive and more successful education system. However, schools, themselves, are knowledge markets. That is, in an education system a consumer (the student) seeks schooling because he or she does not have perfect information. Much of the political debate about school choice centers on church-state entanglements or diverting public funds to private schools, yet a central conflict is one of meaning: the difference between educational and economic markets and how they operate.

In a similar vein, Stone (1988) suggests there are multiple ways to define the equal distribution of goods and services by governments. State lotteries are based on the
assumption that all who purchase tickets have an equal statistical chance of winning the offered prize. Merit pay for teachers is a form of rank based equality. That is, those who demonstrate a higher level of performance receive a greater share of available salary dollars. Student financial assistance to attend college (Pell Grants, Stafford Loans etc.) are based on the premise that ability to pay should be equalized among families of different incomes. In an attempt to improve education, both the executive and legislative branches of government have proposed giving financial awards to "excellent" schools and teachers. This system assumes education will improve--according to whatever measure is used--if money is put out as an incentive. In this type of resource distribution, schools with the most resources are likely to be in a better position to compete for the offered financial rewards. The paradox in programs that distribute funds on the basis of merit, such as the one described above, is that lacking up front money to improve existing programs, very poor schools may be unable to compete. Instead of increasing educational achievement through competition, wealthy schools will get additional resources while poor schools remain unchanged or decline.

Green's second type of conflict involves level of aggregation, that is, "some ideals make sense only when we
consider large aggregations and others only when we consider small ones" (Green, 1983, p. 319). When the Exxon Valdez accident polluted Alaskan waterways, government was faced with problems related to cleaning the environment and to preventing other such spills in the future. The prevention problem may be framed at a low level of aggregation: the need to assure that captains of super tankers are sober while in command of their ships. Or, the problem may be framed at a high level of social aggregation: the need to deal with United States citizens' demands for inexpensive oil.¹

Green (1983) points out that Americans want an educational system that embodies both excellence and equity, but that educational equality is a social ideal best achieved at a high level of social policy aggregation while educational excellence can best be pursued at a low level of social aggregation. Attempts to design and implement federal programs to assure that each child receives an "excellent" education may result in mandates and regulations that hamper an individual teacher's creativity. Thus, attempting to enact policy at an inappropriate level of social aggregation may create a paradox in which the goals of a policy may be thwarted by the programs designed to

¹Roger Soder of the University of Washington suggested this perceptive example.
implement it.

Green's third source of conflict involves policy implementation. When public funds are expended there is an expectation that government will account to its citizens for the use of these resources. He notes that to "track the federal dollar" and to be sure that federal funds are used to supplement rather than supplant state or local resources, children in compensatory education programs often are pulled out of their regular classroom or segregated into special classes (Green, 1983). However, when children are removed from their classroom for special services, they may miss other instruction. Thus, children in such programs may actually fall further behind instead of being brought up to the educational level of others in their cohort group. Consequently, mechanisms to assure accountability for the use of government funds may, paradoxically, conflict with the ideal of what is a good education for an individual child.

When policy problems and proposed solutions have apparently contradictory interpretations Stone (1988) calls it a paradox. Similarly, for Green a policy question is formed to "optimally resolve a conflict between different ideals all of which must be accepted but which, taken together, cannot all be maximized." He continues, "...we do not have a...fully formulated statement of a policy
problem until we are able to state the set of ideals or good from which the question arises, and state them so that their mutual inconsistency is evident."

(Green, 1983, p. 323)

In this study, the frameworks suggested by Stone and Green--that policy problems are about finding and coming to grips with conflicting ideals and the paradoxes these conflicts create--are used to analyze a proposed federal initiative to support the alternative licensing of teachers and congressional action to fund the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
CHAPTER 3
HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Relatively little has been written about federal policy in teacher education. Perhaps this is because the federal role in recruiting and preparing teachers has been, and continues to be, a very small part of the federal government’s domestic agenda. Currently federal policy regarding teaching may be found in independent authorities, such as the Christa McAuliffe Fellowship program (P.L. 102-325, 1992), which provides professional development opportunities for career teachers, or it may be imbedded in a larger categorical program, such as support for inservice education of Chapter 1 teachers (P.L. 100-297, 1988).

It is beyond the scope of this study to describe all federal education programs and their direct or indirect effects on teacher education. Thus, this chapter only includes descriptions of those authorizations that have, as a primary objective, programs to influence teacher preparation or recruitment. The intent of this examination is to determine if, prior to 1989, the federal government enacted legislation that mandated or endorsed particular standards for teacher licensure. A brief discussion of the states’ authority for licensing teachers begins this section, establishing their responsibility in this matter.
Federal teacher education initiatives are then described.

**State Licensing of Teachers**

Authority and responsibility for education in the United States are decentralized. As North America was colonized, settlers established schools for their children in the localities and regions that later became United States' cities and states. When a constitution was written for the new nation of the United States, the documents' Tenth Amendment stated, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Because the Constitution is silent on the education of its citizens, states relied on Tenth Amendment language to continue their responsibility for organizing and overseeing what became publicly supported schools.

For the most part, the federal role in elementary and secondary education has been limited to responding to educational needs that states and localities have been unable or unwilling to address (National Teacher Development Initiative, 1978; Stedman, 1990). Alexander and Alexander (1985) point out that federal involvement in education matters emanates from three sources,

(1) acquiescence by states in accepting federal grants that are provided under the authority given the
Congress by the General Welfare Clause; (2) standards or regulations that the Congress has authorized within the Commerce Clause; and (3) courts may constrain actions when they come in conflict with federal constitutional provisions protecting individual rights and freedoms. (p. 58)

Once public schools were established in the 19th century local officials controlled the hiring of teachers for those schools. In some localities an oral or written test was administered; some districts used course counting, a process by which a transcript review documents the completion of certain courses and establishes a person's qualification to teach; in other situations public school teaching was considered a patronage position (Roth & Pipho, 1990; Tyack, 1967). States began to exert influence over who became a teacher in the early part of the 20th century by establishing state guidelines for course counting (also known as transcript review) and through teacher education program approval. Under a program approval approach the state officially recognized programs to prepare teachers in one or more institutions of higher learning. After completing an approved program, graduates were determined by the state to be eligible for employment in public schools. Essentially, through program approval, the state delegated to colleges and universities the authority for determining
who was eligible to apply for a teaching position. By the second half of the 20th Century, in most states the local or county licensure procedures had been replaced by "certification upon completion of an institution's state approved teacher preparation program" (Roth & Pipho, 1990, p.127).

However, the notion of testing teachers was never totally abandoned. In the 1970s many states began requiring prospective teachers to pass an examination as well as graduate from an approved program. According to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, by 1987 44 states had implemented or decided to initiate requirements that teachers pass a written test before being awarded a teaching credential (Rudner, 1987). In reasserting their previous authority to regulate standards to enter teaching, state governments employ different means. For example, governance of teaching standards and assessment may rest with a state board of education, state education agency, or an autonomous professional standards board. The authority for teacher credentialling previously delegated to institutions of higher education is now, for the most part, firmly controlled by one of several of state government agencies.

States operationalize their legal authority over who may be hired by public schools by setting standards to evaluate and approve college and university teacher
preparation programs, by requiring that students in these programs be tested before a teaching license is issued, or both. The rationale for state involvement in standards-setting for public school teachers is grounded in Constitutional silence on a federal role in education and the belief that states' management of public education extends to accountability for those employed in the schools.

Hawley (1992) observes that this regulation of teacher education has placed education faculty and administrators in institutions of higher education in a unique relationship with state government. The norms of institutions of higher education place responsibility for curricular decisions with college or university faculty and state involvement in this matter is perceived as a violation of institutional autonomy. This point is echoed in Prestine's 1991 case study of teacher education in Wisconsin. Both Hawley's and Prestine's works illustrate the paradox that in attempting to satisfy the dictates of the state--without which a teacher education program can not exist--education faculty are placed at odds with colleagues responsible for instruction in the subjects future educators will teach. This paradox results from unresolved conflict between institutions of higher learning and state agencies over the governance of teacher education.
Federal Involvement in Teacher Education

Federal Role in Preparing Teachers Prior to 1958

The history of federal education policy is dominated by tension between the respective levels of government, by debate over the efficacy of federal support for education, and by concern about the implications of federal funding for private (parochial) schools. We find little in this history to suggest extensive federal interest in teacher education and, prior to 1989, no reference to federal involvement in the licensure of educators.

The 1870 Hoar Bill is an illustration of how interest in national standards for education (that potentially could have extended to the licensure of teachers) became framed as a debate over federal and state roles, issues of race, and government’s role vis a vis private schools. Five years after the Civil War, Massachusetts Representative George Hoar introduced legislation to establish a national system of general education to be carried out by the states in accordance with federal standards. This bill was intended to force Southern states to provide education for blacks. In much the same manner that state governments are now taking over educationally deficient local school systems, the Hoar bill would have granted the federal government authority to run schools in any state that did not meet federal standards. It was attacked by supporters of states’
rights as unconstitutional because they assumed it was a strategy to control education in the former confederate states. The National Education Association, which was appealing to the Congress for unrestricted federal education assistance, opposed Hoar's proposal as over regulatory (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations [ACIR], 1981). Basically, the arguments marshalled against the Hoar Bill represent conflicts over levels of policy aggregation: the authority of states and localities for education verses the authority of the federal government.

Economic concerns resulted in federal attention to education policy when 20th century manpower needs led to passage of the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act (P.L. 64-347, 1917). The purpose of the Smith-Hughes Act was to address national labor shortages related to a growing industrial sector through vocational education (Palmer & Sawhill, 1982). Matching funds were made available to states to support agricultural, industrial, and home economics education. States had considerable authority over the use of Smith-Hughes funds, including inservice education and teacher salaries. Edelfelt, Corwin, and Burke (1990) suggest that, notwithstanding the fact that federal money was used to support preparation for vocational education teachers, their "base of training was narrow...not many of the programs funded personnel development expressly and exclusively; and
most of the money for personnel development went into state grants, the use of which is not easy to trace." (p. 174)

The post World War II economy required workers with more sophisticated technical skills. Using the rationale that government support for science programs in K-12 schools and institutions of higher learning strengthens the nation’s economic competitiveness (promote the general welfare), in 1954 Congress established the National Science Foundation (NSF). One of the NSF-supported programs provided funds for summer institutes to upgrade teachers' skills in science (Edelfelt, et al., 1990).

In general, prior to the mid-1950s, the education debate focused on whether the federal government should fund any aspect of public education, not what educational efforts should receive federal monies. During this period battles involved federal intervention in what was seen as a state or local function (states' rights); implications of possible funding for religious schools; and whether or not federal funds should be used to ameliorate educative inequalities due to racial discrimination (ACIR, 1981). Although teacher education was indirectly influenced by the Smith-Hughes Act and creation of the National Science Foundation, neither authorization considered or established standards or requirements for teacher licensure.
Federal Role From 1958 to 1990

Jordan and Borkow (1985) describe federal support for teaching as generally limited and of relatively short duration. This view is supported by Stedman (1990) who characterizes the federal role in education as "focusing on issues of national importance that States and localities are unable or unwilling to address" such as equal educational opportunity (p. 9). Although standards for the preparation and licensure of teachers as well as the authority to award a teaching license remain a state function, issues of national importance have touched the schools and their teachers. An example of the latter occurred when the Soviet Union successfully launched the Sputnik satellite. In response, the Congress and the administration assembled an education package with a new federal purpose: national defense. Passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958 is an arbitrary, but commonly used, starting point for the federal government’s interest in teacher preparation (Clark & McNerney, 1990; Edelfelt, et al., 1990; Jordan & Borkow, 1985).

National Defense Education Act. The National Defense Education Act was a multifaceted piece of legislation that established a number of categorical programs to provide assistance to state and local education agencies to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, modern
foreign languages and other critical services. The delivery of programs for teachers in these disciplines was through summer institutes, similar in structure to those offered by the National Science Foundation (National Teacher Development Initiative [NTDI], 1978; P.L. 85-864, 1958).

NDEA was enacted relatively quickly, in part because of the belief that the nation's defense was in jeopardy and in part because many of the programs that eventually became part of the Act were under consideration before the Sputnik launch. One such program was support for high school guidance and counseling. The purpose of this initiative was to stimulate the preparation of counselors who then would identify talented students and track them into science and mathematics careers (ACIR, 1981; W. Smith, 1991).

Whereas NDEA moved quickly through the Congress, its passage was not without controversy. Arizona Senator Berry Goldwater said, "If adopted, the legislation will mark the inception of aid, supervision, and ultimately control of education in this country by federal authorities" (ACIR, 1981, p. 24). In response to concerns of Goldwater and others, language was added to Sec. 401 of NDEA to clarify that, "The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the states and local communities have and must retain control over and principal responsibility for public education" (P.L. 85-864, 1958).
Biglow (1991) speculates that in addition to establishing the link between education and national security, NDEA's attention to enhancing teachers' subject matter competence was an effort by Congress to fight progressive education, a point of view shared by Kaestle and Smith, (1982, P. 392). He notes that shortly before the passage of NDEA, the Congress received information on low academic achievement among public school children and increased numbers of high school drop outs. At least some members of Congress believed, he suggests, that problems in the schools were related to progressive education, which they felt stressed teaching techniques rather than the subjects to be taught. Whether anxiety over progressive education contributed to congressional decision making or not, the first NDEA-funded institutes supported improving teachers' subject matter competence not their teaching skills.

Amendments to NDEA in 1964 increased its funding and broadened the base of the original institute program by adding new subject areas such as English, history, geography, economics, civics, and special education. According to an analysis of federal discretionary programs with professional development components (NTDI, 1978) the NDEA institutes were devoted almost exclusively to short-term training for teachers already in the system. Title XI
of the Act’s 1964 amendments consolidated NDEA programs under the Division of Educational Personnel Training. This unit provided a connection between the NDEA discipline-based programs and teacher training, a move that helped government respond to requests by NDEA institute teachers for information on teaching strategies. It also provided the Department of Health, Education and Welfare greater program flexibility than found within the original categorical framework (NTDI, 1978).

NDEA is significant because it employed a categorical approach to federal aid to education, it increased federal funding for elementary and secondary education, and it linked education to national security. Undergirding the original NDEA programs was the belief that curricular effects are more important in terms of student learning than other school related variables (Stedman, 1990) and that the efficacy of the federal intervention could be measured by student scores on standardized tests. With the passage of NDEA the federal government made the education of mathematics and science teachers and counselors a priority, but neither the original authorizing legislation nor its subsequent amendments set standards for teacher preparation or licensure (Biglow, 1991).

During the early 1960’s members of Congress again looked to education to help solve a possible manpower
problem: What to do with returning Peace Corps personnel (Freiberg & Waxman, 1990; W. Smith 1991). According to Smith, members of the Kennedy administration wanted to establish a program to provide jobs for former Peace Corps volunteers, to address a perceived teacher shortage, and to help urban and impoverished rural schools. It was from these concerns that the Teacher Corps program emerged.

**Teacher Corps.** Teacher Corps was established in 1965 as Title V, Part B of the Higher Education Act (P.L. 89-328, 1965). The purpose of what then was known as the "National Teacher Corps" was "...to strengthen the education opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation" (NTDI, 1978, p. 34). Teacher recruitment and establishment of induction programs to prepare individuals at the school site were strategies to achieve the legislative purpose. According to W. Smith (1991), the influx of returning Peace Corps volunteers never materialized. However, because the program’s emphasis was on recruiting persons to teach in disadvantaged schools, the program attracted a significant number of minorities. Unlike NDEA, Teacher Corps didn’t use the education system to track the "best and brightest" into mathematics and science careers, nor did it achieve its initial purpose—the
re-employment of Peace Corps personnel. Instead, it began to advance a different agenda: targeting education services to disadvantaged populations.

Teacher Corps' focus and purpose were adjusted between 1967 and 1981 by a series of amendments and its placement into an education block grant. Initially Teacher Corps sought to introduce new educational research findings into programs for persons teaching disadvantaged children, to send persons who would serve as change agents into the schools, and to serve as a teacher recruitment mechanism (P.L. 89-328, 1965). The legislation's 1974 amendments included support for efforts to revise collegiate-based teacher preparation (NTDI, 1978) and, later, teacher inservice training (Jordan & Borkow, 1985; Stedman, 1990). At various times Teacher Corps funds were awarded on a competitive basis to institutions of higher learning with programs to prepare teachers and to local education agencies for teacher recruitment and induction. In these instances, however, Teacher Corps projects—in tacit recognition of state authority in teacher preparation, certification, and placement—were required to have state education agency approval before they received federal funds. According to William Smith (1991), who directed the Teacher Corps Program in the 1970s, the federal intent was not to require a common preparation program or set of standards for all persons
entering teaching. Nor did the federal government attempt to become involved in issues of teacher licensure.

Congress reauthorized the Teacher Corps program in 1967 as part of the Education Professions Development Act and in the 1970s it was returned to Title V of the Higher Education Act. For all intent and purposes, Teacher Corps ended when it was folded into a comprehensive state block grant through the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (P.L. 97-35, 1981).

**Education Professions Development Act.** In June 1967 the Education Professions Development Act (P.L. 90-35) was signed into law. According to Biglow (1991) and W. Smith (1991), belief that there was a teacher shortage and that it would continue into the future helped build a rationale for enacting this legislation. EPDA was an umbrella program designed to

...improve the quality of teaching and to help meet critical shortages of adequately trained educational personnel by (1) developing information on the actual needs for educational personnel, both present and long range, (2) providing a broad range of high quality training and retraining opportunities, responsive to changing manpower needs; (3) attracting a greater
number of qualified persons into the teaching profession; (4) attracting persons who can stimulate creativity in the arts and other skills to undertake short-term or long-term assignments in education; and (5) helping to make educational personnel training programs more responsive to the needs of the schools and colleges. (P.L. 90-35, 1967, Sec. 501)

Freiberg and Waxman (1990) assert that EPDA was "...hastily enacted with little debate and no [House and Senate] conference" in an attempt to reauthorize the Teacher Corps program that was set to expire in June 1967 (p. 619). Eventually EPDA came to include a number of authorizations, including special education for regular classroom teachers, career opportunities, early childhood, vocational education personnel development, Training of Teacher Trainers, education administration, Teacher Training in Developing Institutions, and Pupil Personnel Services (NTDI, 1978). Undergirding EPDA programs was the belief that teachers are a variable in student achievement, that there should be a knowledge-base for the preparation of teachers, and that it is proper for the federal government to fund programs intended to promote educators' professional as well as subject matter preparation.
Efforts to promote development of a more precise knowledge-base for teacher preparation programs were promoted by the U.S. Office of Education Bureau of Research through funding of ten research universities to develop models for preparing elementary school teachers (W. Smith, 1991). Smith points out that when it became clear in the late 1960s that funding for this project would end, the Office of Education commissioned a study of findings at the ten universities. The result of this study indicated that the conceptual idea linking research at all sites was competency-based teacher education (CBTE). Although a competency-based teacher preparation was never federally mandated, Smith suggests that CBTE research influenced the teacher education approach utilized in a number of Teacher Corps projects.

In 1976 the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development submitted a report on EPDA to the President. The report traced the history of the Act, discussed its unfulfilled agenda, and attempted to build a rationale for the continuation of EPDA programs. This was not to be; the 1976 education amendments repealed most EPDA programs.

EPDA was predicated on a teacher shortage that never materialized; there was internal dissent between new EPDA staff and pre-EPDA staff; the establishment of the National
Institute of Education in 1971 threatened EPDA's mission; and, its programs "...satisfied some people and groups not at all and some people and groups only partially. It's safe to say that for nearly everyone much of the dream ended in frustration" (Davies, 1974, p. 212). Yet, in the history of federal involvement in teacher education, EPDA is significant because its programs redefined the federal government's role to encourage educator's professional development and in so doing, stimulated thinking and discussion about the knowledge-base that supports the professional education of teachers.

**Teacher Centers Program.** The 1976 Higher Education Amendments included an authorization for the Teacher Centers Program (P.L. 94-482, 1976). Although the Teacher Centers program did not enjoy universal support in the House and Senate, backing of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers helped ensure its passage. The program provided funds to local school districts to plan and operate teacher renewal sites administered by a board of educators. The purpose of these centers was to coordinate inservice opportunities designed and delivered by and for teachers. Institutions of higher education could work with the centers, but their involvement was limited by statute. The Teacher Centers Program was short-lived, but its enactment signaled the growing

**Creation of the Department of Education.** The creation of a cabinet level Department of Education was a campaign promise of President Jimmy Carter. In 1977 the Congress began considering legislation to establish a Department of Education—the 130th time in its history it had done so (ACIR, 1981). Establishing an Education Department wasn’t a simple task. Even within the education community, creating a cabinet-level department did not enjoy universal support. The American Federation of Teachers, the National Catholic Education Association, and certain higher education groups opposed it, believing education would be stronger and actually receive greater support if programs remained disbursed among divisions within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Supporters argued a cabinet-level department would give education prestige and represented a more rational approach to federal education policy (ACIR, 1981).

There was some apprehension that the creation of the department would result in elimination of local school independence. In response to this, when the Department of Education Organization Act (P.L. 96-88) was passed in 1979,
it contained very specific language about federal and state roles. In Sec. 101—findings—the legislation states,

(3) parents have the primary responsibility for the education of their children, and States, localities, and private institutions have the primary responsibility for supporting that parental role;
(4) in our Federal system, the primary public responsibility for education is reserved respectively to the States and the local school systems and other instrumentalities of the States; (P.L. 96-88, 1979, Sec. 101)

Later in Sec. 103, the Act speaks directly to federal and state relationships,

Sec. 103. (a) It is the intention of the Congress in the establishment of the Department to protect the rights of State and local governments and public and private educational institutions in the areas of educational policies and administration of programs and to strengthen and improve the control of such governments and institutions over their own educational programs and policies. The establishment of the Department of Education shall not increase the authority of the Federal Government over education or diminish the
responsibility for education which is reserved to
the States and the local school systems and other
instrumentalities of the States.
(b) No provision of a program administered by the
Secretary or by any other officer of the
Department shall be construed to authorize the
Secretary or any such officer to exercise any
direction, supervision, or control over the
curriculum, program of instruction,
administration, or personnel of any educational
institution, school or school system, over any
accrediting agency or association, or over the
selection or content of library resources,
textbooks, or other instructional materials by any
educational institution or school system, except
to the extent authorized by law. (P.L. 96-88,
1979, Sec. 103)

The legislation is equally specific about what the
Department may do. Overall, the purpose of the Department
of education is to promote the general welfare of the United
States. Specifically, it is charged with coordinating
federal education activities, ensuring access to equal
educational opportunities, supplementing and complementing
state efforts to improve the quality of education, and
promoting improvements in educational quality through
research, evaluation, and information dissemination.

**Merit Pay Task Force.** In the early 1980s several states and school districts initiated programs of career ladders or merit pay for teachers, including a well-publicized effort in Tennessee promoted by then Governor Lamar Alexander. Recognizing the federal government probably had no role in teacher salary issues, but that it was a topic of high public interest, in 1983 the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor established a task force to explore merit pay for teachers. Then Representative Paul Simon (D-IL) chaired this task force. Its charge was to explore the quality of persons entering teaching, consider if salary differentials would attract more talented individuals into teaching careers, and advise the Congress and the public on the federal role in this matter. Jordan and Borkow (1983), in a briefing paper prepared for the task force, point out that "given the legal structure of American education and the usual concerns about infringement on State and local control over education, the possibility of Federal actions mandating national merit pay or a master teacher program likely would be viewed with considerable concern by State and local officials" (p. 17). Although the task force report included recommendations both for institutions of higher education and for school districts to enhance the status of teaching, the task force
did not support a federal role in establishing salary levels, salary scales, or merit pay criteria for teachers (Committee on Education and Labor, 1983).

**Higher Education Amendments.** Compared with the 1960s and 1970s, federal activity in regard to teacher education during the 1980s was modest. The Higher Education Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-374, 1980) reauthorized Teacher Corps and Teacher Centers, and established programs to prepare special education teachers and to provide grants to schools or colleges of education. However in 1981 Teacher Corps, Teacher Centers and roughly 30 other categorical programs were consolidated in an education block grant (P.L. 97-35, 1981)—essentially eliminating them as individually identifiable programs.

The 1984 Higher Education Amendments (P.L. 98-558, 1984) established scholarship provisions for persons going into teaching (initially called Perkins Scholarships they were later renamed Paul Douglas Scholarships) and authorized a program of fellowships for persons already in teaching. Originally called the Talented Teachers Program, this fellowship program was later renamed in honor of teacher Christa McAuliffe. Both Douglas Scholarships and McAuliffe Fellowships are administered by the states which receive appropriations on a formula basis.
Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 1986 (P.L. 99-498, 1986) saw the establishment of additional categorical programs in Title V. These included a program to fund colleges and universities to prepare midcareer persons as teachers, a program to establish Professional Development Resource Centers—which looked remarkably like Teacher Centers—and a program to support training for school administrators. The 1986 Amendments also required states receiving funds under Title V to establish task forces on teacher training to assess teacher supply and demand. Of these additional categorical programs, only Mid-Career Teacher Training and Leadership for Educational Administration Development (LEAD) were funded.

A number of current federal programs directly and less directly may support teacher education. They are categorized below on the basis of four broad purposes: Recruitment, Preservice Preparation, Inservice, and Support for Research on Teaching and Learning.

**Teacher Recruitment Programs.** Two current federal programs provide college scholarships and loans forgivable by teaching. The Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship Program (originally the Carl Perkins Program, then the Congressional Scholarship Program) was introduced and aggressively supported by Representative Ron Wyden (D-OR) a member of the 1983 Merit Pay Task Force. Now part of Title V of the
Higher Education Act (P.L. 102-325, 1992), Douglas Scholarships are actually forgivable loans for persons who enter teaching. Funds are divided among congressional districts and students who graduate in the top ten percent of their high school class may apply for these awards.

The Perkins Loan Program (previously Direct Student Loans) is authorized through Title IV of the Higher Education Act. The low-interest Perkins Loans may be forgiven for persons who agree to teach special education students or in schools receiving federal compensatory education funds through the ESEA Chapter 1 program (P.L. 102-325, 1992).

**Preservice Preparation.** Three programs offer federal support to institutions of higher education to prepare persons for education careers. The Midcareer Teacher Training program (P.L. 102-325, 1992, Title V) makes competitive awards to colleges and universities to design teacher preparation programs for individuals with bachelor’s degrees who want to become teachers. Two other major authorizations have provisions within them to support preservice preparation for certain kinds of teachers. Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped (Individuals with Disabilities Act, Part D) provides support for collegiate programs to prepare special educators, to operate parental education programs, and to prepare regular
educators to teach children with disabilities. Bilingual Training and Technical Assistance is part of Title VII of the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary Improvement Act (P.L. 100-297, 1988). Funds authorized for this purpose support programs to prepare bilingual education teachers.

**Inservice.** The federal government offers only one program devoted solely to teacher professional development—the Christa McAuliffe Fellowship Program. Authorized through Title V of the Higher Education Act (P.L. 102-325, 1992), this program awards grants to fund sabbaticals for teachers. It also was an initiative of Oregon Congressman Wyden and an outgrowth of the 1983 Merit Pay Task Force. Certain elementary and secondary education programs allow funds to be used for teacher inservice but in each situation it is a small part of the total authorization.

**Research.** One can argue that any research or data gathering related to children and schooling ultimately will influence teachers during their initial preparation, through inservice activities, or both. This perspective notwithstanding, there are only two federally supported research activities directly related to teaching. The Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching (FIRST) supports school site research, and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement has awarded five-year
grants to two national centers for research on teacher education and evaluation.

**Summary**

State regulation of teacher education through program approval and by establishing standards for educator licensure resulted in a level of aggregation conflict between state government and institutions of higher learning. In general, this tension continues and probably slows attempts to change collegiate based teacher education. Because the federal government has been silent in regard to mandatory standards for teaching or the teacher education curriculum, to the present time it has been a neutral factor in this level of aggregation conflict.

The U.S. Constitution provides no guidance on the purpose of schooling—and, related to this, the U.S. government's role regarding standards for teaching. Consequently, the role of schools in society has been redefined continuously over time in response to public expectations and political needs. The history of federal involvement in teacher education reflects this redefining of purpose. Initially, educator preparation was seen as a means to promote manpower production through vocational education. This link between education and the economy was expanded in the 1950's to a broader general welfare argument: national defense. Briefly, during the Kennedy
and Johnson Administrations, teacher education was seen as a way to promote a social agenda—minority advancement. By 1989 the federal role in teacher preparation was one of support for general recruitment in times of shortage, of assistance to institutions of higher education in preparing particular kinds of teachers (special education, vocational, bilingual, or to work with disadvantaged populations), of funding in-service activities, or of research. The federal authority to support these initiatives is vested in the General Welfare Clause of the Constitution which allows the appropriation of categorical, or conditional, aid to states, institutions, or individuals for a range of purposes, including education.

Although certainly it can be argued that actions of individuals, institutions of higher education, or state and local governments may have been influenced by federally supported research (such as competency-based teacher education) or by the availability of discretionary programs (such as those authorized through EPDA), before 1989 federal interest in teacher education did not extend to licensure or mandated standards for professional preparation. Identifying specific standards for good teaching and supporting activities to hold teachers accountable to these standards for a teaching credential have not been part of the federal education portfolio. In fact, when the
Department of Education was established, the Act clearly reaffirmed state and local government’s authority over most education functions.

From this historical review it becomes clear that although the federal role in education expanded between 1953 and approximately 1990, there is no evidence of a shift in authority over teacher licensure from state governments to the federal government. In fact, state regulation of teacher preparation through institutional program approval and state-established licensure standards does not suggest these units of government are relinquishing their authority over employment criteria for teaching.
CHAPTER 4

TEACHER LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION AND FEDERAL POLICY

In this chapter policy case studies of alternative licensure for teachers and federal funding for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards are presented. Included are discussion of events contributing to the issues' movement onto the federal policy agenda. Although these two measures were considered by the same congressional committees during the same time frame (1988-1992), this review will show that for the most part decision makers were unaware of (or ignored) conceptual connections between the two.

Testimony, legislation, committee reports, statements by members of the administration and the Congress, and other written materials are supplemented by interviews with congressional staff, department of education officials, and White House representatives. In this Chapter supporting rationales for federal government involvement in the licensing of teachers are identified and noted.

Background And Agenda Setting: Alternative Licensure

The New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program

In 1992, when Thomas Kean became governor of New Jersey, teachers in that state received their licenses
through a program approval process established in accordance with state standards. Students who completed a state-approved collegiate program with an education major, or a major in another area supplemented by the required pedagogical courses, were issued a state teaching license. Students were not required to pass the National Teacher’s Examination or other state mandated assessment to receive their credential (Carlson, 1990; Natriello & Schechter, 1989).

New Jersey also had a teacher shortage. Colleges and universities in the state either couldn’t prepare sufficient teachers for New Jersey classrooms, students who earned teaching credentials at these colleges and universities chose to work outside of the state, or both. The teacher shortage was particularly acute in urban areas of New Jersey, such as Trenton and Newark. As a result the state issued a number of emergency licenses to individuals to work in these schools. These persons had little or no teacher preparation and some did not hold bachelors degrees (Kean, 1983, December 7; Natriello & Schechter, 1989).

Carlson (1990) reports that during the late 1970s and into the 1980s there was concern in New Jersey about the quality of persons enrolled in programs to receive a teaching credential. In 1978 the New Jersey legislature established a Commission to Study Teacher Preparation
Programs in New Jersey Colleges. The staff person for the Commission was an employee of the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, Leo Klagholz. The Commission released a series of recommendations in 1981 regarding grade point average (GPA) for admission into teacher education programs, required field experience, and basic skills assessment. Thus, when Thomas Kean became governor of New Jersey teacher education reform already was part of the state's policy agenda (Carlson, 1990; Natriello & Schechter, 1989).

Governor Kean had experience in education. He first taught social studies in a private school, then earned a masters degree at Teachers' College, Columbia University. According to Natriello and Schechter (1989), Kean felt he understood the arguments for and against pedagogical preparation for teachers. The Governor appointed Saul Cooperman, a former local school superintendent to be Commissioner of Education. Leo Klagholz was asked to head Teacher Education and Certification in the Department of Education. It was in a climate of national attention to reforming education that Kean, Cooperman, and Klagholz proposed the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program—a plan to bring "qualified" persons into teaching through an alternate route (Carlson, 1990; Natriello & Schechter, 1989).
The establishment of the Provisional Teacher Program in New Jersey was the result of a policy paradox. As noted above, one of the problems facing the New Jersey education system was the need to issue a large number of emergency credentials, often to persons with minimal qualifications, to assure that urban classrooms were staffed. The paradox, as described by New Jersey officials, is that "... on the one hand, our system prevents us ordinarily from issuing standard certificates to the many competent scientists who apply while, in an economic emergency, we are willing to accept as teachers individuals who have not even acquired a college degree" (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1983, p. 5). Imbedded in this paradox is what Green (1983) would identify as a conflict of meaning, namely: What is meant by a well prepared teacher? This friction may be traced to unresolved conflict between the state and institutions of higher education over control of teacher education and its curriculum.

The New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program—which also is referred to as the "alternate route"—was announced by Governor Kean in a speech before a joint session of the New Jersey Legislature on September 6, 1983. The Governor's speech mentioned teacher salaries, school discipline, and bilingual education, however the alternative route to teaching received the most media attention, perhaps because
it was seen as a new notion or perhaps because copies of An Alternative Route to Teacher Selection and Professional Quality Assurances: An Analysis of Initial Certification (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1983)—the description of the proposed Provisional Teacher Program prepared by the New Jersey Department of Education—were available for the press at the time of the Governor’s speech.

The rationale for proposing changes in the education system advanced by Kean was an economic one. In his speech before the New Jersey legislature the governor said,

The gap between our need for rigorous schooling and our ability to provide that schooling is far too wide. We know, as one national report put it, that knowledge is power, that trained intelligence is a chief component of a nation’s productivity, of its ability to innovate, and of its general economic health. (Kean, 1983, September 6, p. 1)

It isn’t surprising that this argument is put forward. After his election as governor, Kean became a member of the Education Commission of the States’ Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. This task force, which included governors James Hunt (NC), Pierre du Pont (DE), Lamar Alexander (TN), Robert Graham (FL), Richard Lamm (CO), Scott
Matheson (UT), George Nigh (OK), Robert Orr (IN), Rudy Perpich (MN), Charles Robb (VA), Richard Thornburgh (PA), and William Winter (MS) supported merit pay, tougher school standards, and teacher assessment as means of creating a more economically competitive education system (Education Commission of the States, 1983). The message that economic growth is dependent upon a strong education system also was reflected in the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s report, A Nation at Risk, released nine months earlier and listed as a reference in the New Jersey Department of Education’s plan for the provisional teacher program (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1983).

Implementing the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program involved revising state regulations to allow a teaching license to be given to persons who (a) have a bachelors degree in any subject, (b) pass a test in the subject matter to be taught, and (c) complete a supervised internship in a school. The rationale for this particular approach was based on several considerations. The quality of persons entering teaching was the first. Program supporters asserted that teacher preparation programs had lowered admission standards during the 1970s in an attempt to attract students (Natriello & Schechter, 1989). Weaver’s 1979 study of Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores of students who indicated teaching as a possible career choice
on the biographical section of the examination was presented as evidence. The Weaver study reported that SAT scores for persons indicating an interest in teaching or who ultimately majored in education were lower than scores of persons pursuing other careers. Weaver's interpretation is open to criticism because he assumed a correlation between high school students who check teaching as a possible career when they take the SAT and persons who actually are admitted into teacher preparation programs. In addition, there is no evidence to support the assumption that there is a relationship between SAT scores and a teacher's job performance. However, the New Jersey State Department of Education accepted the premise that SAT scores have predictive validity for future career performance. When they determined that "...SAT scores of students entering New Jersey teacher preparation programs have been consistently lower than those of nearly all other college majors" supporters of the alternate route to licensure felt they had the documentation they needed (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1983, p. 2).¹

Another consideration for those who designed the New Jersey plan, was the belief that teaching, as a discipline, lacked a substantive professional knowledge base. They felt

¹Problems related to the use of SAT data to judge teacher quality are examined in greater detail in Chapter 5.
that collegiate-based teacher preparation, in and of itself, was insufficient for good teaching,

... education is a profession in which the relationship between success in the training program and actual competence in the classroom is tenuous. There are individual studies which can be cited to support the predictive validity of some teacher education programs. However, in general, the literature on teacher education indicates a low degree of consistency among the programs and does not establish a relationship between success in the program and future teaching effectiveness. (New Jersey Department of Education, 1983, p.4)

Carlson (1990) suggests that Kean and Cooperman were "new on the state scene and fresh with promise and ... [they] embodied hope for something better" (p. 2). He points out that they publicized the New Jersey alternate route to teaching under the rubric of competition, economy, and reform. They claimed (a) it would create competition for collegiate teacher preparation programs, causing everyone to do better, (b) it would be a more efficient use of individual and state resources because the preparation time would be shorter, and (c) it would reform the existing emergency license system that allowed persons who might not
even hold a bachelor's degree to teach.

The New Jersey plan received considerable positive attention in the press. Carlson (1990) notes that Kean's proposal was backed by the state's largest paper, the Star-Ledger (Newark). In the months following the announcement of the alternative route numerous articles favorable to the governor's plan were published in the New Jersey and East Coast press (see, for example, Braun, 1983, May 1984, June 1984; Cooperman, 1984; Maeroff, 1985; Van Tassel, 1983). In addition, Governor Kean promoted the Provisional Teacher Program in speeches inside and outside of the state. On December 7, 1983 the United States Department of Education held a National Forum on Education in Indianapolis, Indiana. Addressing participants at the forum, which was attended by other governors, members of Congress, and President Ronald Reagan, Kean reiterated his concern about the pool of persons eligible to be hired as teachers,

We have measured those who are now preparing to enter the [teaching] profession and have found them wanting. As a group, they score among the lowest of their peers on almost every measure of academic ability. In New Jersey, 57 percent of the new students in our public colleges' education programs scored less than 400 on the verbal SAT. forty-seven percent of them scored less than 400 on the math section. These are far below
the averages of all New Jersey college-bound students. We cannot allow the academically deficient to teach our children. (Kean, 1983, December 7, p. 2)

He then described the alternative route he had proposed to the legislature four months earlier "...as a way that the most able in our society can bypass traditional teacher training courses and enter the classroom by means of an intensive internship" (Kean, 1983, December 7, p. 2).

Policy makers tend to listen to individuals from "role alike" groups (Gilley & Fulmer, 1986; Marshall, Mitchell, & Wirt, 1989). That is, governors respond positively to proposals from other executive branch officials, state legislators get ideas from legislators in other states, and chief state school officers exchange education ideas through their own networks. Governor Kean, New Jersey's chief state school officer, Saul Cooperman, and the New Jersey certification officer, Leo Klagholz, described the merits of the New Jersey alternate route at a number of education and education policy meetings in the mid-1980's including those of the National Governors' Association and the Education Commission of the States, (Braun, 1983). Thus, it isn't surprising that other states began to report the existence of alternative licensure proposals, even though they varied considerably (Darling-Hammond, 1991; Earley, 1991; Stedman, 1990; Zumwalt, 1991). Although the New Jersey Professional
Teacher Program probably was the most commonly recognized state initiative, it was but one of a variety of alternative models. As Darling-Hammond (1991) and Earley (1991) note, many state agency reported "alternatives" actually were pre-existing emergency licensure options.

In a case study of the establishment of the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program, Carlson (1990) observes that teacher education faculty and administrators in the state opposed the alternate route. Certainly some of this disagreement was born of economic fear. Although the initial rationale for the New Jersey Alternate Route was to address the proliferation of emergency licenses, the program was made available to any bachelors degree holder who wanted to become a teacher. Teacher educators worried that the state-supported and promoted alternative program would result in the downsizing of collegiate-based teacher preparation programs and lead to faculty dismissals. However, the argument most commonly was framed as concern about the quality of professional preparation alternative route students would receive. The essence of the debate involved a conflict of meaning between teacher educators and supporters of the alternate route over what characterizes a qualified beginning teacher.

The New Jersey Department of education addressed this issue by appointing an external panel of educators, chaired
by Ernest Boyer, to identify "1. what is essential for beginning teachers professionally to know?, and 2) what teaching skills and abilities are most effective?" (Boyer, 1984, p. 1). The report of this panel, which totaled 14 double-spaced pages, addressed general domains of knowledge, such as assessment, individual differences, the K-12 curriculum, the subject to be taught, and effective teaching skills. The only education field not included in the panel's report as necessary for a beginning teacher was foundations of education. However, roughly a third-of-a-page was devoted to why this domain is important, although not included. The points addressed in the Boyer Report were very general and were ones that the teacher education community could not oppose. Thus, conflict over the components of a good teacher preparation program—a conflict of meaning—was neutralized.

Established to address a paradox that originated with unchecked issuing of emergency teaching licenses, the New Jersey Provisional Teacher program produced new paradoxes. While the alternative route was being debated and ultimately implemented by the New Jersey State Board of Education, requirements for students pursuing a teaching license in the state's colleges and universities were being held to higher standards. Carlson (1990) reports that in the mid-1980s a student enrolled in an institution of higher education
planning to become a teacher needed 50 credit hours in
general education, including mathematics, science and
technology in addition to his or her other undergraduate
requirements. Persons licensed through the Provisional
Teacher Program, on the other hand, did not need to meet the
general education distribution as part of their
undergraduate degree. Paradoxically, teacher licensure
requirements were at the same time highly regulated and
prescriptive (for students in colleges and universities) and
deregulated (for persons electing the alternative route). A
second paradox involves professional and public
accountability for persons who are employed in public
schools. Under Governor Kean’s plan, the New Jersey
alternative route was to be developed and delivered by state
and local education agencies. Thus, alternative preparation
programs for teachers would be operated by the agency also
authorized to evaluate and approve collegiate-based
programs. This structure provided no external professional
accountability or review of the alternate route, such as
that afforded by college and university program
accreditation. For the New Jersey alternative licensure
program the state attempted to assume both professional and
citizen watch-dog roles. Some educators feared the state
agency would deny approval to college and university teacher
education programs as part of a strategy to channel students
into state-operated alternative programs (Carlson, 1990).

Alternative Licensure and President Reagan

Ronald Reagan brought a philosophy to the presidency that advocated market-based remedies for social problems instead of government-sponsored social engineering (Labaree, 1992). Reagan called this approach, "New Federalism." It was characterized by a reduction in federal funding for a number of domestic programs and limiting regulations for those programs that did receive federal dollars. New Federalism assumed a preference for decentralization over bureaucracy (Labaree, 1992) and accepted that "...state and local authorities and citizens are the proper and most effective means of action and change" (Jung & Kirst, 1986). It was within this context that the alternative licensure of teachers began to be discussed at the federal level.

Reagan was the first President to speak about alternative teacher licensure. He applauded the 1983 New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program in a speech in Indianapolis, Indiana on December 9, 1983--the same meeting at which Governor Kean had spoken two days earlier (Reagan, 1983). Although President Reagan lauded the New Jersey program, consistent with his "bully pulpit" approach to education policy, he did not suggest that it, or other state plans like it, be supported by federal resources.
By the mid-1980s the federal government's attention to alternative teacher licensure had begun to move beyond the President's bully pulpit. In early 1986 the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation awarded a grant to Policy Studies Associates (PSA) to study alternative teacher programs and the persons who participate in them. As Hawley (1990) points out, the PSA study was poorly designed and executed,

This study draws some conclusions which appear to provide strong support for [alternative certification] (AC). For example, the report asserts that AC attracts persons to teaching whose effectiveness in the classroom is greater than that of traditional certification (TC) teachers. To be blunt, this study is so weak that it could be used in teaching research methods as an example of what not to do. This study bases its conclusions about AC "Program results" on interviews with 26 participants in ten different programs (a total of 26, not 260 interviews) and on assessments of the performance of 16 AC candidates in seven programs by their supervisors. No indication is given of how respondents were chosen. The programs studied range from New Jersey's school-based state licensure program to Harvard's mid-career program. Some are not AC programs at all but simply different
models of teacher preparation. Despite the enormous variety in the programs, all interview results are collapsed into one pool. No data were gathered on TC programs or candidates. (p. 10)

The federal government’s attention to alternative licensure wasn’t confined to support for data gathering and analysis, such as the PSA study. In September 1986 Secretary of Defense Weinberger and Secretary of Education Bennett signed a joint statement to encourage retired and retiring military personnel to consider second careers as teachers or administrators. This agreement obligated the Department of Education to inform retired military personnel of ways in which they could pursue education careers. The Department of Defense agreed to make this information available in military retirement offices and education centers (U.S. Department of Defense, 1986; U.S. Department of Education, 1986). Implicit in this agreement was the expectation that military retirees would be directed to alternative licensure programs (Baird, 1991; Finn, 1992).

In spite of its design and methodological problems, the PSA study referenced above was accepted and used as justification for future federal government attention to alternative licensure of teachers. The PSA study and information from the New Jersey Department of Education were cited extensively in a 1987 White Paper prepared by the
Department of Education’s Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation (Opening Alternative Routes to Teaching, 1987, p. 1). In this White Paper, which was sent from Secretary Bennett to governors and chief state school officers, the Administration’s grounds for supporting alternative licensure began to emerge,

Alternative teacher certification offers States and local districts an excellent opportunity to improve the quality of teaching. This is a strategy for dealing with:
- The poor academic backgrounds of many prospective teachers,
- The poor quality of many teacher training programs,
- State certification requirements that discourage well-educated applicants. (Opening Alternative Routes, 1987 p. 1)

The White Paper reflected an anti-teacher education and anti-credentialling mind-set that reflects the Reagan Administration’s inclination toward deregulation and market remedies (Kolb, 1991). At the same time, it signaled the beginning of alternative licensure’s movement from the bully pulpit to the federal government’s policy agenda. In the White Paper those components that should be included in alternative licensure programs are outlined. They include,
o Require candidates to be competent in their subject areas, as indicated by (1) appropriate academic training and (2) a passing score on a rigorous test of subject matter knowledge.

o Provide intensive field experience, which may involve full responsibility for a classroom.

o Provide close supervision, significantly exceeding that usually provided to student teachers or first year teachers. (Opening Alternative Routes, 1987, p. 2)

The evidence presented in the Administration’s White Paper for the alternative licensure criteria is anecdotal, drawn from the PSA study and reports from the state of New Jersey. The extent to which, if at all, these criteria were compatible with existing state licensure practices was not addressed.

Alternative teacher licensure shows up two more times during the Reagan Administration. In January 1988 the President mentioned it in his State of the Union Address (Reagan, 1988) and when the Republican Platform statement was adopted in the summer of the same year, the party’s education agenda included, "Making use of volunteerism from the private sector and providing opportunity for accelerated accreditation for those with needed expertise [to] broaden the classroom experience and encourage excellence" (An American Vision, 1988, p. 41).
Between the development of the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program in 1983 and the election of George Bush as President of the United States in 1988, alternative licensure moved onto the federal policy agenda and became a goal of the Republican Party. Its supporters were relatively few, but had sufficient political influence to get the attention of the President of the United States and to influence the Republican Platform Committee. By 1988 four arguments favoring alternative licensure had emerged: (a) A manpower argument. Alternative licensure would provide a mechanism for retired military personnel and persons from business and industry to enter teaching. (b) A quality argument. Persons who enter teaching through an alternate route were expected to be better than those who completed, or were enrolled in, traditional college or university programs. (c) A deregulation argument. Alternative licensure was seen as a form of choice, it would open up a job market that was traditionally closed by collegiate requirements and state regulations. (d) A reform argument. Alternative licensure was perceived as new, innovative, and anti-status quo (Opening Alternative Routes, 1987; An American Vision, 1988; Reagan, 1988).
Background and Agenda Setting: The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

During the mid-1980s many states were enacting alternative licensure programs (or renaming their emergency programs "alternative licensure"). One interpretation of these actions is that policy makers were rejecting the importance of professional preparation of teachers in favor of apprenticeship-type training. However, during the same time frame other educators and decision makers were designing a plan that supporters argued would link an advanced teaching credential to standards developed by a private, but federally supported organization.

Alternative teacher licensure appears to dismiss the importance of professional preparation while national certification would seem to endorse advanced preparation, yet these two proposals made their way onto the federal policy agenda in a similar manner. Like the notion that the federal government should support alternative licensure of teachers, the idea that an organization offering a national certificate for teachers should receive a special federal appropriation did not originate in the Congress. In addition, positive media attention played a role in moving national teacher certification on to the federal policy agenda. Agenda setting for national teacher certification, like alternative licensure, began several years before it
emerged as a federal legislative initiative.

The recommendation to establish an organization to be called the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards first surfaced in a report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, one of a number of education reform reports unveiled during the mid-1980s (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986). However, the idea that teachers should take and pass a national examination did not originate with that task force report. In 1983, two years prior to the appointment of the Carnegie Task Force and three years before its report was released, American Federation of Teachers (AFT) president Albert Shanker proposed requiring a two- to three-year internship for all new teachers during which they would be assessed by supervising teachers and administrators (Jordan, 1985). Later, in early 1985, the AFT leader called for the establishment of an American Board of Professional Education. Similar to boards that assess physicians, the body Shanker envisioned would be composed of educators and charged with developing and administering a proficiency examination for new teachers. The Shanker proposal assumed that the national professional board he suggested would review research related to teaching and learning, leading to changes in the teacher preparation curriculum and ultimately resolve problems associated with competency testing measures
existing at the time (Jordan, 1985).

Jordan (1985) points out that when Shanker made his standards board proposal, three broad questions were being raised about the efficacy of state-mandated teacher licensure tests. One concern was whether or not a standardized "paper and pencil" test could adequately measure both academic competence and teaching skills (Jordan, 1985; P. Smith, 1987). A second point involved whether the purpose of the exam was to evaluate the quality of the individual taking it, to evaluate the quality of the candidate’s teacher preparation program, or both (Jordan, 1985, p. 11). A final issue was determining what level of test performance would assure the public that the new teacher met minimum qualifications to be responsible for a classroom of children (Stedman, 1984). This last point, debate over the appropriate cut score for a beginning teacher’s licensure examination, reveals a policy paradox,

...state [testing] efforts have been criticized from two opposing positions; some educators have contended that the minimum passing scores in some States were too low to ensure that only competent persons were allowed to enter teaching, and others have contended that the passing scores are too high and that the content of the examinations is racially biased against blacks and some other minority groups. (Jordan, 1985, p. 24)
The problem Jordan identifies is the result of unresolved conflict over the purpose of the licensure examination’s cut score. Although teacher competence is generally cited as the reason for selecting a particular test score as the minimum for earning a license, there is an absence of evidence linking scores above or below certain levels with good or poor teaching. Instead the identification of a particular test score as necessary for teacher licensure may be related to (a) a desire by state policy makers to reinforce their authority over matters of teacher licensure or (b) the state’s interest in regulating the supply of persons eligible for employment in public schools (Hawley, 1992). Like much of the debate around alternative licensure, the issue underlying arguments over the appropriate cut-score for a teacher licensure exam is a conflict over the definition of good teaching and how it is measured.

Creation of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession

In January 1985 the Carnegie Corporation of New York established, and provided resources to support, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. The Forum had a four-person staff and was "...created to draw America’s attention to the link between economic growth and the skills and abilities of the people who contributed to that growth,
and to help develop education policies to meet the economic challenges ahead" (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. iii). A nineteen-member Advisory Council provided programmatic direction for the Forum. Eight council members were drawn from business and industry, four were federal or state government officials, and the remaining seven were current or former administrators or faculty in institutions of higher education. At the Advisory Council's first meeting, in March of 1985, they decided to "...assemble a group of leading Americans to examine teaching as a profession" (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. 111). This assembly was called the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession.

The Task Force on Teaching as a Profession had fourteen members: Lewis M. Branscomb, an IBM Vice President (Chair); Alan Campbell, Executive Vice-President of ARA Services; Mary Hatwood Futrell, president of the National Education Association (NEA); John Gardner, a writer and consultant; Fred Hechinger, President of the New York Times Company Foundation; Bill Honing, California's Superintendent of Public Instruction; James Hunt, an attorney and former governor of North Carolina; Vera Katz, Speaker of the Oregon House of Representatives; Thomas Kean, Governor of New Jersey; Judith Lanier, dean of the College of Education at Michigan State University and a founder of the Holmes Group; Arthuro Madrid, President of the Tomas Rivera Center;
Shirley Malcom, a program director with the American Association for the Advancement of Science; Ruth Randall, Commissioner of Education in Minnesota; and Albert Shanker, President of the AFT.


**Task Force Recommendations.** In its report the Task Force presented eight recommendations they concluded would transform the educational system by changing the environment for teaching. This decision, to focus on restructuring the teaching profession, stemmed from the belief that more sophisticated levels of instruction for children and youth could occur only if schools and school personnel were different. The eight recommendations were, (a) create a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards both to establish standards for teaching and certify individuals who meet those standards, (b) provide teachers with authority to decide how to meet state and local education goals,
(c) create a new category of educators to be known as "Lead Teachers," (d) require a bachelors degree in arts and sciences as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching, (e) develop a graduate-level professional curriculum leading to a Master in Teaching Degree, (f) recruit minority students to be teachers, (g) link teacher incentives to student performance, and (h) make teachers' salaries competitive with those in other professions (Carnegie Forum, 1986). The bulk of these recommendations--such as those regarding teacher responsibilities and evaluation--are ones that fall to states and localities to implement. Two recommendations, requiring a bachelors degree in liberal arts or a teaching field prior to teacher preparation and creation of a Master in Teaching Degree, generally are under the purview of institutions of higher learning. Thus, the only recommendations that could be promoted in a national forum were creation of a national certification board and recruitment of minorities into teaching.

The Task Force report concluded with a discussion of implementation of the eight proposed recommendations. Establishing a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and urging policy makers to provide salary differentials for Board Certified individuals was the focus of the concluding section. The emphasis on creating the
NBPTS, rather than the Task Force’s other recommendations, suggests that the Carnegie Forum believed establishing the National Board should be priority for their future investments.

The Task Force recommendations reflect the attitudes and predispositions of its members. Dean Judith Lanier was a founding member and president of the Holmes Group, an association of universities committed to graduate-level teacher preparation. Arthuro Madrid had advocated policies to provide educational opportunities for minority students. Former Governor James Hunt had been a member of an Education Commission of the States Task Force that recommended tougher educational standards based on the need to build a stronger economy. As noted above, the idea of a national testing system for teachers had shown up in remarks and articles by AFT president Albert Shanker. It is interesting that a paragraph deep within the Task Force report denounced the practices of hiring teachers who are not licensed, and opposed the assignment of persons to teach subjects for which they are not prepared. Given New Jersey governor Thomas Kean’s presence on the Task Force, a statement in favor of alternative teacher licensure might have been expected. It is possible, however, that Kean found this language acceptable because by 1986 all teachers in New Jersey received the same license whether they earned it
through an alternative or traditional program (Carlson, 1990).

Advocacy for a system of national certification of teachers raised an interesting political situation for the AFT and NEA. Since the 1970s, the National Education Association had lobbied state governments to establish professional standards and licensure boards with 51 percent of the membership made up of practicing teachers. In most states the majority of teachers belong to the NEA, consequently, where these boards exist, they are NEA controlled (Jordan, 1988). However, the establishment of a national board to certify teachers, upon which the AFT and NEA have equal voice, can be seen as enhancing the AFT's political leverage. This would be even more the case if national certification ultimately replaced state licensure and the power of the state standards boards diminished. This point was not lost on Mary Futrell, the NEA's representative on the Task Force. Included in *A Nation Prepared* is a "Statement of Support with Reservations" by Futrell. In it she contends,

...while I have no fixed position about the proposed national standards board, I do strongly favor strengthening currently existing state standards boards and supporting creation of state standards boards in states where they do no[t] now exist. Additionally, I
would certainly want to see a distinct link between those state boards and the National Board. (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. 117)

**Task Force Evidence and Rationale Statements.** The Task Force report clearly states that the primary rationale for initiating changes in the education system is an economic one. The Report begins,

America’s ability to compete in world markets is eroding. The productivity growth of our competitors outdistances our own. The capacity of our economy to provide a high standard of living for all our people is increasingly in doubt. As jobs requiring little skill are automated or go offshore and demand increases for the highly skilled, the pool of educated and skilled people grows smaller and the backwater of the unemployable rises. Large numbers of American children are in limbo—ignorant of the past and unprepared for the future. Many are dropping out—not just out of school but out of productive society.

As in past economic and social crises, Americans turn to education. They rightly demand an improved supply of young people with the knowledge, the spirit, the stamina and the skills to make the nation once again fully competitive—in industry, in commerce, in
social justice and progress, and, not the least, in the ideas that safeguard a society. (Carnegie Forum 1986, p. 2)

The argument that significant changes in teacher qualifications, preparation, authority, responsibilities and remuneration is important to economic growth is put forward in the Task Force report as follows. Pacific rim nations are attracting industry because of relatively low labor costs. Thus, if the United States is to compete with these nations for manufacturing jobs, low-skilled and semi-skilled American workers will need to be content with lower wages and the nation must "be prepared for a massive decline in our standard of living" (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. 13). To counter this trend, the Task Force asserts that the United States should turn to a knowledge-based economy. This will require,

...people who have a good intuitive grasp of the ways in which all kinds of physical and social systems work. They must possess a feeling for mathematical concepts and the ways in which they can be applied to difficult problems, an ability to see patterns of meaning where others see only confusion; a cultivated creativity that leads them to new problems, new products and new services before their competitors get to them; and, in many cases, the ability to work with other people in
complex organizational environments where work groups must decide for themselves how to get the job done.

Such people will have the need and the ability to learn all the time, as the knowledge required to do their work twists and turns with new challenges and the progress of science and technology. They will not come to the workplace knowing all they have to know, but knowing how to figure out what they need to know, where to get it, and how to make meaning out of it.

(Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. 20)

In sum, public education must be changed if individuals are to be employable in a knowledge-economy. This will necessitate teachers with different skills and preparation for their jobs.

After reasoning that the nation's economic growth is related to the education received by its citizens, that the United States must move from an economy based on the mass production of goods to a knowledge-economy, and that teachers must possess different skills if a knowledge-economy is to be created, the Task Force sets forward its core argument: a knowledge-economy needs better skilled teachers, bright people will be attracted into teaching if it is professionalized, and this will occur when the trappings of a profession are established for teaching.
The notion that the economic base of the United States will shift from manufacturing to knowledge production may be a reasonable hypothesis. Furthermore, it is plausible that the nature of schooling and the requirements of teachers for those schools will change. What is less clear, is how teachers of the future should differ from teachers of the present. The Task Force attempts to address this point by describing the desired qualities of teachers,

Teachers should have a good grasp of the ways in which all kinds of physical and social systems work; a feeling for what data are and the uses to which they can be put, an ability to help students see patterns of meaning where others see only confusion; an ability to foster genuine creativity in students; and the ability to work with other people in work groups and decide for themselves how to get the job done. They must be able to learn all the time, as the knowledge required to do their work twists and turns with new challenges and the progress of science and technology. Teachers will not come to the school knowing all they have to know, but knowing how to figure out what they need to know, where to get it, and how to help others make meaning out of it.

Teachers must think for themselves if they are to help others think for themselves, be able to act
independently and collaborate with others, and render critical judgement. They must be people whose knowledge is wide-ranging and whose understanding runs deep. (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. 25)

It can be argued that these characteristics are not unlike the qualifications many superintendents and principals now seek—and believe they have—in the teachers they hire.

The Task Force may have recognized that the inability to describe teachers of the future in a way different from teachers of the present was a weakness in their argument for a national standards board. After proposing, in general, the desired qualities of teachers, the Task force turned its attention to characteristics and demographics of current educators. In regard to qualifications of teachers currently in the labor force, the Task Force report cites the differences in SAT scores between high school students who are contemplating a teaching career and high school students who are thinking about careers in other fields. They point out, as did Weaver (1981), Schlecty & Vance (1982), and others that the average verbal and mathematics SAT scores for young people thinking about a teaching career are lower than the average for persons thinking about careers in all other fields. They neglect to report that the SAT is intended to be used as a measure of high school students’ success in their first year of college and has no
validity as a measure of success in teaching or other careers (Report of the Advisory Panel on the SAT Score Decline, 1977; Robinson and Brandon, 1992).

The Task Force shores up arguments for a national certification board by pointing to an anticipated teacher shortage,

The challenge we have described comes at a time of extraordinary opportunity and great difficulty: a turning point in the national market for teachers. After years of teacher surplus, in 1985 jobs and job seekers were roughly in balance. For at least the next 10 years, however, there will be more jobs than applicants.

... The situation just described has two faces. If the teacher shortage is dealt with as it usually has been in the past, districts will fill the empty slots by lowering their hiring standards. To make that strategy work now, the country will have to scrape the bottom of the barrel to find its teachers. ... the consequences will be a decreasing standard of living for the nation as a whole, a growing underclass, and a citizenry unable to sustain its democratic traditions. (Carnegie Forum, 1986, pp. 31-35)
Creation of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards was seen as central to implementing other recommendations in A Nation Prepared. For example, teachers could not command greater pay and autonomy without a mechanism in place to testify to their increased ability and competence. The Carnegie Task Force's idea that schools and teaching need to be reformed was grounded three assumptions. The first is an economic argument, similar to that put forward to support passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. The United States' economic competitive edge is being threatened by other nations. To retain superiority in a world economy the nation must have workers who possess different skills. The shift from a manufacturing to a knowledge generating economy means a different kind of educational system. Imbedded in this assumption is a link between a nation's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and investment in education.

The second assumption, based on the first, is that teachers with different skills and abilities will be needed for elementary and secondary schools. The premise in this assumption is that many persons in the current teaching force aren't up to the task. This assumption is based primarily on SAT records. The final assumption is that the nation is on the verge of a teacher shortage and the Carnegie Task Force recommendations will, if implemented,
assure that teaching vacancies are filled by academically able, creative persons rather than individuals hired on an emergency basis or individuals drawn from the least able of the college educated population. The validity of these claims is considered in Chapter Five.

Sustaining and Promoting Support for the NBPTS

Like those who supported proposals to alternatively license teachers, individuals and groups who endorsed the concept of a national certification board turned to the media for backing.

The Media. The Carnegie Task Force Report, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, was released at a Carnegie Forum meeting in San Diego, California on May 16, 1986. Six major daily news papers and the CBS evening news covered the event. In addition, during the next four months articles on the Task Force and its report appeared ten more times in major newspapers and in Time magazine (Carnegie Forum 1987). Without exception, all of these articles reported the recommendations in A Nation Prepared in a positive fashion. Establishing a national certification board for teachers was the focus of the story in 13 instances. Moving teacher education to the graduate level and increasing teachers’ salaries and responsibilities appeared nine times each. The recommendation to direct
funds to recruit minority students into teaching careers—the only proposal, except creation of the teacher certification board, with national policy implications—only appeared in one article.

In June 1986 the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy commissioned Louis Harris and Associates to survey public and business sector reactions to the findings and recommendations in *A Nation Prepared*. The purpose of the survey was to "test public and business reaction to the [Carnegie] task force report" (Harris, 1986, p. 1). The results of the survey were released by Harris and Carnegie Forum Executive Director Marc Tucker on August 26, 1986 during the annual meeting of the National Governors' Association (NGA). This generated additional media attention for the Carnegie Task Force report and solidified support of the nation's governors for the recommendations in *A Nation Prepared*.

*The National Governors' Association.* The August 1986 National Governors' Association meeting focused on educational reform. It was at this meeting that NGA's chairman, then Tennessee Governor Lamar Alexander, presided over the release of another report on education—*Time for Results*. Begun a year earlier, the NGA document presented a series of recommendations to improve elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education. These suggestions came from
seven NGA task forces each charged with addressing one aspect of the education system. New Jersey Governor Thomas Kean (who at the same time was serving on the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession) chaired the NGA Task Force on Teaching. The responsibility of Kean’s task force was to provide possible direction to states in their efforts to improve the quality of K-12 schooling. In addition to Governor Kean, Governors Babbit (AZ), Evans (ID), Branstad (IA), Brennan (ME), Allain (MS), Martin (SC), and Robb (VA) were members of the Task Force on Teaching. The group held public hearings in December 1985 and March 1986. Among those testifying were Carnegie Task Force members Albert Shanker, Mary Futrell, and Judith Lanier. Marc Tucker, who was staff director of the Carnegie Forum on Education as well as the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, also provided testimony. Thus, it is not surprising that among the recommendations of the NGA Task Force on Teaching is that governors “support the creation of a nation board of professional teacher standards” (National Governors’ Association, 1986).

The Carnegie-commissioned survey by Harris Associates, which was released at the NGA meeting, found there was almost unanimous support by members of the public and top business leaders for the recommendations in the Carnegie Task Force Report, A Nation Prepared. An overview of the
survey findings concludes, "By any measure, this study documents an overwhelming endorsement by the American people and top business leaders of the underlying principles, assumptions, and recommendations of the Carnegie Forum Task Force on Teaching as a Profession" (Harris, 1986, p. 14). Although the summary of the study’s methodology and findings describes the sampling frame used by Harris Associates with great care, the document says little about question design and controls to assure that recent media coverage didn’t influence the responses of those surveyed--two weaknesses of the study.

The Harris study consisted of telephone surveys of samples of individuals drawn from two populations: men and women over 18, and business leaders. The citizen survey, which was designed to measure public attitudes toward education, was administered to a stratified random sample of 1,513 adults in all regions of the United States while the survey of business leaders was administered to 202 individuals, at the level of vice president or above, chosen randomly from the "Business Week 1000" list of the 1,000 largest U.S. companies (Harris, 1986). Descriptive data on the public respondents indicate that 44 percent either had not completed high school or had no education beyond high school and in 69 percent of the households, there were no children attending public school. One may assume that
persons at the level of vice president or above of large corporations have incomes above the average American and some may have elected to send their children to private schools. Or, it could be assumed that vice presidents' rise to the top of the corporate ladder may have taken several decades and these individuals may not have had children in elementary or secondary schools at the time of the survey. Although Harris and Associates randomly selected respondents from both pools, it appears that many of those interviewed lacked direct connections with the public schools. Consequently, their actual knowledge of what happens in schools may be based on past personal experiences, what they saw or heard in the media, or both.

The survey instrument for public respondents had 94 questions developed by Harris Associates and the Carnegie Forum staff (Harris, 1986). The questions tend to be lengthy and require considerable knowledge of the education system, information that individuals with no children in elementary or secondary schools, no background on state governance of education, or both, may not have. Several questions regarding the efficacy of creating a national certification board illustrate this point. Respondents were asked if they favored or opposed "new and very concrete" recommendations by a "high level group of leaders from government, business and education" (Harris, 1986, p. 10).
The following statements were read to respondents who then were asked to indicate if they favored, opposed, or weren’t sure about each.

(1) As in other professions, a National Board for Professional Standards would be created, which would establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and which would certify teachers who meet those standards.

(2) Teachers would be required to demonstrate full command of the subject they teach and the ability to communicate that knowledge to students.

(3) The Board would have a Code of Ethics and would discipline violators of that Code.

(4) Since teachers would be held accountable for student progress, they would also be allowed to have a real say over what is taught, how materials are used, and how the budget in their school is spent. (Harris, 1986, p. 10)

The framing of these questions implies that (a) there are no boards or standard setting bodies responsible for determining an educator’s competence, (b) that individuals currently teaching don’t have command of the subjects they teach, (c) that no agencies exist with responsibility for handling ethical violations (or revoking a teaching
license), and (d) that teachers lack any say in how they will teach.

Both the citizen and business leader surveys focus on whether or not respondents support the Carnegie Task Force recommendations and whether or not they agree on the undergirding economic competition premises. However, as noted previously, between the release of the Carnegie report in May and the initiation of the two Harris Associates surveys in June, *A Nation Prepared*, received considerable positive media attention. The Harris surveys do not ask respondents if they heard or read about the Carnegie report. Consequently, it is not possible to determine if the survey is measuring agreement with the Carnegie Task Force findings and recommendations or familiarity with recently reported events.

Employing a well-known consulting firm to survey public and business attitudes about the recommendations in *A Nation Prepared* after four to six weeks of extensive and positive media attention helped establish the appearance of legitimacy for the Carnegie Task Force report and reinforced the perception that the group's proposals enjoyed wide public support. Releasing the results of the survey during the National Governors' Association annual meeting achieved several purposes: (a) It demonstrated apparent public support for the Carnegie Task Force recommendations, and by
extension, support for the NGA report being showcased at the governors' meeting. (b) It reinforced the recommendations that were common to *A Nation Prepared* and *A Time for Results*. And, (c) it cemented support of the governors for a national body to engage in the certification of teachers. Thus, the Carnegie Forum effectively dealt with a potential conflict over the level of policy aggregation before it could occur: whether state executive officers would relinquish responsibility for control over teacher credentialling to a national organization. It is probably not coincidental that two months after the NGA meeting, the Carnegie Corporation gave the National Governors' Association a $890,000 grant to help states implement the recommendations or the Carnegie Task Force on Education and the Economy (Carnegie Corporation Makes $890,000 Grant to National Governors' Association to Carry out Objectives of Carnegie Forum Report, 1986, October).

**Establishment of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards**

On September 5, 1986, ten days after release of the Harris and Associates survey at the National Governors' Association meeting and three-and-a-half months following presentation of *A Nation Prepared*, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy announced "the formation of a Planning Group to establish the national body which will be
responsible for setting high standards for teachers and certifying those who meet the standards" (Carnegie Forum, 1987, p. 113). The 33-member body included the fourteen individuals who were members of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a profession, Marc Tucker was assigned to staff the planning group and James Hunt was named its chairman.

The NBPTS planning group met in September 1986, November 1986, January 1987, and April 1987 (Tucker, 1986a; Tucker, 1986b; Tucker, 1987). During that time the planning group developed the general structure of the proposed board and prepared articles of incorporation and bylaws. On May 15, 1987, at the second annual meeting of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, the Carnegie Foundation announced the establishment of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (Hevesi, 1987). Twenty-nine members of the 33-person planning board were named to the national body, again to be chaired by James Hunt. At this same meeting Carnegie Corporation David Hamburg announced he would request $5 million from the Carnegie Corporation to fund the Board for its first five years.\(^2\) Carnegie Forum staff, including Marc Tucker its executive director, assumed

\(^2\)According to NBPTS records, between 1987 and 1989 the Board received an additional $6.4 million in grants from ARA services, AT&T, Charleston Research Foundation, Chrysler Corporation, Du Pont Company, Ford Foundation, Xerox Corporation, Lilly Endowment, RJR Nabisco, and Sears, Roebuck and Company (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Annual Report, 1989).
responsibility for managing Board operations (Hevesi, 1987).

**Agenda Setting Summary**

In the late 1980s both alternative licensure and the national certification of teachers moved onto the federal policy agenda. Statements in favor of each proposal generally fell into one of five categories: (a) *A supply and demand argument*. Alternative licensure or the availability of a national teaching certificate would attract more persons into teaching. (b) *A quality argument*. Personnel attracted to teaching careers by the availability of an alternative route of a national credential would be academically superior to those who entered teaching through traditional collegiate routes. (c) *A deregulation argument*. Programs of alternative licensure would free teacher preparation and selection from government control. The resulting competitive market forces would result in a "better" cadre of educators. (d) *A reform argument*. New processes and ideas are needed to revitalize the education system. (e) *An economic argument*. Schools must prepare students for jobs that will help the nation compete in international markets. National certification of teachers is a strategy to meet this goal.

As will be pointed out in the next chapter, the validity of claims and rationale statements put forward for alternative licensure and national teacher certification
before they arrived on the federal policy agenda, were largely unchallenged during the legislative process. Although each measure had the endorsement of powerful backers, such as governors and the President of the United States, it is important to recognize the influence of the media in legitimizing the claims put forward by those promoting the two proposals.

Returning to the policy methodology developed by Thomas Green (1983), we find in discussions surrounding both the alternative licensure and national credentialling of teachers unresolved conflicts over the meaning of a qualified teacher. Assertions are made that current teachers are not as qualified as they should be and that individuals with higher SAT scores or with work experience in other careers should be recruited to be educators. As will be discussed in Chapter 5, these assertions were made with little empirical evidence to back them up. Consequently, a key policy conflict—a conflict over the meaning of good teaching—was not resolved. Similarly, the initial deliberations on these two measures did not address what Green calls conflicts over level of aggregation—that is what is the appropriate unit of authority to leverage changes in how teachers are prepared and credentialed to work in schools.

By the late 1980s both alternative licensure and national certification of teachers were part of the federal policy agenda. Each had powerful backers: alternative licensure had the support of then Vice-President Bush and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards was endorsed by the Carnegie Corporation. Alternative licensure policy was being developed in the Department of Education. However members of the Reagan and Bush administration, in general, did not believe support for the national certification of teachers was within the authority of the federal government. Given this perspective NBPTS advocates turned to the Congress for backing.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and Actions of the 100th Congress

The first record of congressional attention to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards was in March 1987 when Senator Max Baucus of Montana introduced S. Con. Res. 30, a concurrent resolution "to endorse the national certification of teachers in the United States."

The brief resolution sets fourth four reasons for endorsing the creation of a national teaching standards board:
(a) the nation must be more competitive internationally,
(b) capable teachers are necessary for a well-educated
workforce, (c) national certification will improve the teaching force and attract and retain more capable people in education careers, and (d) the national certification board has the support of the two major teacher organizations. The resolution endorsed the establishment of a National Board for Professional teaching Standards and urged states to "recognize this certification process by providing incentives to teachers to acquire national certification and give serious consideration to adopting professional certification standards promulgated by the National Board as a basis for teacher licensure requirements in each State" (S. Con. Res. 30, 1987, Sec. 2). The March 1987 Baucus resolution was referred to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee where it died.

In early 1988 during the second session of the 100th Congress a draft bill to authorize $25 million to support the NBPTS was circulated on Capitol Hill. According to congressional staff, first drafts of the bill were developed by NBPTS staff and taken to potential congressional supporters for comment and endorsement. Board staff first approached Senator Claiborne Pell (D-RI), but Pell felt he had too many other issues on his plate to champion support for the NBPTS. Moreover, he had reservations about federal role in this matter. The NBPTS staff then "shopped around" for a member to carry the Board’s legislation. Christopher
Dodd (D-CT), a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources agreed to sponsor the legislation (Evans, 1991).

The rationale for congressional involvement, as outlined in the draft bill, was based on the need for well-educated workers so the United States could compete in world markets. Also it was argued that national certification would be a mechanism to recruit and keep good teachers. Government’s past investment in educational research and development was the justification for federal involvement. The draft legislation proposed a $25 million authorization to be matched by non-government funds raised by the Board.

NBPTS staff and Board chairman James Hunt put forward the merits of the NBPTS in meetings with various members of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. As a result of these contacts, a loose coalition of Senate supporters formed that included Senator Dodd, Senator Pell (chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities), Education and Labor Committee Chairman Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA), Senator Robert Stafford (R-VT), Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT), and Senator Dan Quayle (R-IN). Together coalition members’ staffs began to prepare specifics of an NBPTS authorization bill (Evans, 1991).

On February 18, 1988 the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities held a hearing on federal
support for the NBPTS. Eleven Witnesses presented testimony or submitted written statements. Of these, nine testified in favor, one in opposition, and one expressed support with reservations. Seven of the witnesses were members of the NBPTS including its chairman, James Hunt. The arguments in favor the Board fell into two broad categories: (a) arguments justifying federal government support for the NBPTS and (b) testimony addressing teacher needs and frustrations and how the Board would address teachers' concerns.

Testimony related to laying out the federal government's interest in supporting the NBPTS relied on arguments that had been put forward by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, (a) the link between the nature of education and national economic growth, (b) anticipated teacher shortages, and (c) the need to use this as an opportunity to recruit more able persons into teaching. In addition, two new arguments emerged: (d) current state licensure examinations don't assure that teachers are of high quality and minority candidates may not score well on them, and (e) the federal government has an established role in promoting research, which is how the NBPTS indicated it would use the federal award. Thus, the justification for federal support of the NBPTS rested on four lines of reasoning: economic competitiveness, manpower needs (which
encompassed quality of the existing teaching force), limitations of state licensure, and an established federal role in supporting research, development and dissemination.

Much of the testimony at the February 18 hearing focused on what the NBPTS would do for teachers and teaching, rather than linking funding for the Board to a clear federal purpose. Essentially the discussion addressed how national certification would bring teachers status similar to that of physicians, suggesting that with this status citizens would be willing to increase teachers' salaries. The vision of a teaching force recognized as "professional" with greater autonomy and higher salaries would make teaching more attractive and, therefore, more talented people would pursue careers in education.

The one voice speaking against federal funding for the NBPTS at the Senate hearing was Chester Finn, Jr. who at that time was Assistant Secretary and Counselor to Secretary of Education William Bennett. Finn, who did not oppose the board per se, argued that the NBPTS would not be truly independent if it accepted federal funds,

The National Board would be better off without federal funds. We hate to see it follow the too-familiar pattern: a promising private initiative that begins without any hint of public funding soon turning down the well-trod path toward Uncle Sam and his checkbook.
It is said, of course, that federal funds are wanted only for the "research and development" aspects of this undertaking and that federal support would therefore come to an end in a few years' time. Would that it were so. Perhaps it will be. But I must remind the Subcommittee that such predictions seldom come true, that such promises are rarely kept. Instead, in the usual case, a dependency relationship is initiated that never really ends. (Finn, 1988, February, p. 4)

Finn also advanced the position that it was unrealistic for the NBPTS to expect that federal funds would be authorized and appropriated without competition and peer review.

We do not think it is reasonable for the National Board to expect to be given a vat of "no-strings" money from the federal government; nor do we think that it should consider itself a "wholesale" distributor of unsupervised federal research funds to "retailers" of its own choosing. Perhaps private donors will be amenable to supporting such arrangements. We do not believe that the federal taxpayer should be expected to. (Finn, 1988, February, p. 6)

The draft NBPTS bill was revised several times during the Spring and early Summer of 1988. According to Senate
staffers, during that time the supporting senators and NBPTS staff negotiated a piece of legislation that satisfied Pell’s concern about whether this represented appropriate federal role and addressed, at least in part, the Administration’s concerns about accountability. Evans (1991) suggests that the initiative to get the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Act through Congress may have peaked too early. Negotiations between members of Congress and Board staff delayed introduction of a bill until August 1988. By that time Senator Quayle began to have reservations about using federal funds to support the private teaching standards board. In addition, Quayle had become a vice presidential candidate and his involvement with the Senators who supported NBPTS legislation ceased. Moreover, during this period of time a key staff person for Senator Hatch left to take a position in the Department of Education and ultimately he chose not to continue with the coalition. The loss of Quayle and Hatch from the group of advocates eliminated an important link to the conservative wing of the Republican party.

Legislation to fund the NBPTS (S. 2698) was introduced in August 1988. In addition to Senators Dodd, Pell, Stafford, and Kennedy, Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA) became an original co-sponsor. Utah Senator Orrin Hatch agreed to become a co-sponsor but was not a vigorous advocate for the
bill. The Board legislation had lost some of the backing of conservative Republicans, but it picked up an important champion in Senator Harkin. A member of the Senate appropriations committee and the subcommittee with responsibility for education funding, he would be instrumental in securing federal funding for the Board. The NBPTS legislation (S. 2698) proposed awarding the Board $25 million over three years if it could raise matching funds. Federal funds could be used for research but not for administrative or operating purposes. The NBPTS would be required to submit an annual report to the Congress and Department of Education, agree to a yearly audit of federal expenditures, and agree to award its research sub-contracts on the basis of open competition. The bill was based on the following rationale: (a) the nation’s economic well-being and national security depend on a strong education system and well-educated work force, (b) improved teaching is central to the goal of a well-educated workforce; (c) government has traditionally supported educational research, such as that to be supported by the NBPTS, and (d) national certification, which should complement state licensure, will enhance teacher professionalism and raise the status of teaching (S. 2698, 1988). Thus, an organization goal--teacher professionalism--became a social goal to be advanced through federal legislation.
Shortly after the introduction of S. 2698, staff for Congressman William Ford (D-MI) circulated a memorandum to staff for Education and Labor committee Chairman August Hawkins (D-CA) and the ranking minority member of that committee William Goodling (R-PA), asking their support for a possible House version of the same legislation already introduced in the Senate (Kyle to Jennings and St. Martin, 1988). Mr. Ford, however, decided not to move forward with a bill, perhaps because he realized that Chairman Hawkins had concerns about the possible impact of a certification test on minorities. Hawkins’ reservations about the NBPTS are outlined in his response to correspondence from presidential candidate Michael Dukakis’ campaign staff.

In the summer of 1988 Christopher Edley, National Issues Director for the "Mike Dukakis for President Campaign," shared an educational issue paper with Representative Hawkins. In response to Mr. Edley, Hawkins urged restraint in terms of endorsing federal support for the NBPTS,

While I agree with the concept of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, I encourage you to be cautious in your support for testing and certification. We must have safeguards to ensure that such standards do not disproportionately negatively impact minorities. You may want to add that "such
standards be accompanied by funding for in-service training to assist those who have difficulty meeting the performance measurements" or something to that effect. With minorities currently under-represented in the teaching profession, we should not support efforts which could potentially deter minorities from entering or advancing in the field (Hawkins, 1988).

On September 15 Senators Dodd, Hatch, Kennedy, Harkin, Pell, Stafford, and Simon circulated a "Dear Colleague" letter in an attempt to gain additional supporters for S. 2698. The letter points out that national certification will "expand and improve the pool of first-rate teachers." In response to possible concerns about an expanded federal role, the letter notes, "the Board will not nationalize elementary and secondary education, but rather provide a national credential that states and localities can recognizes as they see fit" (Dear Colleague, 1988, p. 2). The legislation picked up a few additional co-sponsors, but never made it to the Senate floor and died at the end of the 100th Congress.

During this time Congressional interest in the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards began to grow, however the Administration through its Department of Education, remained opposed to federal funding for it (Finn, 1992; Kolb, 1991). Alternative licensure of teacher was
another matter.

**Alternative Licensure and President Bush (1950s – 1989)**

The Bush Administration accepted Reagan's deregulation agenda but it differed with Reagan on how deregulation should occur. The Reagan Administration advocated reducing the federal commitment and letting market forces pick-up the slack. The Bush Administration talked of "Privatization" rather than "New Federalism" and saw a role for the federal government in creating opportunities for competition within the public sector and in establishing a favorable environment for private sector initiatives.

Although the first federal legislative reference to alternative teacher licensure occurred in 1989, according to White House and Department of Education officials, for George Bush this issue began nearly four decades earlier and influenced his attitude about teacher credentialing. It was during the early 1950's, so the story goes, that young Bush, fresh with a degree in economics from Yale, applied for a teaching position in Texas and was denied a job because he didn't have the necessary teaching credentials. No further information on why George Bush was unable to get a teaching job is part of the story. As one former Department of Education official pointed out, "Presidential Stories" tend to take on a life of their own; details are of less consequence than that it is a "Presidential Story."
Those who repeat the story use it illustrate the point that even the President of the United States wasn’t able to get a teaching job because of restrictive licensing practices and, therefore, these licensing regulations are bad policy.

The "Presidential Story" was offered by a number of persons interviewed for this study as a rationale for the Administration’s interest in the alternative licensure of teachers. Specifics of the story varied only slightly and all but one of those repeating it insisted they heard the President, himself, describe the situation. However, when pushed on the matter, none could remember particulars of the meeting or when it occurred.

Issuing emergency teaching licenses has not been an uncommon practice in the United States (Lilly, 1991; Mastain, 1988; Roth & Popho, 1990). It is probable that in the late 1940’s or early 1950’s licensure requirements in Texas could have been waived by the state or employing school district. However, evidently, in the case of George Bush, there was no attempt to do so. An official on the White House Domestic Policy Staff said, "this president has a long memory" and indicated that a federal initiative to promote alternative teacher licensure was a "personal issue" for the President (Kolb, 1991). Whether this was a major domestic policy concern for Bush, the result of casual conversation with his aides, or neither is less important
than the belief among persons in the Executive Office and in the Department of Education that their support for this measure was important to the President and, one might assume, a way to demonstrate their loyalty to the Administration.

Given Bush's personal experience and his belief that government should actively promote competition within the public sector, it isn't surprising that alternative licensure of teachers moved from the bully pulpit of Ronald Reagan to the Bush Administration's domestic policy agenda. Within this shift is a potential policy conflict: Can or will the federal government develop statutory language or regulations for the alternative licensure of teachers that will avoid conflict with existing state licensure standards? Federal attention to components that should be incorporated into alternative licensure programs through law, regulation or both, creates a paradox that will be seen again in federal efforts to promote these programs, namely: the same government that promotes choice and relaxation of credential standards is setting criteria for the programs it touts as evidence of deregulation.

A former senior official in the U.S. Department of Education during the Bush Administration suggested that alternative licensure activities operated on three distinct "tracks:" (a) an intergovernmental relations track, (b) a
research track, and (c) a legislative track. He maintained that White House and agency personnel were aware of activities in the three tracks but they were not coordinated in any particular way (Sanders, 1991). Individuals associated with each of these three tracks were interviewed for this study. At least one person in each track repeated the "Presidential Story" and used it as partial justification for their interest in alternative licensure. All knew of related activities in other Department of Education offices, but generally believed their division or unit had primary responsibility for the issue.

**Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs.**

By 1988 the Administration's interest in alternative routes to teacher licensure was institutionalized. Department of Education officials report that during the Reagan Administration, Secretary of Education Bennett assigned the issue to the Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs (OIIA) and the position of "Alternative Certification Manager" was created in OIIA. According to personnel in that office, it was a logical assignment because the responsibilities included liaison between different government jurisdictions and organizations that represent the interests of these governments (such as the National Governors' Association, Education Commission of the States, and National Conference of State Legislatures). The
individual hired as Alternative Certification Manager described his responsibilities as tracking those programs at the state level, advising citizens of opportunities to earn an alternative teaching license, developing issue papers, and using the influence of the federal government as a catalyst for alternative licensure (Baird, 1991).

After George Bush became president, alternative licensure activities began to show up in other areas of the Department of Education, and personnel in the Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs faced a struggle to keep this issue exclusively in their portfolio. Intergovernmental Affairs’ personnel saw the Office of Educational research and Improvement (OERI) as their primary rival within the Department of Education. They also were wary of the actions of Bush’s first Undersecretary of Education, Ted Sanders. They were irritated that Sanders didn’t approve the release of a second White Paper on alternative licensure and felt this indicated a lack of commitment to its implementation. Personnel in the Department of Education who saw the second alternative licensure White Paper defended Sanders’ actions indicating that the second White Paper was of poor quality. In addition, they confirmed that Sanders blocked the distribution of an alternative licensure brochure, produced by Intergovernmental Affairs, until grammatical and content
errors were corrected—a move that did nothing to improve his stature among staff in that unit.

Although Undersecretary Sanders supported the Administration's education agenda, he wasn't an aggressive spokesman for alternative licensure. When nominated to be Undersecretary of Education, Sanders was told his responsibility would be to design and advocate the Administration's legislative agenda for education. However, by the time he was confirmed, the Administration's legislative package for education already was prepared and transmitted to the Congress. This legislation included alternative teacher and administrator licensure. Sanders, who had been a chief state school officer in Illinois and Nevada, felt the federal government had limited authority in this matter. Furthermore, he was skeptical that alternative licensure legislation would be passed and funded and, if it was, he surmised that its impact would be modest (Sanders, 1991).

Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs staff pointed to Sanders' reluctance to be a champion for alternative licensure as evidence of his opposition to a presidential initiative. They believed that Sanders and close ties to the National Education Association (NEA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (Baird, 1991). Because the NEA is anathema to conservative
Republicans, a real or suspected tie to the teacher organization was equated with opposition to a tenet of the Bush Administration: deregulation of the process by which teachers are prepared and licensed (Kolb, 1991).

**Office of Educational Research and Improvement.** The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) has responsibility for supporting educational research, data gathering and statistical analysis, and monitoring educational innovations. Given this charge, current and former senior officials in this agency indicated they assumed when alternative licensing legislation was passed by the Congress, it would be administered in OERI, most likely as part of Programs for the Improvement of Practice (PIP). With this in mind, OERI established a small "Alternative Certification Working Group" to learn about the issue and get the agency prepared to administer the legislation once it was passed. According to members and those familiar with the working group, when an alternative licensure bill wasn't passed in a timely manner, the group met less frequently and eventually disbanded (Ashburn, 1991; Betka, 1991; Cross, 1991).

Even though the working group stopped meeting, alternative licensure activities in OERI continued. According to Cross (1991) and Ashburn (1991) in late 1989
OERI's Office of Research decided to use end-of-the year funds to commission a set of papers exploring research and policy related to alternative teacher licensure. Educational researchers including Linda Darling-Hammond, Willis Hawley, Gary Fenstermacher, and Trish Stoddard were invited to prepare papers. In addition, Lynn Cornett from the Southern Regional Education Board, Tracy Bliss, then with the Connecticut State Department of Education, and Leo Klagholz with the New Jersey State Department of Education, prepared manuscripts. By the end of 1990 all the papers were received and reviewed. After receiving reviewer's comments, the author from New Jersey requested that his paper not be included with the set. According to an individual in the Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs—who indicated he received a copy of correspondence from the New Jersey author to OERI—the author felt the criticisms were unfounded and reflected a lack of support for the President's initiative. The Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Christopher Cross, was replaced in 1991 as part of a major personnel shake-up in the Department of Education. His successor, Diane Ravitch decided not to publish the alternative licensure papers. In 1991, a revised version the collection of papers, with the exception of the Chapter by Klagholz, was published in the Peabody
Journal (Hawley, 1992, December) and reproduced as a collection by the Eric Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.


In 1989, shortly after the 101st Congress was convened, representatives from the Office of Management and Budget, White House Domestic Policy Staff, and at least one senior Department of Education official, met to develop a legislative package that would reflect the President’s perspective on education. Individuals involved with drafting the legislation indicated they moved quickly because Bush wanted something before the Congress that would distinguish his policies from those of Ronald Reagan (Kolb, 1991; White 1991).

White (1991) reports that the Administration's legislative proposal was developed with little input from Republican members in Congress because White House Domestic Policy staff felt Republican members on the House and Senate education committees were too liberal, because the bill drafters didn’t want to "pre-compromise" any of the President’s initiative with members of Congress, and because they wanted to move the proposal quickly. The President’s initiative was described by staff for both Republican and Democratic members of Congress as a grab-bag of campaign promises. However, it was united by four principles:
(a) recognizing and rewarding good schools and good teachers, (b) targeting federal resources to the most needy, (c) instilling flexibility and choice in the education system, and (d) assuring greater accountability through objective measurements. Included, as a program to promote choice, was "Alternative Certification of Teachers and Principals."

The stated rational for the alternative licensure program was to provide a means to address an anticipated teacher shortage, in particular an anticipated shortage of mathematics and science teachers. The legislation proposed a $25 million one-time authorization for a program of grants to state education agencies to support programs, projects, or activities to develop and implement new, or expand and improve existing, alternative teacher and principal licensure requirements. The state would be allowed to carry out its programs directly or through subcontracts to local education agencies, intermediate educational agencies, or consortia (H.R. 1675, 1989; S. 695, 1989).

Although neither the minority members of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee nor the minority members of the House Education and Labor Committee or their staffs were involved in the drafting of the legislative package, in April 1989 Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS) and Representative William Goodling accommodated the President by introducing

Early in the 101st congress, Senator Dodd introduced legislation to fund the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (S. 478). With only minor modifications, this was the same bill he sponsored the 100th Congress. No further action was taken on the legislation until the Labor and human Resources Committee considered S. 695, the educational reform legislation proposed by the Bush Administration and introduced on its behalf by Senator Kassebaum. During committee mark-up of S. 695 in July, Senator Dodd offered the NBPTS Act (S. 478) as a amendment to the Kassebaum legislation. This amendment was accepted and the bill was reported out of committee. For the first time, the Administration’s alternative certification proposal and provisions to fund the NBPTS were linked in a policy proposal.

There was not broad congressional support for the President’s education measure. Several senior Senate staffers suggested that few members took S. 695 seriously and that it was reported out of committee as a courtesy to Senator Kassebaum. Furthermore, at that time the Chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, Edward Kennedy (D-MA), was preparing his own legislation and it was assumed this would eclipse the Administration’s proposal.
Similarly, in the House of Representatives there was virtually no backing for H.R. 1675, the House version of the Administration’s proposal (but without the NBPTS amendment). Representative Goodling introduced the bill, however, he did not conceal his dislike for it and elected not to push for its consideration by the Education and Labor Committee (Jennings, 1991; St. Martin, 1991).

Although the NBPTS bill had not been introduced in the House of Representatives, on July 25, 1989 that chamber’s Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education held an oversight hearing on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. According to House staffers, National Board supporters lobbied the Subcommittee Chairman, Pat Williams (D-MT) to carry the NBPTS bill in the House. Williams, a former teacher and school administrator, was flown to meetings of the Board and the Carnegie Forum and was paid an honorarium for his participation. Like the Senate hearing held the previous year, the majority of witnesses supported federal support for the Board.

The lead spokesperson for the NBPTS was its chairman, James Hunt. Hunt began his involvement with the Carnegie initiative while Governor of North Carolina and continued to serve as an officer of the Board after leaving government service. Hunt’s primary argument in favor of federal funding for the NBPTS focused on the tie between economic
success and education,

There is a cause and effect relationship at work here which we ignore at our peril. In the modern, knowledge intensive economy, the secret of economic success is what a people "know and are able to do." A poorly educated workforce simply cannot cope in the modern world, and a country with a poorly educated workforce cannot provide its citizens with the quality of life to which we have become accustomed. (Hunt, 1989, p. 1)

This position was echoed in written testimony by NBPTS Board member, David Kearns, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Xerox Corporation (Kearns, 1989). Hunt went on to argue that Board certification is an incentive for good teaching and that it will be an effective tool to recruit minorities into teaching careers. He suggested that Board certification, and the accompanying professional status for teachers, will convince more minority students to consider teaching careers instead of other, higher paying job options (Hunt, 1989). The notion that the presence of a national teaching certificate would attract minority students into education careers was a new argument for NBPTS supporters. Although the original Carnegie report advocated the establishment of programs to attract more minorities into teaching, this was the first time the connection between
this goal and Federal funding for the NBPTS was made. It is possible Hunt believed this line of reasoning would appeal to the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Augustus Hawkins (D-CA), a member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

According to Hunt the NBPTS could remain independent, set its own standards, and develop its own assessment process while satisfying government’s need for accountability for federal funds. He pointed out that

Using an independent organization as a vehicle for federal investment is not a new concept. Congress uses such non-government and quasi-government organizations where detailed federal direction and control is inappropriate. For example, Congress funds the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), a private organization designed to operate independent of political interference. The CPB provides grants to stations to support local programs and contracts for the production and procurement of other programs. (Hunt, 1989, p. 8)

Testimony by University of Missouri President C. Peter Magrath (1989) and AFT President Albert Shanker (1989) stressed the importance of NBPTS certification in promoting a teacher professionalism agenda. Arthur Wise (1989),
testifying on behalf of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) asserted that the goals of the Board—promoting research to identify advanced teacher competencies—were so compelling that AERA supported federal funding for the NBPTS in spite of their long-held opposition to sole source federal awards. The issue of sole source funding for the Board was not so easily dismissed by other organizations. The American Association of School Administrators' representative, a school administrator from Congressman Goodling's state of Pennsylvania, noted that the sole source nature of the funding was their primary reservation (M. A. Smith, 1989).

At the time of the House hearing, the NBPTS listed the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) as a supporting organization. However, the testimony presented by Max Larsen on behalf of NASBE reveals a number of reservation. Within the testimony, the following questions were raised: (a) What are implications of the proposed shift in the governance of teacher assessment and certification from the current state-based structure (comprised of lay people) to a single national board comprised primarily of teachers? (b) Absent lay control, who will represent the interest of "clients" who are required to attend public elementary and secondary schools? (c) What are implications of national certification for
states and localities, particularly the expectation that Board certified teachers will receive higher pay? (d) How will research supported by the National Board be shared with states and localities? (Larsen, 1989, p. 2)

As the Administration’s witness, Secretary of Education Cavazos, spoke against federal funding for the NBPTS. His reservations were four: (a) opposition to sole source awards, (b) lack of accountability on the part of the NBPTS to the Department of Education, (c) concern that the board’s agenda duplicates research supported by the Department of Education, and (d) belief that the level of funding requested is excessive (Cavazos, 1989a). In regard to the last two points Cavazos noted OERI-supported research on teaching and learning, and studies of teacher assessment already underway in National Research Centers. He also pointed out that the annual budget for OERI’s Office of Research was less than the $25 million requested for the NBPTS.

By the time the House and Senate Appropriations Committees considered funding bills for fiscal year 1990 in the Summer of 1989, no House member had introduced legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds for the NBPTS. Although Senate legislation, S. 695, included the NBPTS provisions along with the Administration’s alternative licensure proposal, that bill had not moved to the Senate
floor. However, when the Senate reported out their Fiscal Year 1990 appropriations bill, H.R. 2990, it contained language—introduced by Iowa Senator Harkin—to earmark $5 million for the NBPTS (H.R. 2990, Title III, 1989). During floor debate in the Senate on H.R. 2990, opposition to the Board was raised by Senator Jesse Helms (D-NC). Helms’ objection to the $5 million for the Board was the lack of authorization legislation. He took particular exception to the fact that the Senate Appropriations Committee "...stated in its report that it refused to consider funding President Bush’s $25 million alternative teacher certification program because—now get this—no authorizing legislation has been enacted into law" (Congressional Record, 1989, p. S. 11645). The Senate appropriations bill passed in spite of Senator Helms’ objections. When a House and Senate conference committee met to resolve differences between appropriations bills from the two chambers, the Senate earmark for the NBPTS was retained with one modification. The words "if authorized" were inserted into the sentence awarding the Board’s $5 million. This language was included by Representative William Natcher (D-KY), chairman of the House Labor-Health and Human Services-Education Appropriations Subcommittee because of his belief that appropriations committees should not undertake the responsibilities of the authorizing
committees (Mashburn, 1992). The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards had moved closer to acquiring the federal award it sought, but could not receive a grant until an authorization bill was passed.

During 1989 Senators Edward Kennedy (D-MA), Claiborne Pell (D-RI), and Paul Simon (D-IL) each drafted education legislation. Kennedy introduced his bill, "The Excellence in Teaching Act" (S. 1675) in September. In his role as Chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, he conducted hearings on the measure in October. The Kennedy bill did not include either the alternative licensure or Dodd’s NBPTS amendment.

On November 17, 1989, near the conclusion of the first session of the 101st Congress, Montana Representative Pat Williams introduced H.R. 3717, "the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Act." In terms of providing funds for the National Board, this legislation was almost identical to the bills introduced by Senator Dodd. However the rationale for the bill, as stated in the findings, focused on the need to address teacher shortages—in particular the shortage of minority teachers—and on the importance of promoting teacher professionalism. The bill was not reported out of sub- or full committee.
Senator Edward Kennedy opened the second session of the 101st Congress in January 1990 with hearings on his education reform bill, S. 1675. Additional hearings were held in February and March. Later that spring legislative proposals of Senators Pell and Simon were merged with Kennedy's measure and it was re-named the "National Teacher Act" (S. 1676). The bill included a range of programs to promote literacy and several initiatives to recruit and prepare persons to be teachers. On the House side, Representative Hawkins, Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, introduced the "Equity and excellence in Education Act" (H.R. 5115, 1990), a measure similar but not identical to Kennedy's legislation. Hawkins' bill was the product of several years work and contained literacy and teacher recruitment initiatives. However neither alternative licensure nor support for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards were included.

Kennedy, Pell, and Simon considered the "National Teacher Act" to be the primary piece of education legislation before the Congress (Broun, 1992). Nevertheless, S. 695—which had been introduced by Senator Kassebaum the previous year—was still an active bill. In February 1990 S. 695 moved to the Senate floor where the NBPTS language, which had been added to the bill as an amendment by Senator Dodd during Committee deliberations,
became a point of contention.

It was Senator Jesse Helms who raised a series of objections to provisions in S. 695 that would fund the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Helms cited the following reservations: (a) it would enhance the power of the "teachers unions," (b) federal accountability was lacking, (c) funding the National Board would be contrary to President Bush's goal of opening public schools to free market concepts of competition, (d) the National Board is too aligned with pedagogy, (e) and the federally supported standards for teachers might be applied to teachers in private schools and home-schooling parents (Congressional Record 1990, February 6, pp. 848-864; Congressional Record 1990, February 7, pp. 952-954). Of these issues, the possible imposition of federal standards on private and home schools were the most worrisome for Helms. During the floor debate he secured assurances from Senators Kassebaum and Pell that the NBPTS would not be permitted to develop competency assessments or standards for home-schooling parents (Mashburn, 1992).

In late Fall 1990, as the Second Session of the 101st Congress neared conclusion, members of the House and Senate education committees and their staffs attempted to get S. 1676 and H.R. 5115 passed. Because neither measure had gone to the floor in its respective chamber, a House and
Senate conference committee couldn't be appointed to iron-out differences in the two bills. Time was short and staffs of the Senate and House education committees met to "pre-conference" the bills—that is, to come up with a compromise measure agreeable to the leadership of both chambers. Essentially the strategy was to have staff resolve all substantive differences in S. 1676 and H.R. 5115 and quickly move the bills to the House and Senate floors.

At this point S. 695, the Kassebaum bill, was brought into the negotiations. Because it was a Senate-passed bill, provisions of S. 1676 and H.R. 5115 were folded into it. The compromise bill was then renamed the "Educational Equity and Excellence Act of 1990" (S. 695/H.R. 5932). In a last bid to get a bill through the Senate, sponsors attempted to get approval for the "new" bill through unanimous consent. Under unanimous consent, members agree to support a bill without debate or amendment. However this approach can be stopped by objection of a single member of Congress. In this case, the objection was raised by Senator Helms, who opposed the action because the "pre-conferenced" bill did not contain the language he wanted exempting home-schooling parents from federal standards (Broun, 1992; Mashburn, 1992). The NBPTS legislation and Administration-supported provisions for the alternative licensure of teachers, as well as the larger school reform bill in which they were
housed, died in late 1990 at the end of the second session of the 101st Congress.

**The Bush Administration (1990 - 1991)**

During this time period, the Bush Administration remained on record as opposing funding for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. However, their public broadsides against the legislation ceased. This may have been because no hearings were held to provide a forum for their opposition. Or, it may have been a result of Lauro Cavazos' departure as Secretary of Education and his replacement with Lamar Alexander who felt more positive about the NBPTS than his predecessor (Miller & Diegmueller, 1991).

Alexander's apparent favorable stance toward the NBPTS was not echoed by members of President Bush's domestic policy staff. Working out of the West Wing of the White House, members of the Domestic Policy Staff generally report to the President through his chief of staff. Secretary of Education Alexander may have felt the NBPTS deserved federal support, but this was not the position taken by the President or his White House advisors (Kolb, 1991).

White House staff reservations pertained to whether government involvement in setting standards for teaching was contrary to free market forces. Related to this was a level of anxiety about whether or not the Board represented an
attempt by the teachers' organizations--in particular the National Education Association--to control the teaching profession (Kolb, 1991; Mashburn, 1992). These views represent a more classic conservative position on the federal role in education than that put forward by most members of Congress and individuals in the Department of Education.

The Education Department's position on alternative licensure of teachers was consistent with that of the White House. Support for alternative licensure was evident by Department activities in several program areas. In December 1990, OERI's Programs for the Improvement of Practice unit sponsored a one-day conference on "Alternative Teacher Certification: Policy and Practice." Morning sessions featured presentations on alternative licensure from Texas, New Jersey, and Los Angeles. The afternoon sessions included presentations by persons and representatives of organizations generally not supportive of alternative licensure: an education dean from New Jersey, Arthur Wise then with the RAND Corporation, and a representative of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Undersecretary of Education, Ted Sanders was the final speaker at the conference. Sanders' participation may have been seen by others in the Department--particularly in the Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs--as
endorsement for OERI’s role in alternative licensure policy. The recognition of OERI’s role in this area seemed to reinforce the belief by persons in other parts of the Department of Education that Sanders and personnel in OERI believed federal responsibility for alternative licensure should be limited to support for research and data gathering (Baird, 1991).

The Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs also weighed in on the topic of alternative teacher licensure. After several false starts, in 1991 that unit released an alternative licensure brochure (Alternative Certification of Teachers, 1991). Like the 1988 White Paper prepared by the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, the 1991 brochure referred to the poor academic background of prospective teachers and deficiencies with teacher education programs as the reason alternative programs are needed. To this they added two additional manpower arguments: (a) alternative licensure will help meet the demand for mathematics, science and special education teachers, and (b) it will attract more minority teachers. Anecdotes describing three persons who became science or mathematics teachers through an alternative program were presented as evidence that these programs can help meet a national demand. The claim that alternative licensure programs are successful in recruiting minorities into
teaching was based on information from New Jersey and Texas. (The strength of these claims is addressed in the next chapter).

Although personnel in the Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs insisted their activities did not reflect federal intrusion in state licensure matters, when alternative licensure requirements are described in the Department of Education's 1991 brochure, it is evident that the model they favor would impose federal standards on state licensure systems. The following criteria were suggested,

Entry criteria should be reasonable to that experienced and talented professionals are not discouraged from applying. Once these criteria are set, deviations should be minimal [italics added]. . . . Candidates must:
- hold a bachelor's degree with a concentrated major in the subject to be taught;
- pass a require subject-matter or comprehensive test;
- complete prescribed courses in pedagogical theory;

and

- complete a prescribed internship under the supervision of a certified teacher. (Alternative Certification for Teachers, 1991, p. 3)

The alternative licensure brochure includes criteria absent in previous administration documents--the need for
alternatively licensed teachers to complete necessary pedagogical course work. In this document we see that the Department of Education’s rationale for supporting alternative licensing of teachers expanded and the recommended criteria for these programs became more specific.

Teacher Licensure/Certification in the 102nd Congress
(1991 - 1992)

When the 102nd Congress convened in 1991 a major issue on its agenda was reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Senate legislation, S. 1150, contained provisions to support alternative routes to licensure for teachers and principals as part of Title V, Teacher Training and Recruitment. Although the House Bill, H.R. 3553, initially didn’t include alternative licensure language, it was later added as an amendment offered by Representative Goodling.

Most members of the House and Senate didn’t have strong positions on the National Board legislation. Senator Kassebaum (R-KS), a former school board member, didn’t think the federal government should be involved in the certification of teachers and felt the $25 million suggested for the Board should be used for direct services to schools and children (Hattan, 1991). Yet, Kassebaum supported the NBPTS Act after it was amended to her education reform bill (S. 695, 1989). For Kassebaum this was a political
decision—she wanted to see her bill pass, amended or not. Congressman William Goodling (R-PA) shared Kassebaum’s apprehensions and had reservations about what he saw as lack of government oversight and accountability by the Board for public funds. Goodling was an important player in this matter because of his position as ranking minority member of the House Education and Labor Committee and because that Committee’s Chairman, Augustus Hawkins (D-CA) also had reservations about the Board. Unlike Goodling or Kassebaum, Hawkins’ hesitancy was based on what he knew of the use of state teacher licensure tests in the South and the disproportionate failure rates among African- and Hispanic-Americans (Jennings, 1991).

Mary Hatwood Futrell, then president of the NEA and a member of the NBPTS, lobbied Congressman Hawkins on behalf of the Board. His opposition was tempered, but he did not become a supporter. Mr. Hawkins retired from the House of Representatives and Michigan Congressman William Ford became chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. With the retirement of Hawkins, Goodling was the only senior member of the Education and Labor Committee still opposing the standards board legislation. Ultimately Mr. Goodling agreed not to block the board legislation in exchange for some language he felt would provide more accountability for the federal funds (Jennings, 1991; St. Martin, 1991).
Most resistance to the NBPTS came from conservative members of the U.S. Senate, the most outspoken of whom was North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms.\textsuperscript{3} Helms based his resistance to the Board on the following points: (a) This board, like boards in other professions, is nothing more than a guild that will control entry into teaching. Teaching should operate as a free market (which alternative licensure is intended to create). (b) The Board’s standards probably won’t really be voluntary and states will begin to adopt them. In this manner, the federal government is intruding into state policy. (c) Although the Board legislation provides a measure of fiscal accountability, it doesn’t provide any policy accountability. Thus, the NBPTS could use federal money to fund educational research that might be objectionable to conservative educators. And, (d) the Board will promote the study of pedagogy rather than the subject to be taught (Mashburn, 1992). Board staff and supporters submit that Helms disagreement with the NBPTS stems from his long standing feud with former Governor James Hunt who had challenged Helms in a Senate race several years earlier. Helms staff disagree, indicating that the Senator’s position on this issue is consistent with his

\textsuperscript{3}Senators Gordon Humphrey (R-NH), Daniel Coats (R-IN), and William Armstrong (R-CO) did not support the NBPTS bill, but were not as vocal or single-minded in their disagreement as Senator Helms.
philosophy of government, but add that "if Hunt weren't involved, it wouldn't be as much fun" (Mashburn, 1992).

It took Desert Storm/Desert Shield, the United States' military action in the Persian Gulf, to finally provide funds for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. In March 1991 the Congress considered a "Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations" bill (H.R. 1281) to pay for the cost of the Gulf War and related issues. In the conference report to the appropriations measure the language requiring an authorization for the NBPTS was stripped, freeing the funds appropriated for it though the Department of Education appropriation for Fiscal Year 1991 (Conference Report 102-29). President Bush signed the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill even though it contained NBPTS funding. Neither the White House nor the Department of Education commented on the inclusion of NBPTS funding language in the Appropriations bill. Certainly irritation about funding for the National Board wasn't sufficient to withhold resources to pay for the Desert Storm initiative. In addition, by the Spring of 1991 Secretary of Education Cavazos had been replaced by former Tennessee Governor Lamar Alexander and Undersecretary Sanders was succeeded by David Kearns. Both Alexander and Kearns were NBPTS supporters, Alexander through this involvement with the National Governors' Association and Kearns through his earlier
membership on the NBPTS.

Even though the NBPTS received nearly $5 million through an appropriations earmark, supporters continued to pursue authorizing legislation. Two reasons were put forward for the continued attempt to get a separate authorization for the NBPTS: (a) the Board and their congressional supporters believed the authorizing language would help them get the remaining $20 million they wanted and (b) they felt authorizing legislation would give the Board a sense of legitimacy that an appropriations earmark did not (Evans, 1991).

In July 1992 the Higher Education Amendments became law. This legislation authorized a program of alternative licensure of teachers and funding for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (P.L. 102-325). The alternative licensure and National Board programs were a very small part of the Higher Education Amendments. However, when President Bush signed the legislation, he departed from the text of his speech to tell the "Presidential Story" one more time.

And the act includes parts of what we call proudly our America 2000 program, including academies for teachers and school leaders and something called alternative certification.

Now, that’s a program near and dear to my heart,
so let me try to explain it. When I lived out in Odessa, Texas, in 1948 -- I’d just graduated from college and I went out there and had a little extra time on my hands. And my college economics degree was not good enough because I didn’t have the required courses, mandatory courses, then in education. And that bothered me. And then I learned that without a teaching degree, even Albert Einstein couldn’t teach high school science. And now, I might understand keeping me out of there -- (laughter) I might get embarrassed around the computer or something. But Albert Einstein? Come on.

In my first months in office, I proposed legislation to allow the Einsteins to teach without traditional certification. And after three years and three tries, now the Congress has agreed to this. And this helps, in my view, to open up huge talent pools to bring into our classrooms. Now, we can find a way, for example, to encourage more of our men and women who are leaving the Armed Services to put their skills to work leading future generations in the classroom.

And by the way, I’m pleased to note that this past spring, I did receive my alternative teaching certificate from the state of Texas. And the woman who sent me my certificate, Delia Stafford, is with us
today. She's a champion of change, willing to try something different because our children deserve nothing less. And I think it's good to give her a round of applause for her innovative approach (Applause). (Bush, 1992)

There is no doubt that a school district hiring decision of 40 years ago may have been a catalyst for interjecting a third unit of government into teacher licensing policy.

**Summary**

Whether the licensure of teachers is governed by a national body or uncontrolled to allow for the entry of alternative providers, the issues that undergird the two ideas are similar: What standards, if any, should govern entry into education careers? Will the nation's economy be improved if different criteria govern who enters teaching? Can or should government use standards for entry into the profession to address possible imbalance between the supply and demand for teachers? Is this something the federal government should consider as part of its education portfolio?

Given the realm of policy problems facing federal decision makers, it is not surprising that these two measures received relatively little debate or attention. However, that the two measures were not linked during policy
considerations was unexpected. Furthermore, findings from these policy case studies reveal little in the way of patterns of support or opposition to these two measures by decision makers. Senators Kennedy (D-MA), Pell (D-RI), Qayle (R-IN), and Hatch (R-UT) backed both measures but the level of support was modest in each case. Senator Kassebaum (R-KS), Senator Helms (R-SC), and Representative Goodling (R-PA) opposed federal funding for the NBPTS but endorsed alternative licensure. Similarly senior members of the Reagan and Bush Administration (Secretary of Education Cavazos, Secretary of Education Bennett, Assistant Secretary Finn, Undersecretary Sanders, and Charles Kolb, an advisor on Bush’s Domestic Policy Staff) opposed the NBPTS and supported alternative licensure of teachers. These political leaders generally believed that government’s role in social policy should be limited and they saw the NBPTS as imposing federally-endorsed standards on teaching. Yet, the argument could be made that federal authorization of alternative licensure similarly expands the national government’s role and results in endorsement of licensure standards by the manner in which alternative licensure is defined. However, these policy makers elected to define alternative licensure as a strategy for promoting

---

4Department of Education brochures that outline what an alternative program should look like and contain clearly illustrate this point.
educational choice instead of an example of increased federal authority. It is likely the interest of President Bush in alternative licensure and the recounting of his personal experiences in Texas may have influenced the positions of some members of Congress and the executive branch.

Although most Democrat members of the House Committee on Education and Labor opposed the alternative licensure of teachers, this was but one example of their overall opposition to proposals by the Bush Administration. One explanation of the absence of much in the way of patterns of support and opposition is that decision makers defined these policy issues in a manner that would fit their personal values and perspectives on government.

**Policy Influentials**

Two primary factors accounted for the movement of both the NBPTS and alternative licensure proposals onto the federal policy agenda. One catalyst was support by high-placed decision makers and powerful organizations. In the case of alternative licensure these were New Jersey Governor Kean and President Ronald Reagan. For the national certification of teachers it was the nation’s governors through the National Governors Association and the Carnegie Foundation. Another impetus was the influence of the media. The role of the press was found to be uniquely
influential in giving legitimacy to claims put forward by each measures' supporters.

Once the two proposals moved to the federal legislative agenda, the NBPTS proposal was advanced by interest group pressures. Many individuals who served on the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession and later on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards were politically powerful in their own right. These included former North Carolina Governor James Hunt, Mary Futrell, at that time president of the National Education Association, Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers and Xerox executive David Kearns, who later became Undersecretary of Education.

Without exception every congressional staff person interviewed for this study about the NBPTS legislation volunteered that National Board representatives mounted one of the most sophisticated lobbying efforts they had seen from an educational interest group. They noted that the Board had money to prepare "slick" materials, to bring powerful individuals from members' states to Washington as advocates for the Board, and to cover travel and honoraria for members of Congress who attended NBPTS meetings. Former Governor James Hunt was singled out as an effective spokesperson for the Board. Congressional staff mentioned that Hunt understood how the House and Senate operated and
that knowledge, coupled with the Board’s financial resources, proved to be very forceful.

NBPTS staff wisely targeted only members of the authorizing and appropriating committees who would potentially consider the NBPTS legislation. They realized that the measure needed committee support and that it was more cost effective to lobby a relatively few persons than the entire Senate and House of Representatives. Furthermore, they recognized that the potentially powerful role of congressional staff and lobbied these individuals as well (Hattan, 1991; Jennings, 1991).

**Role of the Media**

The Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards that was created by it, enjoyed months of positive media attention. There is no doubt that this "good press" generated momentum that helped the NBPTS legislation in the House and Senate (Jennings, 1991). Moreover, a core group of NBPTS supporters delivered a very focused message to members of Congress in respect to the efficacy of national teacher certification—the same message picked up by the media when the NBPTS was created. This message, which was repeated in meetings, in testimony, and in written materials went virtually unquestioned.
The alternative licensure proposal had media support as well, although it was less extensive than that for the NBPTS. Governor Thomas Kean—a leader in the Republican party during the 1980s—was a forceful advocate of the measure. President Reagan spoke positively about alternative licensure and President Bush adopted the proposal as a personal issue. The alternative licensure measure had no supporting interest group but enjoyed the favor of at least two top Republican party leaders. Like the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, claims on behalf of federal involvement in the alternative licensure of teachers for the most part were unchallenged.

Policy Rationales

Although legislation to fund the NBPTS and alternative licensure of teachers were not purposefully linked in the policy process, both relied on similar assumptions to justify federal government support. By 1991 five claims had emerged that commonly were cited to justify alternative teacher licensure:

1. Persons enrolled in traditional teacher education programs have been and continue to be less able than other college students, alternative licensure will bring more able persons into teaching careers.

2. Alternative licensure will attract more minorities and persons with mathematics and science backgrounds into
teaching.
3. Traditional teacher education isn't necessary, teachers can learn most of what they need to know on the job under the tutelage of an experienced practitioner.
4. Alternative licensure is an example of educational reform.
5. Alternative licensure is a form of deregulation that offers educational choice.

Individuals who mentioned one or more of these claims were asked what research, data or other information led them to believe the statement or statements were valid. Several persons thought they might have seen some reports on the New Jersey Provisional Teacher program, but they couldn't cite anything specific. Two individuals said they believed there were some studies that showed students in private schools out-performed students in public schools on standardized tests. They asserted that because some private school teachers do not have to hold a teaching license and children in some private schools score higher on certain tests than children in some public schools, alternative licensure would bring achievement of children in public schools to the level of those in private schools. Several respondents mentioned hearing stories of brilliant mathematicians or scientists who couldn't get a job in a public school because of licensing restrictions. With the exception of those who
told "The Presidential Story" none could remember who these people were or where they had attempted to get a teaching job.

National Board supporters also relied on assertions of poor teacher quality and a potential teacher shortage—particularly in the science fields and of persons of color—to promote backing for the NBPTS legislation. However, their two central claims were that federal support would advance economic growth and teacher professionalism. The most often cited of the two is the connection between education and economic renewal. It was put forward in the report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession and later is seen in testimony presented in support of federal funding for the teacher certification board and in the legislative purposes of the NBPTS authorizing legislation (H.R. 3717, 1989; S. 2698, 1988; S. 478, 1989). This argument is presented as follows: The United States has lost its competitive edge and is threatened by foreign industry, primarily in Pacific rim nations. Unless American workers will accept further wage declines, the country will need to shift its economic base from manufacturing of goods to knowledge production. For this to occur, schools must educate children in a different manner and teachers are central to this educational shift. Consequently, two things must happen: teachers must possess
different knowledge and skills, and more academically able persons must be recruited into teaching. During debate on the NBPTS legislation this last point was extended to link board certification to recruiting persons in general, and minorities in particular, into teaching. The attention to minority teacher recruitment was based on the notion that the teaching force should reflect the ethnic composition of public schools.

The professionalism argument was a consistent, but quieter part of the policy discussion. Most often advanced by spokespersons for the teachers organizations (Futrell, 1988, 1989; Shanker, 1989), it was stated in terms of enhancing teachers’ working conditions, status, and pay. Because these issues are beyond the realm of federal policy, members of Congress and their staffs often cast teacher professionalism as a means to recruit persons into teaching, a policy strategy more congruous with the federal government’s limited authority.

In Chapter 5 the policy claims revealed in the two case studies are considered. Included is a discussion of unresolved policy paradoxes and conflicts, and proposals to refine the analytic methodology used in this study.
CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The policy case studies described in Chapter 4 provide evidence to support certain of the premises noted in Chapter 1. But, more importantly, the case studies detail the policy arguments used by decision makers to warrant their support for federal funding of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, programs of alternative teacher licensure, or both. In this chapter the policy claims for the two measures are discussed and evaluated, unresolved policy conflicts and paradoxes are noted, and the case study premises presented in Chapter 1 are revisited. The chapter concludes with recommendations for revising the analytic framework employed in this study and suggestions for further research.

Policy Claims

Three assertions consistently were put forward as justification for legislation to alternatively license or to nationally certify teachers: (a) The quality of persons now in teaching is poor and the proposed measure or measures will rectify the situation. (b) The United States is facing a shortage of teachers in general and a shortage of mathematics/science and minority teachers in particular. The proposed measure or measures will act as a recruitment
device. (c) The nation's economic growth will be stimulated by the measure or measures. Each of these three policy claims are reviewed below.

**Teacher Quality**

Congressional and Administration supporters of alternative teacher licensure, federal funding for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, or both often raised the issue of the quality of current teacher candidates. They asserted that individuals who enroll in an undergraduate program leading to an initial teaching license are academically less able than those who decide to enter teaching after earning a bachelors or other degree, after a number of years in other careers, or both.

For alternative licensure, this argument generally was put forward as follows: persons who are preparing to be teachers (either with an education major or minor field of study) are less academically able than other college students. This logic is supported by the assertion that bright people will pursue careers that pay well. Teaching doesn't pay well, therefore, individuals preparing to be teachers are less able. If schools and teachers are to improve, different people need to be attracted into teaching careers. Persons holding bachelors, masters or even doctoral degrees who are tired of jobs in their field, cannot get jobs in their field, or have been unsuccessful in
jobs in their field constitute an alternative pool of potential teachers. These persons should not be expected to enroll in a traditional undergraduate or graduate teacher education program; instead they should be offered a different approach.

Supporters of national certification of teachers relied on similar reasoning. Children do not grow up to productive workers because schools are wanting. Schools are in bad shape because those currently in teaching are academically inferior. The presence of a NBPTS credential will give teaching enhanced status (akin to that of the medical profession). This enhanced status, or professionalism, will lead to higher teacher salaries. Increased pay will attract "brighter" people into education careers. This will lead to the improvement of schools.

Three claims support the arguments outlined above regarding teacher quality: (a) Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores provide evidence that teachers are not as academically qualified as other college-educated persons. (b) Career decisions are motivated primarily by economic factors, and higher salaries will lead to better teaching. (c) Persons in the alternative pool are older with life or work experience that may prove valuable for a teacher. Each of these assertions is considered in turn.
**Academic Qualifications.** When high school juniors or seniors take the SAT, they are asked to identify possible future careers; teaching is among those that may be selected. Providing this information is optional and students may select one of a number of job areas. Weaver (1979, 1981) reviewed mean mathematics and verbal SAT scores for college-bound seniors electing either education or arts/science areas as their first choice college major. He reported that between 1978 and 1981, high school seniors taking the test and indicating a desire to enter teaching scored an average of 320 points below the national mean, placing them in the bottom one-third of students tested.¹ A similar pattern was found by Schlechty and Vance (1982).

The design of studies such as these are open to criticism because they assume a correlation between high school students who check teaching as a possible career when they take the SAT and persons who later are admitted to a teacher preparation program. Moreover, because the examination has been validated only to predict students' freshman year achievement it is not an appropriate instrument to predict teachers job performance (Report of the Advisory Panel on the SAT Score Decline, 1977; Moss, 1989-90).

¹The highest possible score on the SAT is 1600 points.
Schlechty and Vance (1982) point out that the SAT measures something and knowing something has to be preferable to not knowing it (p. 6). The question then becomes, do students who pursue teaching careers know less than other students? In 1985 the U.S. Department of Education awarded a grant to the Allied Systems Institute, Inc. to review data on entering college freshman (including their SAT scores) from 1974 to 1983—the same period studied by Schlechty and Vance and by Weaver. This analysis indicated that high school students who express an interest in teaching scored lower than the national average on both the verbal and mathematical portions of the SAT. However, after reviewing other indicators of student achievement, the Applied Systems Institute report suggested there was no major difference in grade point averages between teacher candidates and other college students; a finding confirmed by AACTE (1987). The grade point comparability presented in this study was evident even when students were measured only on their non-education course work.

Looking at characteristics of persons who enter teaching, Allied Systems Institute, Inc. (1985) reported the ratio of women to men planning to teach was roughly three to one.² This is of note when SAT scores are considered by

²Although there is some yearly fluctuation, the three to one ratio of women to men entering teaching has remained constant to the present (NCES, October 1992).
gender. Currently and historically, men have out-performed women on the SAT. For every year since 1971 average SAT verbal scores for men have been higher than those for women. Average scores for men on the mathematical portion of the SAT have been higher than those for women every year since 1966 (NCES, October 1992). In 1989 Rosser analyzed data from the November 1987 administration of the SAT and found that "[g]irls and boys with A to A+ grade point averages showed a 23-point gender gap on the verbal test and a 60-point gender gap on the math (compared to 14 in the verbal and 44 in the math for the entire sample)" (p. 19). She also reports that female high school students enrolled in advanced mathematics classes earned higher grades but scored 37 to 47 points lower on the SAT than male peers (p. 19). These data raise the question of, how much variance in SAT scores is accounted for by gender?

Concern about possible gender bias associated with the SAT is not new. In Sharif v. NYS Ed. Dept., the U.S. District Court Southern District of New York found "that the SAT under-predicts academic performance of females in their freshman year of college, and over-predicts such performance for males. The court also stated that the probability, absent discriminatory causes, that women would consistently score 60 points less on the SAT than men is nearly zero" (Schuman, 1989, p. 40). Given this finding, the court
prohibited awarding Regents Scholarships in New York State on the basis of SAT scores alone.

Whether SAT scores differ by gender due to test bias or reflect differences in education and societal attitudes toward girls and boys, females tend to score lower than males on both verbal and mathematics sections of the test. Because women constitute approximately two-thirds of persons who enroll in teacher preparation programs and, as a group, women have lower SAT scores than men, it is quite likely that a substantial part of the variance in SAT scores for persons interested in teaching careers reported by Schlechty and Vance and by Weaver is accounted for by the over representation of women in that category of test takers.

The Carnegie Task Force on Education and the Economy (Carnegie Forum, 1986) notes in Time for Results that the overall quality of persons entering teaching has declined because qualified women and minorities now have opportunities in other professional fields. Paradoxically, at the same time, average SAT scores for persons entering education careers gained slightly. If, as the Carnegie Task force asserts, talented women and minorities are not going into teaching, one would assume that SAT scores for education students would fall. This apparent paradox is understood when the influence of gender differences on SAT performance is considered. As "talented" women pursue
careers other than education, the proportion of men in the future educator pool of SAT takers will rise slightly. The increase in SAT scores for persons thinking of becoming teachers may well be the result of fewer women in that category of test takers.

Although there are studies comparing education and non-education college students, much is institution-specific. For example, Book, Freedman and Brousseau (1985) found no significant difference in high school grade point averages (GPAs) when students with teaching and non-teaching majors at Michigan State University were compared. Fisher and Feldmann (1985) reviewed student records at Illinois State University and found that teacher education students had higher overall GPAs as well as higher GPAs on upper division content courses. Studies at Clarion University (Matczynski, Siler, McLaughlin, & Smith, 1988) and at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside (Olsen, 1985) report similar results.

National data on college students who either major in education, or more commonly, take education courses as electives for purposes of licensure are difficult to come by. Studies are confounded by differences in colleges’ curricula and the manner in which institutional data are gathered. The Research About Teacher Education project attempts to address these problems through multi-year studies of a stratified random sample of institutions with
teacher preparation programs. According to data gathered in 1986, elementary education students had 2.9 GPAs and secondary education students had 2.8 GPAs in the general liberal arts courses taken before entry into teacher education programs (AACTE, 1987). Thus, as a group, persons who enroll in traditional teacher education programs appear to be neither the most brilliant nor the least able individuals, instead they are average college students. Haberman (1991), writing in favor of alternative routes to licensure, calls differences in collegiate ability a false argument. He points out that "...once people reach the level of doing well enough to graduate from the university, the distinctions between 'good' and 'high' GPAs become spurious. ...GPA does not correlate with teaching performance" (p. 2).

Caveats about the use of SAT data and studies of future teachers college performance as measured by GPAs notwithstanding, in the case of federal policy regarding teacher credentialling, decision makers were inclined to accept the argument that teachers, as a group, are less able than others in the college-educated population (see, for example, Boyer, 1984; National Commission on Excellence, 1983; National Governors' Association, 1986; New Jersey State Department of Education, 1983).
The tendency to ignore certain data or to use it in an inappropriate manner is illustrative of a societal conflict in addition to the three identified by Green (1983) and discussed in Chapter 2. This conflict involves dissonance between personal convictions of decision makers and empirical evidence presented by the scientific community that may contradict those convictions. Unlike conflict of meaning, which results from disagreements over policy definitions or intent, this fourth conflict involves policy makers' assumptions and personal convictions (or the values and convictions they believe are held in the larger society) and the extent to which these convictions and assumptions do or do not change when contrary evidence is presented to them. The Scholastic Aptitude Test was designed and marketed to be used to predict first year college grades, yet many individuals and groups who want to compare teachers' academic skills with the skills of others in the college-educated population continue to cite SAT scores. It is likely that SAT data are used because they appear to support the assumption of certain individuals in the policy making community that teachers, as a group, are of low academic ability. By misusing SAT data and ignoring studies that suggest future teachers perform well in college coursework, decision makers can resolve this conflict between evidence and values.
Relationship of Salaries To Good Teaching and Career Choice. Teaching commonly is characterized by low wages for those who are engaged in it. In 1960 the average public school teacher’s salary was $4,995, or about $23,500 in 1992 dollars. However, in the 1980s the salaries of public school teachers rose faster than the inflation rate and the average public school teacher now earns $32,413 per year (NCES, October 1992).\(^3\) Representatives of the teachers’ organizations frequently point out that teachers are undercompensated relative to salaries for individuals in other professions. One policy option, suggested by state and local decision makers is to pay teachers on the basis of merit, rather than on the basis of years of service. The National Education Association, in particular, has opposed such efforts, arguing that these merit pay plans are actually schemes to avoid raising salaries for all education professionals (Jordan and Borkrow, 1983).

In congressional testimony NBPTS champions suggested that once the public recognized the special abilities of nationally certified teachers, citizens would be willing to pay them competitively with other professionals (Futrell, 1988; Hunt, 1988). Firestone (1991) submits that "[t]he

\(^3\)These data include teachers in all fields in grades kindergarten through 12. It does not include supplemental salaries; classified employees and principals or other administrators are not included in this pool.
principle underlying merit pay is that some teachers earn more for doing the same work as others only better" (p. 269). This is the expectation for NBPTS teachers. However, unlike existing merit pay plans, the process for earning the national credential would be managed by a national body rather than a school, district or state. Finding the dollars for these additional salaries would continue to be the responsibility of states and localities. Although "merit pay" plans are not an ideal parallel for the salary differences suggested for NBPTS certified teachers, they are a useful proxy for locating policy conflicts that may accompany a pay differential plan.

The notion of merit pay is paradoxical for many teachers. On one hand the typical teacher believes he or she does a good job and deserves to be compensated for it. On the other hand, teachers are apprehensive about the evaluation system used to identify meritorious employees (Lines, 1984). This paradox results from unresolved conflicts between teachers and policy makers or administrators over the meaning of "good teaching" and the

---

"At the time of this study, it was argued that teachers holding NBPTS certification would be able to negotiate higher salaries from schools, districts, or states. NBPTS supporters did not lobby for federal subsidies for teachers. However, when the Clinton Administration introduced its proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1993, language was included to allow school districts to use federal compensatory education dollars to provide salary subsidies to nationally certified teachers.
way in which educators are evaluated and selected for merit awards. If this conflict is not resolved, teachers tend to be distrustful of the pay system and those who administer it (Firestone, 1991).

A key question in regard to the NBPTS credential is whether or not there is a connection between teacher pay differentials and increased student learning. In a monograph summarizing state-supported career ladder programs, Cornett and Gaines (1992) report that 38 percent of teachers in Utah’s Career Ladder Program, which includes a performance bonus component, indicated the program had a positive impact on their own teaching. It is important to recognize, however, that the Utah program involves performance bonuses, job enlargement, an extended contract day, and a career ladder. The data on Utah teachers pertains to the entire program rather than its individual components. Consequently, it is difficult to determine if those teachers who believe their instructional performance has improved were motivated by merit pay or one of the other program elements. Reporting on results of case studies of merit pay programs, Firestone (1991) suggests that while teachers are motivated to spend additional time in the classroom or take on additional responsibilities if a salary supplement is offered, it is intrinsic rewards that motivate their instructional behavior. This is confirmed by
interviews with teachers in Fairfax County Virginia who offered to give up their merit awards if the funds were redirected to student programs and services (Brown, November, 1992).

Awarding certain teachers merit pay is a controversial concept. The Fairfax County Virginia program was criticized by representatives of the teacher organizations for "creat[ing] an atmosphere of competition which is not necessarily helpful when you're working with children" (Gurskey, 1992). The question of who receives merit pay also may cause dissention in a school or community. When school officials in Fairfax County released a report on merit pay teachers and their school assignments, it was determined that academically prestigious schools and schools in wealthier areas of the county had much higher percentages of merit pay teachers than older schools serving poorer residents. Neither the report nor spokespersons for the school districts offered explanations for the distribution of merit pay teachers (Brown, November 1992; Comiteau, November 1992).

Certainly teachers who have been identified as meritorious would be welcomed by principals in newer schools, schools with better facilities, or schools with higher performing students. Thus, it is possible teachers selected to receive merit awards used this recognition to
facilitate transfer to schools they believed would offer better working conditions. It also is possible that the criteria and evaluation system used by Fairfax County to award merit discriminated not just on the basis of the quality of teaching, but also on the basis of school facilities or wealth, the types of students attending the school, or both.

School districts may find that merit pay programs are expensive and are expendable when education budgets are cut. A Philadelphia "senior career teacher" program has cost the city $16 million since its inception in 1989 and is the target of criticism by both teachers and administrators (Mezzacappa, 1992). The Fairfax County merit pay program was discontinued when the school board voted to divert its $8.4 annual allocation to other school services (Brown, 1992).

Questions of whether salary differentials will recruit more persons into teaching, whether NBPTS certified teachers will end up working more often in more wealthy school districts, and whether or not schools will be willing to earmark funds to pay higher salaries for those teachers are not resolved. These programs were not raised during debate on federal support for the NBPTS, either because members of Congress and federal-level decision makers believed salary increases would follow national certification, or more
likely, because they felt this is a local and state issue. During debate on the national certification of teachers, the issue of teacher remuneration became linked to teacher recruitment. In articles and testimony, supporters asserted that as teacher salaries increase academically more able persons will be attracted to education as a career. This line of reasoning assumes that brighter college students are drawn to higher paying occupations leaving the less academically able to pursue teaching careers. Studies by Book et al. (1985) and by Goodlad (1984) suggest this may not be the case. In both studies, researchers interviewed students enrolled in teacher education programs and found that money was not a prime motivating factor in their career choices. Instead, individuals selecting careers in education indicated they did so for intrinsic reasons, such as interest in working with children. This finding is supported by Jelmberg’s 1993 study of elementary and secondary teachers in rural New Hampshire. In this research graduates of traditional teacher preparation programs cited more "child-oriented" reasons for entering teaching while individuals who were alternatively licensed suggested job security and availability as motivating factors.

That the "best" college students end up with high paying jobs while the "poorest" college students take low-paying employment assumes a high correlation between
academic achievement and post-college earnings. Evidence to support this correlation has not been presented by those who make the argument. Book and her colleagues' 1985 study of education and non-education majors at Michigan State University found that a much higher proportion of non-education majors came from families with combined incomes in excess of $50,000 (35 percent vs. 12 percent). This suggests that students may seek careers that will bring them incomes at or slightly above their parents. Thus, the relationship of interest may involve family earnings and expectations of students, or of their families for them, rather than the relationship between anticipated economic rewards and academic ability.

Significance of Candidate Pool Differences. A common theme in the discussion of alternative licensure for teachers is that those who elect to enter teaching in this manner differ from individuals who are licensed after completing a traditional undergraduate or graduate program. Evaluations of alternative programs commonly use a "t"-test or Analysis of Variance to show that traditional and alternate candidate pools are statistically different on such variables as age, work experience, and undergraduate majors. From this, evaluators conclude that alternative licensure programs produce better teachers. (See, for example, Adelman, 1986; Brown, Edington, Spenser, &
Tinafero, 1989).

Finding age, gender, and work experience differences between groups of alternatively licensed and traditionally licensed persons does not, in and of itself, provide evidence that one group produces teachers superior to the other. Hawley's 1991 review of the alternative licensure literature found numerous studies comparing traditionally and alternatively prepared teachers. The majority of these, he notes, had design and methodological flaws (p. 11). Although the conclusions of particular studies may be of questionable validity, Hawley concludes, these studies suggest alternative programs do attract persons with qualities often cited as desirable for teaching and not always present in the pool of graduates from traditional programs. As for example, alternative programs tend to have: (a) more males, (b) more persons over 25, (c) more minorities, and (d) more individuals who have college majors in mathematics, science, and foreign languages (p. 13). He does not, however, accept the premise that the presence of these characteristics results in better teachers. Hawley notes that Darling-Hammond and Hudson (1987) found that career switchers tended to come from jobs in lower salary ranges rather than from the professional or managerial ranks (p. 13). He also observes that knowledge in the sciences and other fields has changed rapidly in recent years and he
questions how up-to-date the academic preparation of older career changes may be. Hawley concludes one should be cautious about equating background in a given discipline or type of employment with current knowledge in the subject or subjects to be taught. In considering whether more mature teaching candidates are better than younger candidates, he suggests that the value of past work experience must be countered with the problem that "mid-career recruits to teaching have more fully developed conceptions of teaching and learning, which if incorrect, are difficult to undo" (p. 14).

Speaking on behalf of the Bush Administration, Baird (1991, March) suggested that the presence of education courses in a student’s undergraduate program of studies keeps them from additional study in the subject matter they will teach. This argument assumes that once an individual completes necessary undergraduate course work for an academic major (teaching field) she or he will continue to take courses in that or a related field. Boyer’s 1987 study of undergraduate education in the United States found little curricular integration in institutions of higher learning and that college departments were increasingly specialized and operating independent from one another. There is no compelling evidence that students who enroll in education courses do so at the expense of study in their major field.
Rather, it appears, they take these courses to fulfill elective requirements outside their major field.

Data from the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program reveal that participants have higher mean scores on measures of subject matter competence than students completing a traditional teacher education program (Klagholz & Schechter, 1991). Reports from other alternative sites present similar findings (Adelman, 1986; Brown, et al., 1989). Several points need to be considered when weighing the importance of such data. Haberman (1985) and Darling-Hammond (1991) caution that individuals enrolled in alternative licensure programs may have been specially recruited and selected on the basis of GPAs, scores on a standardized test—such as the SAT, or both. Carlson (1990) and Sutman (1991) confirm this was the case in New Jersey. Darling-Hammond further suggests that the number of individuals with high GPAs and scores on standardized tests who are interested in entering teaching may be relatively small. She notes that alternative licensure programs may continue to draw non-traditional candidates, but the number of persons with strong academic credentials will be a smaller percentage of that pool.

It is common sense to believe that teachers should be competent in the area or areas they will teach. At issue, is the strength of the relationship between the amount of
academic preparation future teachers receive, scores on subject matter tests, or both, and their students' achievement. Ashton, Crocker, and Olejnik, in a 1986 review of the literature on teacher education effectiveness, found that in nine of 14 studies, there was a correlation between teachers' scores on tests in the subject they teach and their students' achievement. They add the caveat, however, that this is true more often when higher order thinking skills are being taught and in classrooms with high achieving students.

McDiarmid and Wilson (1991) studied 55 randomly selected individuals with undergraduate degrees in mathematics who were enrolled in one of two alternative licensure programs. Subjects were measured on their algorithmic knowledge of mathematics and their knowledge of the logical foundations of the discipline. Although the alternate route candidates could recite mathematical rules of thumb, they could not explain ideas underlying the rules. In regard to individuals preparing to teach at the elementary level they found, "...their initial knowledge of mathematics is procedural and thin [and] they do not seem to learn much about mathematics from teaching it." They question, "...should a major in mathematics -- or in any discipline -- be accepted as a proxy for the kinds of understandings of the subject essential to help diverse
learners understand critical ideas and concepts?" (p. 102)

**Teacher Supply and Demand**

Central to the reasoning that undergirds support for federal funding for the NBPTS and federal involvement in alternative licensing of teachers is an anticipated shortage of elementary and secondary school teachers. In 1986 the Carnegie Task Force on Education and the Economy predicted that roughly 1.3 million new teachers would be needed between that time and 1992 (Carnegie Forum, 1986). This forecast was based on three factors: (a) teachers hired in the 1960s to meet the "baby boom" should be nearing retirement age, (b) fewer people were entering college teacher preparation programs than in the 1970s, and (c) the children of baby boomers would be entering school (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. 31). Given this forecast, the Task Force envisioned a system of national certification of teachers as a recruitment tactic.

The specter of an anticipated teacher shortage is echoed in testimony presented before the House and Senate during hearings on the NBPTS legislation and in the authorizing bill's statements of findings (Hunt, 1988; H.R. 3717, 1989). Governor Hunt points to "looming" teacher retirements (p. 2) and in H.R. 3717, the Congress "finds that there are 2,300,000 public school teachers for grades kindergarten through 12, and between 1988 and 1997 1,600,000
new teachers will be needed" (Sec. 2.(a)(1)).

**Projections of Teacher Demand.** According to data compiled by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the Carnegie Task Force and congressional estimates of teacher demand were unrealistically high. NCES reports that between 1985 and 1988 the number of teaching positions in public and private elementary and secondary schools increased from 2.550 million to 2.661 million, an average growth per year of 1.7 percent. Further, they predicted a teaching force of 2.840 million in 1992, an increase of 290,000 teaching slots over seven years (NCES, July 1992, p. 56). Thus, the Carnegie Task Force’s prediction that 1.3 million new teachers would be needed between 1986 and 1992 exceeded the actual requirement, as reported by NCES, by 1.0 million teachers. The difference may be explained by unfulfilled expectations that teachers would leave the field in large numbers, that schools would have an exceedingly high demand for new personnel, or both.

The number of actual or potential teaching positions is only one dimension of the teacher demand picture. Teacher demand is a function of both the number of job vacancies and the ease with which administrators are able to fill these vacancies. During the 1987-1988 school year the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education
Statistics sampled and surveyed 56,000 educators in 9,300 public schools and 11,000 educators in 3,500 private schools. The result of this effort, the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), was published in 1992. SASS data indicate that for the 1987-88 school year, fifty-three percent of administrators reported problems finding teachers in certain fields, and 19 percent reported general difficulty in filling vacancies, however ultimately 99 percent of classroom vacancies in public and private schools were filled. Private school administrators reported more recruitment problems than public school counterparts and urban districts and had more difficulty finding qualified applicants than suburban districts (NCES, July 1992, pp. 107-112).

An important component of the demand picture is whether or not additional new teaching jobs are expected to be created. New jobs could develop as the result of state, local, or federal policies mandating smaller class size, requiring additional course work of all students--such as foreign languages--or because the number of school-age children increases. Of these, the one most likely to have a nation-wide effect on the demand for teachers is an increase in the number of children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools. The Carnegie Task Force predicted in 1986 that school enrollments would increase from
approximately 39 million children to 41 million children in 1992. This projection was on target. The Department of Education (NCES, 1992) reported that in 1990 there were 41 million children in public elementary and secondary schools and 5.2 million students in private schools. Using data from the 1990 census, the Department of Education went on to project that, by the year 2002, 54.0 million children will be enrolled in public and private elementary and secondary schools (NCES, December 1992). Although census data help gauge future school enrollments, they don’t automatically translate into a need for additional teachers.

Teacher vacancies in elementary and secondary schools aren’t always filled. State or local revenues may be insufficient to fund new positions, even if qualified candidates are found. The Schools and Staffing Survey (NCES, July 1992) asked school administrators to identify methods used to handle unfulfilled teaching vacancies. When faced with this situation administrators most often reported the use of substitutes or part-time teachers (saving the expense of health, retirement, and other benefits). The next most common strategy involved reassigning teachers and increasing teaching loads. In addition, ten percent of the time administrators reported they increased class size instead of hiring a new teacher. Consequently, enrollment growth doesn’t always create new teaching positions.
**Projections of Teacher Supply.** The Carnegie Task Force suggested that because a number of new teachers were hired in the 1960s to meet baby boom enrollments, the retirement of these people in the late 1980s and early 1990s would result in a teacher shortage. However, significant teacher retirements haven’t materialized. The average age of teachers in 1988 was 40 years old (NCES, July 1992). NCES (October 1992) reported that the largest category of persons with bachelor’s degrees in education are persons 35 to 44 years old, and the second largest category is persons 25 to 34 years old. Collectively, these two groups account for three-fifths of persons who hold undergraduate degrees in education. Additionally, of those persons who left teaching at the end of the 1988-1989 school year, only 29,600 indicated retirement as the reason (NCES, July 1992). Several reasons may account for fewer retirements than expected. Overall, teachers’ salaries have increased in recent years (NCES, October 1992), perhaps convincing some educators to postpone plans to leave teaching. Also, because of relatively high general unemployment in recent years, teachers may have chosen not to retire because they believed few opportunities existed for second career employment.

Murnane, Singer, and Willett (1988) point out that studies of teacher supply may be confounded by complex
teacher attrition and re-entry patterns. In their study of persons who began teaching in Michigan in 1972, they report that between one quarter and one third of persons who left teaching within their first eight years returned after a career interruption. That re-entries form a pool of potential of teachers from which administrators will select employees in confirmed by the SASS data.

The Schools and Staffing Survey data indicate that 11 percent of all teachers were new hires; however only three percent were new to teaching. That is, of the approximately 2.6 million persons teaching in 1987-88, 286,000 were new hires, but 208,000 jobs were filled by transfers and persons who were experienced teachers but had not taught the previous year. Only 78,000 persons who could be classified as new to teaching were hired. If most positions are filled by experienced teachers, are enough new teachers prepared each year to make up the difference?

According to the *Digest of Education Statistics 1992* (NCES, October 1992), in 1990 104,711 students were graduated from U.S. colleges and universities with undergraduate education majors. Because some states and institutions don't recognize or offer education majors, yet students may take necessary course work to meet state licensure requirements, it can be assumed that this is an underestimate of the number of individuals who complete
undergraduate programs and are newly prepared to teach. In addition, 86,057 education master’s degrees were awarded in 1990 (NCES, October 1992). It also may be assumed that a portion of these are Masters of Arts in Teaching or other programs that prepare a person to receive an initial teaching license. If vacancies in the 1990-91 school year are comparable to those in 1988-89, new college graduates (bachelors and masters levels) who have completed state licensure requirements could fill all non-transfer vacancies in public and private schools at least one and a half times.

Assertions that the United States is facing a shortage of teachers appears to be based on the assumption that new hires are drawn primarily from the ranks of newly prepared to teach and that college enrollments of persons who want to be teachers are declining or have remained constant from the low levels of the 1970s (NCES, October 1992). According to the Digest of Education Statistics 1992, there were 5.3 million persons in the United States holding bachelor’s degrees in education in 1987. Of these, 61 percent would now be 50 years old or younger. Additionally, since 1987 approximately 350,000 new education bachelor’s degrees were conferred (NCES, October 1992). Thus, the supply of potential teachers appears to be equal to and keeping pace with demand needs. Furthermore, the Department of Education projects that enrollments in institutions of higher learning
will increase by 14 percent between 1991 and 2003 (NCES, December 1992) and it is reasonable to expect that the number of students interested in education careers also will increase.

In making the argument that NBPTS certification or alternative licensure will address teacher shortages, advocates have relied primarily on projections of teacher demand. When data on teacher supply are considered, the expectation that a nation-wide teacher shortage is on the horizon is open to serious question. Of course the issue as framed by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a profession isn’t merely an absolute undersupply of teachers but rather an undersupply of teachers prepared to meet NBPTS-developed standards.

**Recruiting Particular Teachers.** Once the policy making community locked onto the notion that NBPTS certification or the availability of alternative licensure might attract persons into teaching, the next level of argument was that one or both of these measures would appeal to individuals with mathematics and science backgrounds or to persons of color. Advocates of alternative licensure pointed to programs in Los Angeles, New Jersey, and Texas as evidence that these programs would help increase numbers of minority and mathematics and science teachers.
Stoddard's 1991 study of the Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program reveals that between 1985 and 1990 of the 1100 persons who completed the LAUSD alternative program, 257 were licensed to teach science. The same report indicates that 440 individuals enrolled in the program had some previous experience in scientific areas. Thus, the LAUSD program apparently attracted quite a few persons with scientific experience or backgrounds. However, only about half of these people became licensed science teachers (Stoddard does not indicate whether these persons left the LAUSD program or elected to teach in other fields).

Data from the state of New Jersey indicate that between 1985 and 1989 15 percent of the alternative licensure candidates employed in New Jersey schools were working as science teachers and 12 percent were working as mathematics teachers (New Jersey State Department, 1989; Schechter, 1987). Even assuming that most, if not all, of these New Jersey teachers have some previous experience in mathematics or science fields, the number of scientists or mathematicians who entered teaching through the alternative route is modest.

The suggestion that alternative licensure is a good mechanism to attract minorities into teaching is a claim

---

5It is interesting that according to the New Jersey data, the largest number of alternate route graduates took jobs teaching in elementary and nursery schools.
that didn't enter the policy debate until after federal legislation was introduced. When the notion of alternative teacher licensure first appeared on the policy agenda, the argument was made that this strategy would attract persons with different qualifications into teaching, but ethnic or racial differences initially were not mentioned. However, when alternative teacher licensure moved into the legislative arena, it did so when Congress was struggling with issues of race-based scholarships and the problem of how to recruit more minorities into teaching careers. It was during this time that the connection between alternative licensure and minority recruitment began to be made. This allowed policy makers to assert they had a strategy for recruiting minorities into teaching without becoming embroiled in the matter of race-based federal aid.

Alternative programs in Texas, Los Angeles, and New Jersey often are cited for their minority enrollees (Baird, 1991, March; Klagholz & Schechter, 1991; Schechter, 1987; Stoddard, 1991). From this Baird, Stoddard and others imply that alternative licensure program are more successful in recruiting minorities into teaching than traditional teacher education programs. This seemingly causal relationship deserves further investigation. New Jersey established the Provisional Teacher Program to replace an emergency credential offered by the state. Teachers with a New Jersey
emergency license were most commonly found in urban settings and often were minority. When the emergency license was eliminated these persons were required to enroll in the Provisional Program or risk losing their jobs (Carlson, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1991). F.X. Sutman (personal communication, March 9, 1990) stated that minorities enrolled in a Master of Arts in Teaching program at a New Jersey college,

...were required by the Teacher Certification Officer in the New Jersey Department of Education to formally register as alternate route candidates. In fact, some of these candidates were required to complete the eight [sic] week summer alternative route program experience after receiving the MAT degree. This action by the State Department of Education continued at least through 1987, swelling the number [of minority candidates] reported in formally announced alternate route data (p. 1).

There are roughly 20 alternative licensure sites in Texas, some operated by institutions of higher education, others by school districts. State Education Agency data for 1986 show that in geographic areas with a significant minority population minority enrollments in alternate route programs are high. Few, if any minorities enrolled in alternate
programs found in predominately white areas and institutions (Texas Education Agency, 1990). Similarly, the alternative route program serving Los Angeles was designed to recruit individuals from minority communities and prepare them for teaching careers in those areas (Stoddard, 1991). Thus, in the three most often referenced states, presence of minority candidates in alternative licensure programs appears to be a function of geographic and demographic influences, rather than the alternative program itself.

**Connection Between Education and the Economy**

The connection between education and the economy assumes there is a correlation between policy intervention in the education sector and a nation's economic health. It is not new to link government support for education to economic growth. This was the premise of the Smith-Hughes Act (P.L. 64-347, 1917) and was, in part, justification for establishment of the National Science Foundation in 1954. Linking school improvement to economic growth was an argument forwarded by New Jersey Governor Kean when he announced the Provisional Teacher Program (Kean, 1983, September 6). It also was commonly presented as justification for NBPTS certification. In House and Senate hearings on funding for the NBPTS, virtually all supporting witnesses asserted that creating a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards would help promote economic
growth. No one explained how or when this would occur, nor did members of Congress raise the question (see Hunt, 1988; Kean, 1988; Kearns, 1989; Shanker, 1989).

A Nation Prepared, the report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession that proposed the NBPTS doesn't present an evidential foundation for the connection between classroom teaching and economic growth. The Carnegie Task Force report reprints a table from the U.S. Department of Education that indicates average mathematics achievement for eighth graders in the United States lags behind achievement of children in Japan. From this, one supposedly may presume that Japan has the kind of learning economy the Task Force proposes, that mathematics achievement is a hallmark of a learning society, or both.

Whether or not there is a correlation between a nation's education system and its economic productivity (generally as measured by the nation's output per worker) deserves further attention. The former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Charles Schultze (1992), points out that growth in output per worker is a function of five components: (a) the average number of hours worked each week, (b) the quantity of workers’ education, (c) the quantity of capital, (d) economies of large scale production, and (e) a residual category that includes advances in technology and other factors, some of which are
not known. He notes that between 1943 and 1973 the total output per worker increased by 2.3 percent per year. Of this, 0.4 percent per year, or about one-fifth, is attributed to increases in the amount of formal education workers receive.\textsuperscript{6} Between 1973 and 1983 productivity, as measured by output per worker, slowed to 0.2 percent per year. However, education's contribution remained constant at 0.4 percent per year.\textsuperscript{7} This indicates that although worker productivity has been buffeted about by a number of factors, the influence of education on productivity has remained steady from 1940 to the present. It should be noted that during this same time period, expenditures per elementary and secondary school pupil as a percentage of per capita income nearly doubled (NCES, June 1992, p. 130). Thus, although more people attend school and graduate than 50 years ago, and funding for education, in constant dollars, is higher, the contribution of education to worker productivity has remained constant. This suggests that investments in programs to increase the amount of education per citizen may have intrinsic benefits, but such investments don't measurably increase worker productivity.

\textsuperscript{6}The residual category accounts for roughly half of the output per worker (Schultze, 1992, p. 230).

\textsuperscript{7}The contribution of 0.4 percent by the education category is offset by negative contributions in other categories, such as the number of hours worked per employee.
When computing worker productivity, economists account for education in quantitative terms. Schultz (1992) points out that "Growth studies rely on the central assumption that the economic payoff of education -- the higher productivity associated with additional years of education -- can be measured by examining the differences in earnings among people with different amounts of education" (p. 290). However, Rasell and Appelbaum (1992) caution that wages do not always precisely measure productivity. They note that factors like wage discrimination based on gender, ethnicity or both, regional variation in wages, and the size of the employing firm "make wages an imperfect measure of productivity and introduce error into wage-based estimates of the contributions of education" (p. 21). They conclude,

Actually, workers' wages are determined by a combination of factors, including skill and productivity levels, a credentialing process, discrimination, and industry and regional variables. But empirical studies of workers' economic contributions frequently assume that wage differentials solely reflect differences in productivity and skills and ignore these other factors. This can overstate the benefits of education. These points must be kept in mind as we review the evidence of the effects of education on the economy and on individual productivity
and earnings (p. 21).

These analysts conclude that advances in education have had a positive impact on economic growth, but admonish that "evidence of past contributions from education must be accepted with some reservations, and we cannot assume that past trends will automatically continue into the future" (Rasell & Appelbaum, 1992, p. 40). They observe that

...an abundance of well-educated, highly-skilled workers alone will not guarantee that needed changes occur. Education advocates must be careful not to promise more than can be delivered. Education is necessary to enable the change to more highly skilled jobs in a more competitive economy, but even an abundance of very educated workers cannot ensure that change will occur. For that, additional workplace and industrial policies are necessary to push business and industry onto the high-skill, high-wage path (p. 41).

Questions about the assertion that there is a correlation—if not a causal relationship—between an individual’s education and the nation’s economic growth are raised by Hurn and Burn (1982) who note that there is no known research
. . . which shows that the mathematical skills or scientific literacy of the mass of a society’s population has effects on national productivity or even on the level of scientific achievements in that society. Perhaps such relationships do exist—relationships, for example, between enrollment in business courses and increased entrepreneurial activity, or between the low quality of high school science teaching and a possible relative decline in American as compared with European scientific achievement. But it is beyond [our] skills to validate them (p. 5).

On their face, arguments linking education and economic growth are compelling. Individuals and groups who appeal to local, state, and national policy makers to fund educational programs use "education and the economy" as a mantra to justify the expenditure of public funds and make the case that the public will receive financial benefits for an investment in education.

NBPTS advocates have taken an unquestioned connection between education and economic growth that generally is framed in quantitative terms and recast it qualitatively. That is, they submit it is the type rather than the number of years of education that correlate with increases in worker output. This argument is taken further to suggest
that of the possible variables that influence the quality of a person’s education, the most important is the teacher’s professional preparation. This approach largely ignores students’ role and responsibility in learning and other variables. In reshaping the economic argument to advance the idea of national certification for teachers we are asked to assume that the measure of a successful education is worker flexibility instead of worker wages. Behind this way of thinking is the expectation that the average worker will hold five to ten different jobs during his or her career (Kearns, 1989) and that these individuals need the intellectual creativity to make job shifts without extensive new training. Thus the value to the economy does not necessarily come in the form of increased worker wages but rather that less money is spent on retraining allowing individuals to spend time producing goods and services.

There are seeds of a policy paradox in this line of reasoning. Carnegie Task Force members assert that a good educational system is one that promotes worker flexibility rather than focusing on job retraining and accumulation of years of education and employment credentials, the empirical basis on which the linkage between education and the economy rests. Thus, the contribution to the nation’s gross domestic production (GDP) by the average number of weekly working hours should increase while the education
contribution—which typically is measured in terms of amount of education—will decline. Consequently, the causal connection between a different educational system and the economic growth that NBPTS supporters suggest (Hunt, 1989) won’t be reflected in the economic models currently used to measure GDP.

**Policy Conflicts and Paradoxes**

The analytic framework employed to study federal policy in regard to the licensure or certification of teachers required identification of societal conflicts in public policy and locating policy paradoxes. Three policy conflicts were adapted from Green’s 1983 work on excellence and equity and were presented in Chapter 2. They are, (a) conflict of meaning, (b) conflict over level of aggregation, and (c) conflict associated with policy implementation. In the two policy case studies reported in this work, policy conflicts were many, rarely subtle, and generally unnoticed or unaddressed. By not heeding these conflicts, decision makers’ decisions generated new policy paradoxes.

Five paradoxes are associated with alternative teacher licensure, two are specific to state government activity, one is seen at state and federal levels, and the final two did not emerge until teacher licensure moved onto the federal agenda. The first paradox involves situations, such as New Jersey in 1983, in which state governments were
imposing new regulations on collegiate-based teacher education programs while, at the same time, alternative programs were able to operate with relatively few standards. This paradox was created because conflicts over what qualifications are necessary for a beginning teacher were unresolved. The second paradox, again, specific to state government, involves accountability. Governments are created, in part, to protect the public interest. In the case of education, this involves using the licensure and institutional program approval processes to assure that persons prepared to teach in the public schools meet certain minimum standards. When states design and offer teacher training programs and also award the license, but are not subject to external evaluation, how is the public interest protected? This paradox is the result of policy conflicts over the delivery and evaluation of teacher education programs. That is, does the responsibility for teacher education curricular decisions lie with institutions of higher learning--which protect their independence from government intrusion in the curriculum--or with the state, which carries responsibility for protecting children and youth in the public education system?

The New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program and similar alternative programs in other states include an induction period during which the teacher candidate assumes
responsibility for a classroom of students while being mentored by an experienced teacher. The paradox in this approach, which shows up in state and federal rationales for alternative licensure, is that the very people who are products of the traditional teacher preparation programs the alternative may replace are charged to help the teacher candidate learn how to teach. Quite clearly, this paradox arises from lack of consensus over what constitutes good teaching.

Two new paradoxes emerge when alternative licensure moved to the federal policy agenda. The first involves problems with level of implementation of a federal program. Can the federal government establish standards or criteria for states to receive support for alternative licensure programs that are neither more permissive nor more restrictive than existing state licensure requirements? If the U.S. Department of Education develops universal criteria for states to receive alternative licensure funds is the Department exceeding its statutory authority? The final paradox is related to the previous one. The Bush Administration, committed to deregulation, a market economy, and educational choice, developed a plan to legislate licensure flexibility and began to develop standards to implement it. However, in resorting to federal legislation and standards setting, the federal government is extending
its regulatory power rather than restricting it.

The argument that investments in education will lead to a stronger economy has within it the seeds of a paradox. Currently national economic models compute GDP on the basis of worker productivity (determined in part by the amount of worker education). Consequently, if NBPTS-certified teachers promote intellectual flexibility among learners, reducing the need for additional years of training, we may expect a reduction in education’s contribution to GDP computations weakening the core argument upon which federal support for education was constructed.

Federal support for educational research is clear and long standing. Although the NBPTS is involved in assessment design, it describes itself as a standards setting body rather than a research institute or think-tank. Senator Helms pointed out that the authorizing legislation for the National Board provided financial accountability but not programmatic accountability. For Helms this was troublesome because of his concern that the Board would enact standards unacceptable to private school personnel. However, if the NBPTS authorizing legislation included federal government involvement in, or approval of, teaching standards it would be moving into a policy area generally reserved to the states. States give no indication of relinquishing their responsibility for teacher credentialing, so we assume that
educators will be expected to meet both state and national standards. But, states license individuals to protect children from incompetent or dangerous persons while the federal government’s interest in this matter appears to be to stimulate the economy. In this instance, there potentially is a conflict between government jurisdictions over their differing expectations for teacher standards.

Although the NBPTS was successful in securing federal funds to support its efforts, the policy conflicts associated with federal support of the Board are not resolved. A primary problem is the purpose of the NBPTS certificate. Looking at the structure of the Board, it appears that its purpose is to change the behavior of individual teachers. This will occur by establishing standards and then having individual teachers exhibit behaviors that indicate the standards are being met. The purpose of the NBPTS also may be to alter the nature of teacher preparation (preservice or inservice) so programs to help teachers achieve national certification are institutionalized either within colleges and universities or other teacher training providers. Discussion in congressional hearings and conversations with House and Senate staff do not suggest that policy makers see either individual teachers or teacher preparation programs as the unit of change to be effected by the NBPTS. Instead, policy
makers indicated they expect the change to be reflected in elementary and secondary student performance, generally as measured on national standardized tests. At issue are unresolved policy conflicts over the implementation of the program to nationally certify teachers and the expectations of decision makers of outcomes of that certification. The policy making community holds expectations that schools and performance on national tests will improve, while NBPTS advocates anticipate that the units of change will be a limited number of individual teachers.

**Creating Paradoxes.** Certain policy paradoxes clearly were the result of one of the three kinds of unresolved societal conflicts proposed by Green (1983). Lack of consensus about what constitutes good teacher preparation (a conflict of meaning) led to policies in New Jersey that simultaneously tightened standards for collegiate-based teacher education while opening up alternative routes for persons with baccalaureate degrees. Other paradoxes were more likely the result of advocacy for a program proceeding sound analysis. Linking economic growth to the availability of NBPTS certification for teachers is one such example. Attention to how national economic models are constructed would have revealed that education's contribution to GDP is computed on years of education or training workers receive and that teachers' qualifications or skill level aren't
explicitly considered.

Resolving these or other policy paradoxes may be confounded by more fundamental problems. Lazerson (1982) suggests that problems with developing sound educational policy is confounded by "...the tendency to treat fundamental tensions as if they were managerial and evaluation problems" (411). By thinking about education problems as "...primarily managerial and evaluative is to trivialize the deep tensions within American Education" (Lazerson 1982, p. 411). Conflicts exist over what constitutes good teacher preparation, how it is certified, and government’s role in this process. However, instead of addressing these core problems, decision makers elected to enact policies related to a more administrative matter: legislating the process by which educators are credentialed.

Initially, it seems paradoxical that both alternative licensure and national certification of teachers would share policy arguments and would be enacted by the same Congress (although they followed independent legislative paths). Why would government at the same time push alternative licensure—a form of deregulation and national standards for teachers through the NBPTS?

Labaree (1992) suggests an answer. He describes the history of education reform in this manner,
Over the years, reformers have swung back and forth between political goals (equity, equality, citizenship training) and market goals (excellence, vocational training, individual status attainment). For example, while the 1960s and 1970s were marked by a push for more equity in schools, with attacks on racial segregation and class-based tracking, the early 1980s saw a shift in the direction of excellence. (p. 129)

He suggests that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is an example of a market-based education reform.

The advantage of the market approach, from [Carnegie’s] perspective, is that it provides an incentive for individual teachers to strive for excellence in the practice of their profession, whereas the political approach (for example, state-mandated certification requirements) can only establish minimum criteria for entry into practice. In the best tradition of Reagan-era initiatives, then, board certification of teachers promises to promote higher standards for public education by means of individual initiative and unfettered competition (p. 131)

Employing Labaree’s theory, resolves—at least in part—some of the apparent dissonance between alternative
licensure and national certification policies.

**Review of Premises**

**Shifting Federal Role**

Policy case studies were used to explore the dynamics that led to congressional endorsement of funding for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and programs to alternatively license teachers. Because both measures dealt with teacher credentialing—an area traditionally under the authority of state governments—it was assumed that discussion of a shift in federal role would be part of the policy debate. In general, this was not the case. Several members of Congress questioned whether the federal government would overstep its authority in funding the NBPTS, but no similar concerns were voiced in regard to alternative licensure. Instead, most of the discussion centered on when these two programs would deliver on the claims articulated by their supporters and how quickly the measures would lead to the promised reforms. No evidence was found to suggest that state governments are relinquishing their responsibility for teacher licensure or the standards colleges and universities must meet if they are to offer teacher education programs.

Rather than a shift in authority from one jurisdiction to another, federal attention to teacher licensure appears to be an example of what Cohen (1982) refers to as the
redefinition and expansion of school problems that governments are expected to address. In this case the federal government expanded its influence into the area of standards for teacher credentialling in an attempt to address the general issue of school improvement. Because states continue to retain their authority for teacher credentialling, the outcome of federal involvement in this area will be a standards setting and licensing process under the authority of more than one jurisdiction. Because potential intergovernmental jurisdictional matters were not part of the policy debate, future policy conflicts may be anticipated. At the core of this debate we may expect to find unresolved tension over the purpose of teacher credentialling; or, more specifically the expectations of federal and state governments for their standards and licensing policies. State governments have developed processes to license teachers for two primary purposes: (a) to protect citizens of the state from those who are unqualified to teach, and (b) to increase or reduce the supply of teachers. However, the federal government’s entry into the realm of teacher credentialling has been marked by expectations that national certification or alternative licensure would: (a) lead to school reform, (b) result in more capable workers, and (c) create a stronger, more competitive national economy, none assured by evidence
currently available.

**Agenda Setting**

A framework developed by John Kingdon (1984) was used to assess how the NBPTS and alternative licensure proposals came to the federal policy agenda. Kingdon identified several factors that may push items on to the policy agenda. In the policy case studies reported here, two elements suggested by Kingdon were found to be catalysts: the presence of powerful supporters for each of the measures and the influence of the media. In the case of alternative teacher licensure, the proposal’s champion initially was New Jersey Governor Kean. However, the measure received positive attention by President Reagan and the personal endorsement of President Bush. These endorsements helped solidify support among Republican policy makers in the Reagan and Bush Administrations and in the Congress. The proposal to use government funds to support the NBPTS had the backing of former North Carolina Governor Hunt, the leaders of the two major teacher organizations, and the Carnegie Foundation. Although these individuals and members of the Foundation’s board didn’t have the direct political power of a U.S. President, they were skillful advocates for the NBPTS. In addition, they were adept in the Washington, DC political arena and, thus, able to cultivate key congressional decision makers who ultimately backed the
NEPTS legislation.

The role of the media in moving the two proposals onto the public policy agenda was similar in both cases. That is, both the proposal for a national teacher certification board and for a way to alternatively license teachers received positive media coverage over a sustained period of time.

An unexpected finding was the importance of the claims reported by the media for these two measures before either was part of the federal policy debate. In both the case of national certification and alternative licensure of teachers, undocumented assumptions put forward in the media were legitimized by their appearance in the press. These early claims became the rationales most often cited to justify the expenditure of federal funds for programs related to teacher credentialing. During a conversation with one respondent, he suggested that the best way to get the attention of a member of Congress is to have one’s issue receive positive coverage in the Washington Post or the New York Times (Jennings, 1991).8 Print articles in the media

---

8Legislation to "warranty" teachers illustrates the influence of media articles. In the mid 1980s Oregon Representative Ron Wyden introduced a bill to require colleges and universities to provide "warranties" for new teachers or risk loss of eligibility for any of their students to receive federal financial assistance. When asked about the genesis of this idea Wyden told this author he read about a program like it in an airline inflight magazine.
are particularly powerful because they are accepted as accurate even though the basis of the claims or assertions in the articles are rarely cited and often may be open to question.

**Consistency of Support**

As discussed in Chapter 4, there was little consistency among policy makers regarding support for or opposition to the two teacher credentialing bills. In general, Republicans in the Congress and in the Bush and Reagan administrations supported alternative licensure of teachers but not their national certification. Democrats in the Congress tended to support national certification but not alternative teacher licensure. Obviously, party loyalty is a factor in both cases. What is interesting, however, is that the arguments advanced in support of both measures were almost identical. Was party loyalty so powerful in these two very small, barely significant legislative measures, that their similarities were ignored? The answer to this question may lie in the way data and research were used in the decision making process.

**Use of Data and Research for Policy Decisions**

Policy makers tended to accept without question all of the rationales put forward for both the alternative licensure and national certification of teachers. Yet, they
tended to only support one or the other. If the arguments for these measures were so compelling, why didn't persons in the policy community support both of them?

Airasian (1988) suggests that although the need for a policy initiative may be substantiated by research, empirical evidence rarely if ever "...documents the efficacy of a particularly strategy of intervention" (p. 301). He argues that "...once a need for intervention is documented empirically, the specific policy, program, or approach advanced to meet that need must seek its own sources of legitimization and validation. These sources rarely include trial testing and collection of empirical evidence" (p. 301). His hypothesis is that policy makers seek legitimacy for their decisions in what he calls "social validation" or the "...mesh between prevalent social norms and values and the norms and values perceived to be reflected in the reform strategy" (p. 302). He concludes that,

The legitimacy of most innovations then, derives not from empirical evidence of their likely effectiveness, but rather from the perceptions they evoke and the extent to which those perceptions mesh with prevalent social norms and values. In essence, innovations are weighed in terms of whether they are symbols of broader social values, and it is this symbolic weighing of
innovations that determines their legitimacy in the public’s eyes. (p. 302)

Acceptance of claims on behalf of programs to alternatively license or nationally certify teachers without supporting evidence for those claims conforms to the theory Airasian presents. In this situation, the values imbedded in the policy claims—a competitive economy and a strong education system—were powerful enough to convince decision makers of the efficacy of the policy remedies. Thus, it isn’t surprising that clear patterns of support or opposition to one or the other of the credentialing measures did not emerge. Decision makers legitimized their actions on the basis of the values they perceived in the policy option, giving scant attention to the soundness of the logic undergirding the policy claims.

Utility of Analytic Framework

The analytic lens used to study the arguments revealed in the two policy studies drew upon the work of Thomas Green (1983) and Deborah Stone (1988). Both Green and Stone suggest that the heart of policy studies involves attempts to understand and resolve value conflicts or policy paradoxes resulting from lack of attention to these conflicts. Green’s three types of policy conflicts—conflict of meaning, conflict of implementation, and
conflict over level of aggregation—were useful for scrutiny of policy arguments put forward for legislation to promote alternative licensure of teachers and for federal funding for the NBPTS. However, this framework would be strengthened by inclusion of two additional conflicts.

**Conflict Over Policy Expectations.** In each policy case study it was evident that supporters had very different expectations for what the proposed measures would deliver. In addition, state and federal governments seem to have different expectations of the purpose of educator credentialling. As long as there is a mismatch between policies and expectations for them paradoxes are bound to be a consequence.

**Conflict Between Values and Evidence.** This conflict results when there are differences between decision makers’ personal convictions and data or research about a particular policy issue. In the two policy studies included in this research, decision makers generally ignored research that did not support their personal values or preconcieved ideas about teachers and teaching. Because this conflict wasn’t addressed, questionable policy claims were given government legitimacy.
Areas for Further Study

The absence of extensive work on federal policy in teacher education suggests this is an area where additional research would be valuable. The role of the media in legitimizing policy arguments before measures were on the policy agenda was an unexpected and somewhat disturbing finding. More study is needed on the staying power of rationale statements, data, research reports and the like reported in newspapers and other media. Scholastic Aptitude Test data for persons considering education careers often were cited as evidence of poor teaching. That females score lower than males on both verbal and mathematical portions of the exam is well-documented. In addition, we know that more women than men both indicate an interest in teaching and enter teacher preparation programs. A possible connection between the over representation of women in teaching and SAT scores deserves further investigation. Airasian's (1988) theory of social validation may account for the unquestioned acceptance of flawed policy claims by decision makers. The presence or absence of this behavior in other policy situations deserves additional study. Finally, further attention should be given to variations in expectations among decision makers for particular policies before they are legislated or otherwise enacted.
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