

School Reform: Past, Present and Future

By Sharon Hartin Iorio, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Education
Wichita State University
1845 Fairmount
Wichita, KS 67226

With
M.E. Yeager
Post-Doctoral Fellow
College of Education
Wichita State University
1845 Fairmount
Wichita, KS 67226

School Reform Strategies *An interdisciplinary perspective*

Harris Manchester College
Oxford University
Oxford, England
Monday, July 25, 2011

Discussion Leader: Ronald Canuel, Chief Executive Officer, Canadian
Education Association, Ontario Canada

ABSTRACT

This paper will briefly review the history of U.S. school reform movements and present issues currently being discussed as reform initiatives. More specifically, the paper will address the following: student learning gains and student assessment, education for diversity, curriculum development, and university preparation for pre-service teachers. The paper will address these current concerns by focusing on the transformation of pre-baccalaureate teacher education through a discussion of the efficacy of the Professional Development School model for experiential learning coupled with changes in teacher education pedagogy. Offered as an example will be the implementation of the Wichita Teacher Quality Partnership between Wichita State University (approximate total enrollment 14,000) and the Wichita Public School system—the 50th largest public school district in the United States and the only school system in the state of Kansas to be federally designated as a high-need urban school district). This partnership is developed from a U.S. Department of Education five-year grant currently in its second year. The paper will end with recommendations for moving forward in teacher education.

SCHOOL REFORM: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

Educational reform, at its base, is driven by the one singular idea that runs consistently throughout American experience—the idea that education, in itself, has the power to create fundamental change both for individuals and for society at large. A legion of reformers, includes the great—Thomas Jefferson, Horace Mann, Booker T. Washington, John Dewey and the contemporary—Tiger moms, media pundits, and movie makers who ask us not to be “Waiting for Superman.” With public schools preceding the formal government of the United States, change in the nature and purpose of U.S. education has a rich history.

First, this paper will take a brief and broad sweep of American school reform movements and the forces behind them and then present reform initiatives that are being suggested and implemented in U.S. schools today. Following that the paper will describe the application of current reform strategies through a discussion of the transformation of the pre-baccalaureate teacher education and early childhood programs at Wichita State University using the Wichita Teacher Quality Partnership which was developed with the support of a U.S. Department of Education five-year grant. Lastly, the paper makes recommendations for meaningful, outcome-based reforms for the second decade of the 21st century.

Part 1: School Reform Past

The contemporary challenges for public education facing the United States are mighty, complex, and disparate. Yet, many of them are not so different from the educational challenges faced throughout the nation’s history. The part to follow is a broad historical view that focuses within each era on 1) the context of schools, 2) the process of schooling, 3) the philosophical or ideological underpinnings of education, and 4) the education and work of teachers.

The Beginnings

In colonial New England, education was a local responsibility; today American public education (different from that of many other nations) remains primarily the responsibility of the states and individual school districts. Also not completely dissimilar from U.S. education today, struggling colonial villages had financial difficulty in keeping their schools open; nevertheless, as early as 1647, Massachusetts law mandated that every town of 50 or more families support a school (Comer, 2004). The literacy rate of white males was well over half in the late 1700s (Brinkley, 2009 Vol. 1). After the American Revolution, Thomas Jefferson argued that the newly independent nation needed a tax funded educational system, and he argued that it go beyond basic skills to build knowledge of the classics, sciences, and education for citizenship (Comer, 2004 p. 149). His pleas for a unified system were ignored, however, and locally established schools characterized the early republic. A dual system of public and private schools, often religious, emerged, and although the U.S. Constitution established separation of church and state, an underlying ideology of interdenominational Christian Protestantism was prevalent in the schools of the early republic (Butts, 1978).

Teacher Education. As for the nature of teaching, a Massachusetts law in 1789 required that school masters possess a college education and produce a certificate of qualifications and good morals from a “settled” (established) minister or selectman (Butts, 1978). Despite this, schools across the fledgling nation were taught largely by individuals whose credentials were often self-exampled knowledge. During that same year, Massachusetts law required that public schools serve females as well as males. The literacy rate for both men and women, who were often home taught, was higher than that of European countries in the early American republic (Brinkley, 2009 Vol. 1). Daniel Webster’s grammar, reader, and speller were published in the

1780s, but textbooks for individual students remained scarce (Butts, 1978). The Bible and single copies of classic literature were often the backbone of the curricula.

Education for an Agrarian and Early Industrialized Society.

Private schools and academies run largely by religious groups were prevalent in the early decades of the 19th century; however, as the years passed, settlement crossed the American plains and spread along the Pacific West. Rural, often one-room, schools typically housing students in the first eight grades began to dot the countryside. The Pennsylvania Free School Act of 1834 inaugurated a democratic state organized system of schools (Hewitt, 1934). By the 1840s, in the cities, enrollment mushroomed. Three teachers in one Chicago school were reported to be struggling to handle more than 500 pupils (Butts, 1978). Massachusetts passed its first compulsory school laws in 1852 and New York followed in the next year (The History of Public Schools in America, 2011). By 1865 the number of public schools had quadrupled (Comer, 2004), but the level of education offered varied and there was no uniform compulsory attendance required across all the states.

Schools throughout the 1800s clearly supported the agrarian and the early industrialized society's sense of civilization and culture—mainly to prepare students for citizenship and give them the fundamental skills for livelihood. McGuffey's graded readers appeared in the 1830s and dominated the field of student texts for nearly all of the next 100 years (Butts, 1978). Reading, writing, and arithmetic were the core of the curriculum; but as the years rolled forward, school reformers influenced the inclusion of spelling, geography, history, the U.S. constitution, nature study, physical education, art and music in the schools (Bohan and Null, 2007). The first schools to help the disabled were started, and grew into network of institutions.

19th Century Schooling for Native Americans and African Americans. Despite the limitations and inequities of public schooling, by 1865 The United States had one of the highest literacy rates of any nation with 94 percent of the population in the North and 83 percent of the white population (58 percent of the total population) in the South literate (Brinkley, 2009 Vol. 1). It was not until the 1870s, that the U. S. government funded a number of local schools and boarding schools through the Dawes Act. Indian Normal Schools were created to train Native Americans to be teachers in Indian Schools. As indicated in the Indian General Allotment Act of 1887, the Bureau of Indian Affairs' initial goal was assimilation of American Indians into the general population. This resulted in children being separated from their parents and sent to boarding schools where education was provided in English by white teachers and the students were forbidden to speak their native languages (Gunn, 2004). It was not until the 1934 passage of the Indian Reorganization Act that the policy of assimilation was declared a failure that had contributed to severe problems with Indian education, health, and poverty (Taylor, 1980).

For African Americans, after the Civil War, Freedman's schools for "Negros" established by philanthropic organizations, set the principle of segregation for education. In 1881, a major development in education for African Americans occurred with the opening of the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama by Booker T. Washington. Washington believed that education could help to break down racial barriers (Thornbrough, 1969). The Tuskegee Institute taught men and women a trade or home economics and functioned as a normal school providing teacher training for African Americans to be teachers in public schools exclusively for African American children. Conversely, others including W.E.B. DuBois, a Harvard graduate, history professor, and head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) believed that African Americans should be educated with a classical education, just as white

people were. Beginning in 1900, DuBois challenged Washington's vocational focus by writing and speaking that Tuskegee amounted to acceptance of discrimination (Bankston & Cladas, 2009; Butts, 1978; DuBois, 1987).

In an 1896 decision, *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the U. S. Supreme Court held that as long as facilities for the separate races were equal, segregation did not violate the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Thus, segregation of public schools was upheld. Even though public education was not universal for African Americans at this time, more schools were instituted over time. Inequality persisted. Historical records show that by the 1930s the average amount spent per white pupil in the public schools was eighty dollars, while for African Americans it was only fifteen dollars (Ravitch, 2000).

The Common School Reform Movement and Teacher Education. Common school reform in the years from 1830 to 1860 helped prepare the nation for education as a central part of individual and public life and helped increase the number of public schools. The Common School Movement wrote Robert Church (1976) had three goals: 1) To provide a free elementary education to every white child living in the United States, 2), to advance some form of state control over local schools, and 3) to create a trained educational profession. In 1857, The National Education Association was formed by 100 teachers who wished to professionalize teaching and advance education (NEA, 2011). Horace Mann, a leading reformer of education, headed reorganization of the Massachusetts system. He lengthened the academic year to six months, doubled teachers' salaries, and helped equalize the disparities between the salaries of men and women (Brinkley, 2009 Vol. 1). By the end of the nineteenth century, more than two-thirds of all grammar school teachers were women and as many as 90 percent of all professional women were teachers (Brinkley, 2009 Vol.2).

The first normal school or institution intended exclusively for the training of teachers in the United States opened in Vermont during 1823 (New York Times, 1890). Normal schools trained selected individuals in the basic skills of reading, writing, arithmetic, and related subjects. Horace Mann established the first public normal school in Lexington, Massachusetts in 1839 and enrolled 25 women (Blount, 1998) the first year. Graduates received a certificate that recognized their ability to pass their knowledge to children (Lamson, 1903). Kansas became a State in 1861 and founded its normal school at Emporia two years later. By 1867, there were 37 normal schools in the United States (New York Times, 1890). The New York School for the Training of Teachers, which later affiliated with Columbia University as Teacher's College, was founded in 1887.

Originally, normal schools accepted graduates of at least the eighth grade. At first the curricular content was below high school level, and graduates had to return to high school to earn their diploma (Lamson, 1903; DuFresne, 1985; Ogren, 2005). Although eighth grade may appear to be a low entry threshold, at that time requirements for completion of eighth grade were often quite stringent. The eighth grade graduation examination from Saline County Public Schools, Kansas from 1895 is attached as an example (Armstrong, 1895; See Appendix A).

Progressivism in an Urban, Industrial Society.

The 1920 U.S. census showed for the first time that more Americans were living in urban areas than rural, and more students than ever were attending school. Settlement within the contiguous states neared completion and the increasing industrialization of the nation's cities enticed large scale growth, with many immigrants coming to America from Southern and Eastern Europe. In the context of large-scale immigration, school became the root entry into American society through basic instruction in core learning taught in English and in preparation for

citizenship (Bankston & Caldas, 2009). Within the individual states, the movement toward free, public education led toward ethnic assimilation with separate schools for racial segregation. In most states, public education laws required schooling from first through eighth grades, while some states had compulsory age-based attendance ending with age 14 or 16 (Card and Krueger, 1992; Goldin, 2001). By 1918, compulsory education for elementary school was mandatory in all states (Bankston & Caldas, 2009).

A “high school movement” began about 1910 in New England and spread across the nation. Comprehensive high schools were designed to give a free education. Any student who chose to stay in school for 12 years and earned a minimal grade point average could receive a diploma (Goldin, 2001). In 1910 fewer than 20 percent of 15- to 18-year-olds were enrolled in a high school and less than 10 percent of all American 18-year-olds graduated from high school (Fitzpatrick and Turner, 2006). By the 1920s, high school attendance doubled to more than five million (Brinkley, 2009 Vol. 2).

Historically and today, primary and secondary education in the United States was and is provided by small decentralized local public school districts. The trend across time has been to consolidate the small districts into ever larger ones (Goldin, 2001). The consolidation of school districts and the high school movement paralleled the rise of the progressivism.

The Influence of Scientific Management and Progressive Education. The new century brought two distinct types of school reform—progressive education and a new conservatism that is distinguished from the traditional curriculum rooted in the 19th century. While progressivism has had a more long lasting influence, scientific management also shaped the nature of public education particularly in the early decades of the 20th century.

Frederick Winslow Taylor is credited with pioneering a set of principles that he called Scientific Management. Taylor urged employers to reorganize for maximum efficiency by subdividing tasks, speeding production, and making workers more interchangeable. The implementation of “Taylorism,” as it was often referenced, was thought to reduce the need for highly-skilled, craftsman-level workers. Taylor’s ideas complemented the emergence of mass production and industrial assembly lines. Applied in a larger context, educational tasks as well as factory work could be scientifically studied and the most efficient way of performing them could be identified and taught thus making the worker or student or teacher or school administrator able to carry out their responsibilities with minimum energy and waste of time (Taylor, 1911). This “factory” approach was influential in the organization and planning of schools.

The principles of Taylorism applied to education included implementation of:

- Standardized records of efficiency ratings, standardized tests, and building score cards,
- Planning for curriculum, teaching loads, etc.,
- Standardized conditions of school buildings and classrooms,
- Standardized operations for school personnel and students,
- Monetary rewards for teachers whose students met assigned goals (Callahan, 1962).

The adoption of business values and practice became prominent in educational administration in part because the successful application of Taylorism was thought to reduce school expenditures (Callahan, 1962).

As a part of the system, the final responsibility was put on the pupil to accept the training and feel the responsibility to perform to expectations. Classrooms were set up identically in rigid rows of immovable desks with the teacher positioned at the front of the room in command position (Bankston & Caldas, 2009). Students were taught by drills, memorization, and regimented routines. Taylor’s ideas were narrowly constructed, controversial during his lifetime,

and remain controversial, although not entirely ignored in current social scientific study of school reform (Brinkley, 2009 Vo. 2).

On the other hand, the progressive movement was richly complex, took a more holistic approach, attracted many adherents among academics and politicians, and its basic tenets evolved considerably over the years. Progressivism as a sophisticated philosophy, was most peculiarly American and explicative of American culture. The most famous and influential educational progressive was John Dewey who believed that the decline of local community life and small scale enterprise resulted from people moving to urban centers, and, as a result, young people were losing valuable opportunities to experience and learn from democratic participation. He concluded that education would need to make up for this (Dewey, 1900; Dewey, 1902; Dewey, 1915; Dewey, 1916; Dewey, 1938; Ravitch, 2000).

In 1896, Dewey opened the University of Chicago Laboratory School (Cremin, 1970) and later joined the faculty of Teachers College in New York. In 1919, the Progressive Education Association was founded with the intent of “reforming the entire school system of America” (Altenbaugh, 1999; Beck, 1959). Following Dewey’s lead, educators and academic theorists saw the possibility of making schooling the cutting edge of social reform, as did Jane Adams and other social reformers of the era. These ideas attracted philanthropic business leaders such as Andrew Carnegie who envisioned that a more educated public would ameliorate social problems associated with immigration, replace poverty with a more productive workforce, and lead to a more effective government (Karier, in Karier, Violas & Spring, 1973).

Progressive educators, therefore, were swept up in the national enthusiasm for industrial education, as reflected in the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education that in 1906 recommended the introduction of industrial and vocational

education into the public schools. It claimed that the “old-fashioned” type of schooling caused large numbers of children to leave school early, unprepared for the labor market. Instead of a “literary education,” the commission recommended the vast majority of children should be trained in school with vocational and commercial studies for jobs in industry. For women home economics was strongly emphasized as was preparation for female occupations such as clerks, teachers and nurses (Lazerson and Grubb, 1974; Ravitch, 2000).

Teacher Education. Teachers College at Columbia University became a laboratory for elementary and secondary curriculum development which would “eliminate obsolete material and endeavor to work up in usable form material adapted to the needs of modern living” (Cremin, 1970, 282). While traditional education was based largely on rote learning, progressive education’s pedagogy emphasized the student’s current experience. At Teachers College, William H. Kilpatrick and other students of Dewey taught the principles of progressive education to thousands of teachers and school leaders (Knoll, 1997).

Most progressive education programs had the following attributes in common:

- Emphasis on learning by doing—hands-on projects, expeditionary learning, experiential learning,
- Strong emphasis on problem solving and critical thinking,
- Understanding and action as the goals of learning as opposed to rote knowledge,
- Collaborative and cooperative learning projects,
- Education for social responsibility and democracy,
- Selection of subject content by asking what skills will be needed in future society,
- De-emphasis on textbooks in favor of varied learning resources, and
- Emphasis on life-long learning and social skills (Dewey, 1938; Bode, 1938; Pratt, 1948; Washburne, 1952).

A study by J. L. Meriam at the Teachers College found that teaching efficacy was facilitated by practice teaching even more so than academic achievement which was also important in applying progressive ideas in educational settings (Meriam, 1905).

By the end of the 1920s, Teachers College was the preeminent authority on teacher training. Following Columbia's lead, the remaining normal schools across the country changed from two-year certificate programs to four-year degree granting institutions. Somewhat later they began changing their names to "teachers colleges" (Harper, 1970).

By the late 1940s, many public school programs had adopted a progressive curriculum or elements of it. As the influence of progressive pedagogy grew broader and more diffuse, practitioners began to vary their application of progressive principles. At mid-20th century even Dewey questioned the impact of progressive education on public schools saying that progressive education had "not really penetrated and permeated the foundations of the educational institution" (Kohn, 1999, p. 7).

Waves of Education Reform in the Second Half of the 20th Century

Although World War II and the years preceding it turned the nation's collective energy away from school reform and toward more overarching survival issues; the forward thrust of universal education continued to advance. The United States emerged, post World War II, convinced of its strength as a global economic, political, and military superpower. The hubris of national psyche extended to a general public acknowledgement of an exemplary American education system. Under President Eisenhower, a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was named and elevated to a post in the president's cabinet of advisors. By 1955, nearly 80 percent of eligible students were enrolled in secondary schools and the median education level of American youth was a high school diploma (Fitzpatrick and Turner, 2006). This was the first time in American history that white-collar employees outnumbered blue-collar laborers in the workplace.

School district consolidation continued. However, the historical conflict between religious and public education had not disappeared. In 1962, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that prayers held at public schools were religious events and in violation of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; thus closing the door to virtually all school-sanctioned religious activity and moving public schools from a nonsectarian to a secular culture (Butts, 1978).

The post World War II economic rebound and national “baby boom” cultivated an unprecedented demand for well educated people in the professions, in white-collar jobs, and in technical work. Parents worried about whether their children would have the education needed to succeed in an increasingly competitive economy (Ravitch, 2000). Post WWII superpower status, did not bring general security for the nation. Overall, Cold War anxiety and cultural conservatism held sway over public opinion.

The Demise of Progressivism and the Cold War Era. Progressive education fell victim to the tenor of the era. When questions were raised about the liberal roots of its reforms, progressivism lost favor as an educational rationale. For example, Rudolf Flesch’s highly popular study, *Why Johnny Can’t Read* (1955), claimed that the progressive “reading in context” approach was inadequate preparation for the nation’s children. Ironically, some of the Cold War educational reforms were built on progressive ideas.

The work of Zacharias and Bruner, based on the developmental psychology of Jean Piaget, incorporated many of Dewey’s ideas of experiential education (Bruner, 1966; Zacharias, 1969). Similarly, Bruner’s (1966) developmental psychology was the core of a pedagogical movement known as constructivism. Constructivism argues that that children are active participants in making meaning and must be engaged in the educational process to effectively learn, also similar to the conclusions and methods of both Dewey and other progressives (Von

Glaserfeld, 1987). In the late 1960s, the open classroom movement (where students and teachers worked together without walls separating classrooms regardless of students' age or grade level) helped revitalize some of Dewey's child centered reforms (Karier in Karier, Viloas, & Spring, 1973).

Among those who addressed the overall needs of society during the Cold War, "the most influential was James B. Conant" (Karier, in Karier, Violas & Spring, 1973 p. 20). A pragmatic liberal, Conant extended Dewey's thought. As president of Harvard University and funded in part by the Carnegie Foundation, Conant was influential in calling for education to maintain democratic society. He called for reforms that included instituting a national testing program and an educational achievement index, and increased federal support for vocational guidance in public schools. Conant recognized the growing heterogeneity of the school population and proposed an open system where high school students were assessed, selected, and guided into areas of study (Grison in Karier, Violas & Spring, 1973). His ideas later became an argument for organizing schools into "lanes" or "track" which channeled some students into college-bound courses based on critical thinking skills and others students into basic skills and vocational training classes (Linda Darling-Hammond, 2010).

A brilliant economist, Milton Friedman, published an essay in 1955 titled "The Role of Government in Education." Friedman's ideas were based on a "market driven" approach to schooling (Ravitch, 2010). Believing that government should maximize the freedom of its citizens, he proposed that government supply vouchers to every family so every student could attend a school of choice. As a result, those schools that delivered the best education would grow and supplant those that did not. Debated in Congress and among the public, the voucher system was never passed by voters in any state.

Separate But Not Equal. Meaningful educational reforms for African Americans and Native Americans occurred as a result of federal intervention beginning in 1954 with the U.S. Supreme Court decision *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. By a 9-0 vote the Court held that state laws requiring separate public schools for black and white students were unconstitutional as a violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U. S. Constitution (347 U.S. 483 (1954)). Schools were required to integrate. At this time, 17 of the then 48 states (Alaska and Hawaii did not become states until 1959) required segregated schools; four other states allowed segregation (Arizona, Kansas, New Mexico, and Wyoming), and 16 states forbid it. The 11 remaining states did not have laws addressing the issue of school segregation (Hanushek, Kain and Rivkin, 2009; Hanushek, and Rivkin, 2009; Rivkin and Welch, 2006).

Significant integration did not happen quickly or easily. Initially the Topeka school system allowed African American students to attend classes in previous all-white schools, but they were relegated to separate “all-black” classrooms. In cities such as Little Rock, Arkansas, and Birmingham, Alabama, efforts to integrate public schools were met with aggressive demonstrations. In some cities, students were escorted to class by federal marshals and the U.S. National Guard was called out to keep peace (Miller, 2004).

Even in states that forbid segregation, efforts to integrate across neighborhood school boundaries required court-ordered, forced-busing programs to achieve equal racial representation, as happened in Wichita, Kansas. In south Boston, Massachusetts parents demonstrated belligerently against it (Frum, 2000). The last holdout school systems desegregated in the late 1970s (Hanushek and Rivkin, 2009; Hanushek, Kain and Rivkin, 2009; Rivken and Welch, 2006).

The Sputnik Launch and Concern for Science Education. In the late 1950s a stunning event occurred that triggered a massive round of educational reform. On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union placed the world's first space satellite in a low orbit of earth. Politicians, government officials, and mass media outlets in the United States assessed "Sputnik" "as a major humiliation for the country, proclaimed it a dangerous threat to the nation's security" (Ravitch, 2000), and gave rise to fear that the nation had fallen behind the Soviet Union in technological development. To remedy the situation, government officials called for (among other changes) improved public education. Sputnik both ignited a space race with the USSR and impelled the United States to improve its education in general and its science education in particular (Zharo, 2009).

Seemingly overnight, a nationwide clamor arose for higher academic standards in U.S. high schools and greater attention to mathematics, science, and foreign languages (Leiding, 2009). A series of federal laws were passed that focused on educational content and improvement of educational quality, and provided federal funding so that state and local governments would have an incentive to change curricula and make improvements (Schwegler, 1982). The National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA) supported education at all levels of education. It also provided some support for technical education, area studies, geography, English as a second language, counseling and guidance, school libraries and librarianship, and educational media centers (Schwegler, 1982; Urban, 2010). This was a major shift in direction since public education had been left almost completely up to state and local governments up to this point. The National Defense Education Act had an immense initial impact, but was not uniformly effective across the nation, and its impact did not last. Instead, dealing with the

immense challenge of large numbers of baby boom students resulted in quantity of students overcoming efforts at building quality in many school districts.

Teacher Education. During the 1950s and 1960s teacher education became more highly professionalized. State licensing requirements for teachers became stricter and the need for advanced degrees and professional development in school based settings were recognized. Teacher's colleges became colleges of education within universities (Ornstein, 1993; Morey, Bezuk and Chiero, 1997). In addition to the general education courses required of all college students, students planning to become teachers were required to study professional education courses that included human development; human learning; intelligence and its measurement; human motivation; modern technology; and the social, political, economic, and philosophical bases of societal institutions (Morey, Bezuk and Chiero, 1997).

The future teachers also were expected to learn about a wide range of subjects. On certification examinations in Texas, for example, were multiple topics (Bohan & Null, 2007). Students were expected to trace the development of the state school system and normal schools in the United States, to discuss the character and work of Horace Mann and to explain Rousseau's ideas on education (Morey, Bezuk and Chiero, 1997). The subject matter preparation for elementary school teachers stretched across broad areas, such as English grammar, literature, and composition; speech; mathematics; life and social sciences; humanities and the fine arts, including foreign languages (Morey, Bezuk and Chiero, 1997). Students studying to become secondary education teachers were given specific instruction in their fields of study as well as in educational pedagogy. Moreover, student teaching and field experiences became generally mandated in teaching education to enable all student-teachers to put their newly learned skills into practice under the supervision of a licensed classroom teacher and university personnel.

Fighting a “War on Poverty,” Building a “Great Society,” and the Aftermath

The ferment of the mid-century Civil Rights movement swelled in the 1950s and by the 1960s exploded into a tidal wave of reform. Led by the cause to abolish African American discrimination, through direct action and nonviolent resistance, the social milieu eventually drove political action that increased rights for African Americans, Latino populations, Native Americans, women, individuals with disabilities, and those discriminated against because of their age. The federal and state legislation directed toward establishing equality was often directed toward public education. Clearly, national political leaders saw education as a means of promoting equality and providing equal opportunity in society.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act. U.S. President Lyndon Johnson, who began his career as a teacher, held a belief that education was the cure for both ignorance and poverty, and was an essential component of the “American Dream,” especially for racial and ethnic minorities. He made education a top priority of the Great Society he proposed to build during his term of office. Even though many Americans feared that aid to education would lead to federal control of schools, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 became law in part because it based the aid on the economic condition of the students not on the needs of the schools themselves.

ESEA called for sweeping reforms of public education at all levels and provided more funding for states and school districts to support those efforts. This act had a broad agenda to implement equal education. Originally, the act focused on the following activities: education of low-income families, school libraries, textbooks, instructional materials, educational research and teacher training, improvement of educational programs, strengthening of state departments

of education, help for disabled children, bilingual education, equal access to education, reduction of achievement gaps, and promotion of parental involvement.

For the first time, large amounts of federal money went to public schools. For the first time private schools (most of them Catholic schools in the inner cities) received services, such as library funding, comprising about 12 percent of the ESEA budget (ESEA Reauthorization: A Blueprint for Reform, 2010). In addition, the ESEA explicitly forbid the establishment of a national curriculum. Subsequent amendments to the act supplemented bilingual programs and aid to disabled children. Other legislation enacted during the Johnson administration included an amendment to Title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that required equal opportunities for girls and boys public school and university athletic programs, and Head Start an early education program (Vinovskis, 2005). The U.S. Congress has reauthorized the act every five years since its enactment. One reauthorization of ESEA is the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, named and proposed by President George W. Bush.

A Nation at Risk. Despite the impetus for equality and school reform, a quarter century later, public education in the United States was floundering. A National Commission on Excellence in Education was appointed by President Regan to define the situation and provide solutions. In 1983 the commission's report, *A Nation at Risk*, was published. It assessed K-12 public schools throughout the country and found them inadequate. "The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity," (p.5) the risk of this, wrote the commission, threatened the ability of the country to function in the "information age" and all children would not be afforded a sufficient education.

A Nation at Risk was seen as a call to action throughout the country. It generated a massive round of political, media, and public attention. As a consequence of the report, the states

began to pass reform legislation. Most passed laws requiring higher standards and expectations for students at all levels. For example, more high school graduates were required to study four years of English and three years each of math, science and social studies. Most states increased high school graduation requirements, and most enacted a variety of policies to strengthen the teaching profession. All the states expanded their school facilities improvement programs. Subsequent initiatives emphasized staff development and better teaching methods (Clark & Plecki, 1997; Leiding, 2009; Odden, 1986).

Not as readily addressed were the Nation at Risk report's recommendations for teaching and teacher education that is excerpted below.

- Persons preparing to teach should meet high educational standards by demonstrating an aptitude for teaching and competence in an academic discipline. Colleges should be judged by how well their graduates meet these criteria.
- Salaries for teachers should be increased and be competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based. An evaluation system should include peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and poor ones either improved or terminated.
- School boards should adopt an 11 month contract and provide teachers with professional development. The school day and school year for students should be longer.
- School boards should create career ladders of beginning teachers, experienced teachers, and master teachers.
- Qualified, recent graduates with degrees in content areas should be allowed to begin teaching without the required coursework to become fully licensed.
- Grants and loans should be made widely available to attract outstanding students to become teachers.
- Master teachers should be involved in designing teacher preparation programs and supervising teachers during their probationary years.
- Admission requirements should be raised for those entering four-year colleges and universities to study teacher education.
- University scientists, scholars, and members of professional societies in collaboration with master teachers should help design textbooks and teaching products or publish their own alternatives.

Of the recommendations, grants and loans did become available to students working toward degrees in teaching. A system of alternative certification was put into place in most states to

allow individuals with bachelor's degrees to move into teaching positions and start earning their certification credentials at the same time. In addition, many state departments of education began to require assessment of teacher qualifications by examination beyond the award of the bachelor's degree. The other recommendations regarding teacher education have not been uniformly implemented to date.

The Education Agenda Escalates as the New Century Dawns

Between 1990 and 2010, an explosion of new technologies generated a myriad of communications tools and expanded individual's access to information exponentially. This led to a surge in mediated personal communication across all sectors of society, the immediate growth of knowledge-based industries, and international trade on a scale never seen before. We learned that, indeed, the world was now flat (Friedman, 2005). Latent results of this revolution influenced outsourcing of U.S. manufacturing to other countries and the replacement of some occupations with technology. The business and industrial workforce, and financial services, began to speed ever more rapidly to find the most profitable locations throughout the world. The economic base of the country shifted. Even though some jobs disappeared or were downsized or relocated outside the country, the new technologies created a massive need in the United States for "well-educated workers who understood mathematics, science, and technology and were prepared both to exercise individual initiative and to work in teams" (Ravitch, 2000, p. 430). These changes in turn led to yet another round of public calls for educational reform. The measures themselves, were promoted, as in the past, by business leaders, philanthropists, school reformists, and academics, but during this period the political efforts emanated more often from the nation's capitol than state houses.

Charter and Magnet Schools. The campaign for school choice—the ability of parents to determine the school their children would attend—was reopened in the 1990s by a book, *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools* by Chubb and Moe (1990). The authors contended that public schools were unable to reform themselves due to vested interests such as teachers' unions, school boards, superintendents, and colleges of education. Their plan to remedy the situation was popular, expanded upon, and later defined as the Charter School Movement. The basic idea was that any group or organization could apply for a state charter operative for three to five years, agree to meet all government requirements and academic targets, and receive public funding as part of the school district in which the charter school was located. The difference between charter schools and Friedman's earlier voucher plan was that vouchers were proposed to be used at any school—public or private—while charter schools would be considered public schools, privately managed but under contract to the district (Ravitch, 2010). Charter schools typically are organized to carry out a particular teaching pedagogy or set of rules for students' personal behavior.

Another school choice option was the Magnet School. These schools remained in the school district and under district management. The difference between a traditional public school and a magnet school was that the magnet was designed to “draw” students from all neighborhoods in the district. Students apply and are selected for admission. Magnet schools are usually organized around a theme such as aerospace, communication, or the performing arts and students. Magnet schools also may be organized around educational philosophies such as the Montessori Method. Magnets may offer any level of instruction from elementary to high school.

Typically, charter schools and magnet schools draw support from interested parents or community organizations. Because some of them are clearly directed at specific career preparation, corporate support can be often forthcoming. At magnet schools, school district transportation may be provided because of the distance most students would need to travel from their homes to the school. Some charters and magnets have been short lived, but others, particularly the magnets, have succeeded over time. Charter schools are a significant element of current school reform strategies (Ravitch, 2010).

Private For-Profit Schools. Beginning in the mid-1990s, private companies saw the opportunity to offer elementary and secondary education, usually in large, urban districts, as a business enterprise. The basic idea is that a for-profit institution contracting with a school district can operate one or more schools with income coming from the per-pupil expenditure set by the state where the schools are located. The motivation is that the for-profit institution pledges to operate more effectively and more efficiently, thereby raising student achievement and test scores and turning a profit for the business. The number of for-profit schools remains small; however, these schools have grown significantly during the last decade. While it is difficult to estimate the number of students served in for-profit schools or the amount of profit generated, in 2000, Edison Schools projected that it would manage about 423 schools with 260,000 students for revenue of 1.8 billion dollars within five years (BusinessWeek Online, 2000). Edison Schools, Boston-based Advantage Schools (now called Mosaica) and Education Alternatives Incorporated (EAI) have been early, providers of private management.

Detractors claim that the for-profit schools' focus on profit narrows the curriculum by eliminating high cost programs such as orchestra and athletics to the detriment of students. Supporters claim that because of the profit motive, the customer service orientation makes the

education more student-centered and produces more effective learning. Supporters also say that better qualified teachers are hired and that for-profit schools attract and retain more students and return more profit to the schools.

Homeschooling. For centuries children of royalty and the wealthy have been educated at home, as were a substantial number of children during the early years of the American republic. Compulsory attendance laws passed in the 1800s effectively brought an end to widespread homeschooling. A revival of interest in the 1960s has grown steadily since then. It is difficult to estimate the number of homeschooled children currently; however, in 2000, an estimated 2.5 percent of American school-aged children were being taught at home (Bernard & Mondale, 2001). Currently, all 50 states permit children to be schooled at home. The reasons parents give for homeschooling children are highly varied. Among the most prominent are that families believe they can give the child a better education at home, or they are motivated by their religious convictions to teach their children at home, or that they wish to avoid what they consider a poor learning environment in public schools, or that their child is not challenged intellectually in the public school system (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999). Families who homeschool, often take advantage of social, athletic, and community resources for their children. An American Homeschool Association and state homeschool associations offer annual meetings, interest groups, learning activities and other support to homeschoolers. Some state departments of education and for-profit education institutions offer on-line accredited coursework that often is accessed by homeschool families to augment or fully replace parental instruction.

Goals 2000. During the Clinton administration, the GOALS 2000: Educate America Act became law. The intent was to bolster reform (Goals, 2000, 2011). The reauthorization of the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was specifically intended to support achievement of Goals 2000 by providing additional funding for primary and secondary education; improvement of standards, instructional and professional development, and more accountability (Improving America's Schools Act, 1994, 2011). By 2001 only 22 states had adopted standards promoted by Goals 2000. Those goals required high school students to take at least four years of English, three years of math, three years of science, three years of history and/or social studies, half a year of computer science and college-bound students were required to take two years of a foreign language.

By 2001, only 15 of the states required a minimum competency test for graduation, although several others reported they were planning to do so in the future (Hoover, 2011). Some of the states that adopted the Goals 2000 did not provide meaningful additional funding or significantly change their teaching practices. Consequently, by the year 2000 most of the states had not achieved the Goals 2000 mandate.

No Child Left Behind. Significant revisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (NCLB) reauthorization passed in Congress with substantial bipartisan support and were signed into law in 2002 by President George W. Bush. It required extensive education reform. Substantial new funding was provided to support achievement of these objectives. The Act requires states to develop assessments in basic skills to be administered to all students in grades three through eight annually and once during high school, if those states are to receive federal funding for schools. NCLB does not assert a national achievement standard, as those are set by each state and the tests are chosen by each state. All schools and school districts are expected to make “adequate yearly progress (AYP)” and reach the goal of 100 percent pass rate by academic year 2013-2014. The law requires a series of increasingly stringent steps be

imposed on those schools that do not make AYP. Any school that does not reach AYP for five consecutive years is required to restructure which can mean reassignment or dismissal of all teachers and staff and hiring new employees or closure of the school. The law requires public reporting of test results by school, annually. NCLB also requires that new teachers will be "highly qualified" in each subject they teach.

In 2002, accountability for student performance was enhanced through creation of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics, a division of the U.S. Department of Education. Starting with the 2002-2003 school year school systems were in effect required to participate in biennial fourth grade and eighth grade NAEP reading and mathematics assessments in order to receive Title I grants from the federal government (Nations Report Card, 2011). NAEP scores are intended to be used as an external audit of the state tests mandated for AYP, and there are no consequences for school districts connected to NAEP scoring (Ravitch, 2010).

The law's inflexible accountability mandates and penalties have led to debate about its appropriateness. Objections to NCLB are numerous and range from complaints regarding inadequate funding (Kohn, 2007), to criticism that students' instruction is concentrated on reading and math to the exclusion of science and other subjects because only reading and math are tested as an NCLB requirement, to protests that schools are not given credit for validated progress toward goals that are not met. Passage of a new revision of ESEA has been proposed by the current President, Barak Obama, with the intention of overhauling NCLB provisions. However, passage of a revision has not occurred to date.

In 2011, 18 percent of Kansas schools failed to make AYP. The national average is 37 percent (The Wichita Eagle, 2011). As time passes and the goals for reading and math

proficiency become more rigorous, more schools are unable to meet AYP and more and more schools face impending reorganization of staff and teachers or closure. In March of 2011, the *Washington Post* reported that more than three-quarters of the all public schools could be labeled “failing” after the year’s reporting cycle (Anderson, 2011).

21st Century Schools. The overwhelming force of technological change and state and federal legislation has for more than 25 years reshaped public schools. In 1981, only 18 percent of schools had computers, but by 1993, 99 percent had them. In 1981, only 16 percent of schools used computers for instructional purposes. By 1993, 98 percent reported that they did so. The number of students per computer decreased from 125 in 1981 to 14 in 1993” (Tyack and Cuban, 1995). The trend continues into the present. Classroom computer use by teachers and students for research and learning activities is widespread. Currently, teachers use instructional technology such as video and audio recording, Smart boards, and applications for grade-book management to disseminate information to students, and connect with parents.

The classroom structure and process evolved as well. Teachers are asked to “differentiate instruction” to meet the individual needs and learning styles of the students. Teaching methods that employ group and individual learning tasks are encouraged. Depending on the size of the school, the array of professional educators who assist classroom teachers include librarians, athletic coaches, and art, music, gifted, physical education and special education teachers and school psychologists. These professionals provide instruction outside the regular classroom. The tracking systems of the 1950s and 1960s have been discontinued and students are placed in classrooms according to their age levels with the goal of creating a heterogeneous class unit. Except for those children with severe disabilities who are taught in designated classrooms and by teachers licensed to teach special education, all students, including those with mild and

moderate disabilities, are “mainstreamed” into classes and learn alongside their non-disabled peers.

Schools that receive Title I and other federal funding qualify based on the number of students who receive free or reduced cost school lunches. These schools often provide free and reduced cost breakfasts, operate after-school programs for working parents, and offer early childhood education that can range from birth to pre-kindergarten four-year-old learning to all day kindergarten. In Title I schools and other schools where state and local funding provide it, teachers are given time for daily planning and regular professional development in their schools. Staff support can come in the form of mentors for beginning teachers’ first, and sometimes second year of teaching, peer coaches who offer advice to teachers on classroom management and other pedagogical issues, instructional coaches who are qualified in a specialized subject area to aid teachers and their students, and paraprofessionals who are not licensed teachers but work daily to aid the teacher in carrying out classroom activities. While most schools do not provide staff for all of these activities, it is not uncommon to find Title I schools in large school districts able to do so; however, within those Title I schools typically not all classroom teachers have access to all of the support discussed here.

Teacher Education. Preparation for teaching today is rigorous in selection of candidates, comprehensive in program design with multiple opportunities for matriculation, creative and timely in curriculum offering, and experiential in nature.

Program design is primarily the responsibility of the universities; yet, teacher education is unique in that programs, the standards by which they are delivered, and their evaluation are determined largely by entities outside the university. Colleges of education are accredited through the process of accreditation in the universities where they are

located and must meet those standards. Moreover, the colleges themselves are approved to offer teacher education by several different organizations within different spheres of influence that, through their criteria of evaluation regulate the teacher preparation curricula. The most prevalent of these bodies are the state departments of education that approve new programs, set standards of instruction for schools, and set criteria for teacher and administrator licensure, among other functions.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) is the parent body of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) soon to become the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAPE). This association is the largest accrediting body in the United States for teacher education. Accreditation is also offered by several subject area associations including the National Council of Teachers of English, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the National Science Teachers Association. The criteria for these accrediting bodies typically include: 1) selection of program candidates, 2) quality of field experiences, 3) content area preparation, 4) outcomes assessment system and evaluation, 5) instruction and field experiences to ensure respect for diversity and 6) quality of faculty, facilities, and university resources.

The standards for subject area content in each field of elementary and secondary education as well as for professional skills and responsibilities are also set by the accrediting bodies and state departments of education and revised by them periodically.. Written reports and site visits are the basis for the accreditors evaluations based on data collected from outcomes based summative and formative assessments. Master's degrees, certificates, and specialist endorsements are awarded post baccalaureate in areas of

specialization including reading, special education, English as a second language, and early childhood education among others. Graduate programs as well are subject to accreditation bodies and state department of education approval.

Despite these restrictions, the colleges have great latitude in delivering their programs. A variety of pathways to teacher preparation exist (Lowenberg & Forzani, 2010). They include:

- Traditional baccalaureate degree programs,
- “Two-Plus-Two” partnerships between universities and community colleges for degree completion,
- Alternative certification for individuals who hold a bachelor’s degree and after initial preparation work as a classroom teacher while completing the pedagogy requirements for licensure through on-line or on-site coursework;
- Teach for America and other recruitment programs for recent college graduates who commit to teach for two years in a high-poverty school, and
- Residency programs that allow individuals to enter the school system as a paraprofessional and receive salary while pursuing education coursework (Iorio, 2009).
- On-line teacher education programs for both pre-baccalaureate candidates and those who hold a bachelor’s degree. Programs approved by state boards of education must meet all the standards and regulations of traditional on-site programs. Often on-line programs originate from accredited “for-profit” educational institutions.
- Teacher education programs delivered by non-degree granting organizations. Some states have allowed professional development service centers or PreK-12 public schools to offer alternative certification.

Since the inception of public education, school reformers have pushed for changes that came to fruition through the enterprise of reform leaders’ influence on public opinion, state legislation, and local school board decree. After World War II, media opinion leaders, members of Congress, and U.S. presidents pushed federal legislation to realize school reform. National funding soon began to play a more prominent role in school reform along with state legislation that often paralleled the national agenda. The legislation had both direct and indirect influence on teacher education.

In the 1950s, college courses for teacher candidates in human development that arose from the Progressive Movement were amplified by adding studies in ethnic and racial diversity and creating new courses to address the reform requests brought by civil rights activists, judicial decree, and the Johnson era Great Society directives. Legislation requiring special education in public schools was followed by college programs to educate special education teachers and provide the fundamentals of teaching children with disabilities to all prospective teachers. The needs of the growing number of children for whom English was not their first language were addressed in courses to prepare all prospective teachers with fundamentals for working with bilingual students and offer specialized graduate programs to prepare current teachers for Teaching English as a Second Language licensure endorsement.

Early childhood education became increasingly more important as educational psychologists and developmental psychologists began to publish strong evidence of the importance of education for children ages birth to eight years. Federal funding for early childhood programs for children in poverty, grants for academics to prepare strong early childhood curriculum, and licensure requirements passed by state legislators provided the impetus for new teacher education programs that overall have become quite popular and attract growing numbers of students.

By the mid-1990s, it was apparent that the audio-visual instruction and methods of paper duplication had gone by the wayside, replaced by instruction for contemporary educators. Currently, teacher candidates are prepared with a solid instructional technology foundation to implement new technology applications in the classroom and enable their students to learn the skills for themselves. Pre-service teachers today also learn to integrate technology with practical classroom applications and to use technology as a classroom and educator resource.

One of the most important developments in teacher education was the Professional Development School (PDS). One of the first began in 1988 with a partnership at Teachers College in New York City in collaboration with the Holmes Group. The mission was to enhance the professional development of future teachers, and the experiences of teachers and college faculty working in urban schools (Purposes of the Get Real Conference, 2010). PDS model schools soon were established in Charlottesville, Virginia; Boston and other cities across the United States.

The overall purpose was multifaceted: 1) to improving student learning, 2) preparing teacher candidates, 3) professional development for practicing teachers, and 4) research that helps all students learn. Students benefit because the knowledge, skills and resources of both university and school are focused on meeting their needs. The students of the school also benefit from teacher interns, mentor teachers, and university faculty who play active roles in the PDS setting. PDS schools aim to enhance teacher quality and student achievement in urban schools with high needs populations (NCATE, 2010; Doolittle, Sudeck, & Rattigan, 2008, Darling-Hammond, 2005, Clark, 1999, Abdal-Haqq, 1998, Goodlad, 1980 & 1990).

The future for schools and universities, say Levine and Trachtman (1997) is in partnership relationships between universities and school districts that are focused on children and adolescents and their possibilities, on what they could be and become, and on the competencies necessary for their teachers to live and create order in a complex, changing world. These partnerships are a powerful, albeit still fragile, avenue to the future.

Summary

The purpose of public elementary and secondary education, the role of government, the organization of schools, the responsibilities of teachers, the proper education for teachers—

these domains and other school related matters are caught up together in the ebb and flow of school reform movements. Collectively, they shape the not-so-linear account of Americans' passion for high quality learning and the burden of responsibility for equity in education. If any themes can be drawn from this complex, often divisive, and occasionally circular history, they need to be viewed as rhetorical devices meant to offer perspective on major unresolved questions about public education. What are these recurring and conflicting themes?

Theme one--the purpose of public education. From the period of colonization through the mid-19th century public education instilled basic skills and promoted reading of the classics to enhance individual's lives and create an educated citizenry thought necessary to sustain democratic government. From the mid-19th century to the present a bifurcation of the basic intent of education led in one direction to workforce preparation, then vocational training, and, currently, career development. The other direction mapped education as the process of "learning how to learn" through development of critical thinking skills, opportunity for experiential learning, emphasis on life-long learning, study of mathematics and sciences, and application of the scientific method to prepare students for post-secondary education and transferable skills for currently unforeseen, future careers. The civil rights movement of the 1960s introduced the value of equity in education as inherent and underlying all educational goals. At present, the competition continues over whether the purpose of education is preparation for the workforce or preparation to achieve knowledge and understanding for effective citizenship or to cultivate the intellectual skills needed to thrive in a complex world.

Theme two—the role of government in elementary and secondary education. The locus of public education from the first colonial schools to the present has been at the community level. State funding for schools paralleled the advent of state requirements for

attendance, teacher certification, and other regulation in the 1800s; yet, local school boards continue to this day to hire and fire school personnel and approve school budgets and curriculum, i.e., control the general governance of the school district. Early schools were often connected to religious denominations, but when state funding and regulation expanded, 19th century schools moved toward a non-sectarian Christian curricula.

It was not until mid-twentieth century, that federal legislation and federal judicial decisions began to play a significant part in determining the operation of public schools through support for equity in education across the entire U.S. population of school-aged children and the elimination of religious activities in public schools. Large scale federal funding for education began as an infusion of funds for science and mathematics instruction in the 1950s Cold War era. The largest continuing source of federal funding for education is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its numerous reauthorizations, which were first enacted as a part of the War on Poverty in the 1960s. This legislation allowed private schools to receive federal dollars; but, nevertheless, did not lead to approval of a national voucher system to subsidize private education.

Federal funding for education was designed to supplement rather than supplant school operations; therefore, some programs were underfunded or unfunded because states and local communities were unable to furnish the required education. Although federal funding carried strict rules for evaluation, it was not until 2001 when No Child Left Behind Act became law that large-scale federal funding was tied to students' performance evaluations in each school receiving federal funds. The law ordered that the consequence of failure to meet annual yearly progress would eventually result in school reorganization or loss of federal funding.

The jurisdiction and financial support of public education are, as might be expected, complex, politically-charged, controversial areas of decision making for education. Should there be more federal control of education, or should state and local institutions dominate public school decisions and finance? School finance and governance has, and continues to be, an immense pressure point in school reform.

Theme three—accountability in teaching. In such a large country, with so much diversity in state and local government regulation of education, it is surprising that any particular belief system regarding education might have appeared. Nevertheless, it is possible to trace the successive layering of educational thought through the writing and careers of 19th century leaders such as Thomas Jefferson, Horace Mann, Booker T. Washington, and W.E.B. DuBois. A value system, while not at all coherent, did materialize as a progression of traditionalism that revolved around basic instruction in reading, writing, and mathematics augmented by study of the classics, science, and history and, for some, vocational study.

In the early 20th century, two diametrically opposed schools of educational thought, both uniquely American in context emerged—Progressivism and Scientific Management. Although each evolved through several different incarnations, the fundamental ideas of Progressivism and Scientific Management continue to dominate the debate about what type of education is best for American schools. The recent struggle over the application of the NCLB act through high-stakes testing illustrates the two opposing ideologies. While there is general agreement that students need to improve their reading and math skills to the level of students in other industrialized nations, some educators believe that the rigid NCLB requirements to improve test scores will be accomplished best through more time spent on these subjects and teacher led drills, rote learning, and practice in test taking. Other educators believe that neither such testing

nor strictly followed inflexible curriculum and pacing guides produce learning that can be sustained over time. The alternative belief is that teachers should emphasize critical thinking and organize learning activities around students' interests in science, literature, and social studies along with math and reading instruction to produce the best sustainable learning. The fundamental hegemonic struggle currently being waged in this era of school reform is whether students learn best when the emphasis is on teacher led, basic skills acquisition or on teacher guided development of a body of knowledge. This struggle underlies the debate over how much, if any, of a teacher's evaluation should be tied to the performance of the teacher's students on annual yearly performance measures.

Theme four—the organization of schools. The actual structure of schools advanced over time from those that offered basic education, to schools that taught the first through eighth grades, to the advent of secondary schools through the high school movement of the early 20th century. Restructuring of the system in the mid-20th century created middle and junior high schools and kindergartens for five-year-olds. Recently, early childhood education has extended, in many school districts, learning for children from birth through age four, and pre-kindergarten classes.

Many changes in school physical plants have occurred in recent years to facilitate technology transfer and provide areas outside the classroom for activities such as music, art, special education, physical education, athletics, and libraries (currently referred to as media centers). On the other hand, the basic layout of the school classrooms remains very much like those of the early 20th century. Desks, chairs, and work tables may be arranged in patterns unique to each class, but students and their teacher are assigned to a single class for each year and the class arrangement of teachers' and students' desks, particularly in the middle and

secondary schools, often appear similar to classrooms of the early 1900s. To respond to the call for more for school choice, magnet and charter schools, and for-profit schools opened accompanied by a homeschooling movement that continues to grow in the 2000s.

Alternatives to traditional public schools are available in the 2010s; yet, school choice lies at the crux of current school reform agendas. Do traditional public schools with their large physical plants, access to modern technology, comprehensive curricula, and multiple extra-curricula activities offer the most value to the most students? If not, how can we gauge the viability of the differing models compared to traditional schools and how can we measure each model's long-term impact on student learning. Should there be even wider possibilities for school choice that include tax support of private not-for-profit, religious, or for-profit educational institutions? Do these multiple alternatives to the traditional school model mark the beginning of the end of universal public education in the United States?

Theme five—Teacher education. Among the earliest school directives in Massachusetts was the requirement that a prospective teacher possess a university degree. Teacher education matured slowly. Normal schools that “trained” teachers eventually became colleges of education alongside colleges of engineering, business, and other professional programs within the university structure. In this setting, teachers were “educated” as aspiring professionals the same as engineers or accountants. There are differences, however.

Teacher education is highly regulated by state legislation and state agencies. It is also regulated by professional accrediting bodies. In the 1950s teacher education came to be defined by three major areas of preparation: Disciplinary study, knowledge of professional skills and responsibilities, and field experiences. The subjects of study were general education with concentration for secondary teachers in a subject area. Professional coursework included

human development, educational testing, and assessment culminating in personal participation in a school setting with evaluation by outcomes-based assessment.

The debate over the efficacy of teacher education revolves around the following questions: Should colleges of education be judged by outcomes, for example passing rates on graduates' external licensure exams or by "front-loaded" in-put assessment, for example the number and nature of topics on a teacher education course syllabus? Should college entrance requirements be raised in an effort to recruit students who score high on achievement tests or lowered to attract more students into teaching? Should accrediting agencies, state government, or federal policy determine teacher education? Should non-degree granting institutions be allowed to offer teacher education? Should colleges be judged by school administrators' assessment of the performance of their graduates after they have entered the teaching field? Should colleges be judged by the performance of public school students in courses being taught by their graduates? In the past, critical school reform bypassed teacher education. It was concerned more with equal opportunity issues, student performance, and appropriate facilities. Currently, that is not the case. Reform of teacher education is one of the main objectives of school reform today.

Merging the five themes. Public elementary and secondary education and attempts at its reform at different times in the history of the United States provide insight into major, recurring themes that remain unresolved. The events and issues of the past benchmark who we once were as a nation and remind us of what we wanted to become, even as today we stand at a crossroads of new challenges for public education and new demands for school reform.

Part II: School Reform Present

The United States today is mired in the aftermath of its “Great Recession.” More than half (55%) of all adults in the labor force say that since 2008, they have suffered a spell of unemployment, a cut in pay, a reduction in hours or have become involuntary part-time workers (Pew Social Trends Staff, 2010). On the other hand, as many as one million jobs for workers with highly specialized skills currently are left unfilled in the United States due to lack of qualified applicants . A 2005 study by the National Association of Manufacturers and Deloitte Consulting revealed a widening gap between the supply of skilled workers and manufacturers' growing technical demands. Engineers and scientists also were found to be in short supply. The situation is expected to worsen as more baby boomers retire and there is more demand for workers with the skills needed to help their companies compete in a global economy (Workpermit, 2011).

From 2008 to the present, economic uncertainty has been demonstrated in record home mortgage foreclosures, unemployment hovering at nine percent nationally, vacillating stock markets, tight credit, and continuing tax revenue shortfalls in almost every state. All this brings an immense impact on public elementary and secondary education. Most states spend slightly more than half their budgets on K-12 education. Hence, when faced with revenue shortfalls, the states have imposed harsh cuts in state aid to school districts. At the same time, school districts nationwide face declining local property tax revenues forcing them to make further cuts (Pew Social Trends Staff, 2010). To compound the problem, projections this year indicate revenue shortfalls necessitating further cuts in public education in Kansas and other states.

Simultaneously, the American system of public education found itself at the center of a different situation. As Thomas Friedman, a commentator on American society wrote, “Education failure is the largest contributing factor to the decline of the American worker’s

global competitiveness, particularly at the middle and bottom ranges” (Friedman, 2008). After election to office in 2008, U.S. president, Barack Obama, agreed that the nation’s schools were not uniformly producing well-prepared graduates and placed education high on his agenda of the most important issues facing the country.

Historical antecedents.

In this decade, the themes and conflicts underlying the growth of U.S. elementary and secondary education systems offer relevant lessons. President Obama recently commented in multiple venues that, “Today, America faces a new ‘Sputnik moment’” (Sputnik Moment, 2010) referring to 1950s when competition with the USSR in space exploration led to increased emphasis in more rigorous public education particularly in mathematics and the sciences. Alternatively, other observers find that “the situation we are in today is similar to that at the turn of the twentieth century when the nation was moving from an agricultural to an industrial economy” (Comer, 2004, p. 272).

Both viewpoints are right in the comparison that education, then and now, is central to the national state of affairs and pivotal in the necessary national transformation. This commentary points to two primary educational challenges of contemporary school reform:

- By mid-21st century approximately half of the workforce will be employed in careers that have not yet been imagined. To succeed in these careers students will need strong elementary and secondary preparation in science and mathematics but beyond that they will need strong preparation in a wide range of disciplines and in critical thinking skills...
- The school population is growing and greater growth is expected in students who represent diverse backgrounds and students who are new immigrants to the United States. More students will need instruction in English as a second language and all students will need the skills to be successful in a multicultural society (Iorio, 2008).

Never in the history of our nation has the need for high quality public education been greater, and never has the need for high quality teacher preparation been more important.

Federal support through Teacher Quality Partnership grants offered in 2009 called for proposals to advance urban education by 1) recruiting more academically qualified individuals into a career in teaching, 2) creating a more diverse teacher workforce, and 3) providing rigorous teacher education to meet the needs of contemporary students. Faculty from the Wichita State University College of Education sought community partners and applied for the grant. Awarded in October of 2009, the total grant award was \$6.5 million over a five-year period.

The Wichita Teacher Quality Partnership.

The Wichita Teacher Quality Partnership (WTQP) grant is designed as a partnership with Wichita State University, Wichita Public Schools, area community colleges, and community organizations—Head Start, a federal early childhood program, and The Opportunity Project, a local, not-for-profit early childhood learning center. The mission is to transform the WSU pre-baccalaureate program and launch the first known early childhood residency program in the nation. The goal is to create a wide pipeline for the recruitment, education, and retention of highly qualified teachers for urban schools.

Movement toward the goal in the first eighteen months has been significant. The grant, awarded in 2009, is on schedule and under budget with carry over funds addressing the 27 percent reduction from the U. S. Department of Education in year two. The grant was conducted in year two with no changes to the scope or performance objectives. The progress of the work to date is described below.

The early childhood unified with special education residency program. The first year of the Early Childhood Unified Residency (ECUR) program was given to designing the program and securing approval from various accrediting bodies. First, permission for the program was requested from the Kansas State Board of Education which mandates all early childhood

programs be unified with Special Education endorsement. The second step was to set up the curriculum for the Masters of Arts in Teaching degree the residents would earn; this required review of the College of Education and of the university curriculum committee and the state of Kansas Regent's Council of Chief Academic Officers. As a result of initial media coverage of the grant award more than 50 applications were received for the ECU program that is designed to serve 20. Nineteen applicants met the qualifications and were selected and 18 of those are continuing through the program.

The residency program logistics turned out to be complicated. Using the university's Banner system for tracking the students and managing data for assessment was highly labor intensive. Also problematic was the administration of the residency cohorts. It was decided to take one cohort through to completion rather than attempting to manage two overlapping cohorts. The next challenge was placing the ECU residents in partnership schools (Wichita Public Schools, the Opportunity Project, and Head Start) during a down economy in which the partners were dealing with budget reductions and downsizing, while attempting to maintain highly qualified personnel.

The pre-baccalaureate program. The pre-baccalaureate partners recruited 16 elementary schools and nine secondary schools to become professional development partner schools. A total of 297 WSU pre-baccalaureate candidates enrolled in teacher education coursework in 2010-2011. The target enrollment number was 200 candidates. The mid-level and elementary candidates were placed field experiences in 2010 and secondary students will be placed in fall 2011. Implementation has been a complete transformation of the original teacher education program to a Professional Development School model. More than 500 students will

be placed in PDS field experiences each year as the various cohorts move through the scaffold field experiences within the PDS program.

There are 20 pre-baccalaureate programs for teacher licensure preparation at WSU. The largest is elementary education which enrolls more than half of all teacher candidates.

The placement, supervision, and assessment coupled with cooperating teacher, principal, and university supervisor selection and training has been a massive undertaking. The first cohort of elementary candidates completed the program in spring 2011. Final data for spring graduates will not be delivered by the Educational Testing Service, that conducts the post-graduation qualifying examination for teacher licensure, until fall. To date of the 88 graduates whose data was provided by ETS, only three failed the PRAXIS post-graduation content examination and five failed the Practice in Learning and Teaching (professional education) post-graduation examination. Both examinations are required for Kansas teacher licensure.

The Early Childhood pre-baccalaureate students were calculated separately since they are in a six year program; their target was 10 graduates but a total of 18 graduated. The second cohort of secondary candidates started the fall 2010 and will complete teacher education in spring 2012.

The Wichita Professional Development School Model. All teacher education students whether in residency or a pre-baccalaureate program participate in a method of teacher preparation called a Professional Development School. This method or model is characterized by long-term, hands-on field experiences. Within the WTQP version of the PDS model students teacher preparation comprises a three-fold focus on disciplinary knowledge, field experience, and instruction in professional education coursework as described below:

- Disciplinary knowledge. A deep understanding and appreciation of the discipline a WSU student has chosen is required. In addition to the general education courses, that provide

a strong academic foundation, and, in addition to the professional courses, middle level and secondary education candidates are required to successfully complete 30 credit hours of liberal arts and science courses within their chosen disciplines. The courses specific to the discipline provide the subject area knowledge upon which the professional education courses build. Candidates for elementary education licensure complete, beyond general education, 12 credit hours of mathematics and 10 hours of reading and literacy coursework taught in the College of Education.

- Field Experience. Each student in the teacher education program from freshman to senior year is provided with opportunities to be actively engaged in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms. Placements are made to ensure that teacher candidates have experience a high poverty urban, highly diverse school setting. Placements also ensure that students are assigned to one school for an entire school year. Teacher candidates learn first-hand about classroom management, use of technology in the classroom, and evaluation of student learning from exemplary teachers who are carefully selected to mentor teacher candidates. During the first half of the junior year, candidates spend at least 30 clock hours of time observing and aiding a classroom teacher. During the second semester of the junior year and the first semester of the senior year, candidates spend an average of 75 clock hours each semester in a partner-school classroom where they instruct a class on their own. Elementary teacher candidates teach four separate educational units of study. During the last semester at the university, teacher candidates spend a full semester of 15, 40 hour weeks in a partner-school classroom where they assume the teacher's role and the cooperating teacher assumes the role of mentor to the student-teacher intern.
- Professional/Pedagogy Knowledge. All teacher education candidates are required to successfully complete a minimum of 40 credit hours of professional education coursework that offers the latest in educational research and practices. Among others, these include focus on:
 - Instructional strategies including classroom and behavior management,
 - Research-based reading and literacy strategies,
 - Study of diversity and cultural issues with emphasis on teaching students in poverty and students for whom English is a second language,
 - Methods courses that connect theory to practice with focus on the use of technology in the classroom,
 - Statistics and evaluation and assessment courses that ensure WSU teaching candidates understand and can apply quantitative analysis to better serve the instructional needs of elementary and secondary students, and
 - The history of education, philosophies of education, and professional ethics.

The idea behind the WTQP is to use the PDS model of teacher preparation as a guide and also to carefully adapt it to the unique needs of our urban school district partners and the needs of our WSU teacher candidates. WSU is a regional, largely non-residential university with numerous

non-traditional students who request flexible educational opportunities, for example on-line and hybrid courses and field experiences that are not rigid and are supported by accommodating staff.

Recruitment, Educational, and Retention Activities. The WTQP pre-baccalaureate program and ESU Residency program have three parts that extend and reinforce the PDS model: Recruitment of prospective teachers, teacher preparation instruction, and retention of teachers new to the field. An outline of this work is presented below.

- In the area of recruitment the WTQP provides:
 1. Introduction to Education/Career Development is a course taught in the Wichita School District that offers concurrent enrollment. This means that students who enroll in the course for high school credit may also elect to earn WSU course credit. The course instructors are high school teachers who meet criteria for dual instruction, for instance each concurrent enrollment teacher must hold a Master's degree in education or a related discipline. High school students must hold an overall 3.0 grade point average to apply. During the 2010-11 school year, WSU provided scholarships for qualified students who received free or subsidized lunches. During the 2011-2012 school year, WSU will provide scholarships for all qualified student who wish to earn university course credit. The course is taught in seven Wichita high schools. More than 100 students completed the course and 43 student students received college credit in spring 2011.
 2. "Shock U Summer Camp" is a three-day workshop for high school students who wish to learn about higher education, "the university experience," and a career in education. In summer 2011, 15 students attended the camp.
 3. A WSU staff member is liaison to seven Wichita high school Future Teachers clubs, and assists with meetings, field trips, and other activities.
 4. Cooperative Education and Workplace Learning (co-op) is the WSU work-study program for students. The WTQP funds placement through the grant of 30 co-operative education students in Wichita schools. Approximately 140 WSU students are placed in area schools each semester through co-op.
 5. The College of Education Web site was redesigned and work is underway to produce a WTQP Web site.
 6. Recruitment for the ECU Residency is directed toward day-care providers and individuals with college degrees who seek advising at WSU regarding preparation for career change. Speaking engagements, brochures, and word-of-mouth also are used as recruitment tools. The announcement of the program received positive media coverage; however, it is difficult to measure its direct effect on recruitment.

- Support for the PDS pre-baccalaureate and ECU Residency program instruction includes the following:
 1. A technology class for pre-service candidates with the target of training 50 and 53 completed the course. The course will be implemented for all elementary teacher candidates and encouraged as an elective for secondary teacher candidates in academic year 2011/12.
 2. The elementary teacher education program was redesigned. Principle changes incorporated more understanding of information theory and literacy theory and incorporate them in strategies for communication and reading acquisition. A Children's literature has been incorporated into a literacy pedagogy course.
 3. A four-credit hour course in the college of education—Physical Science for Elementary Teachers—was developed to incorporate scientific knowledge, application of the scientific method, and elementary science pedagogy into one comprehensive course for teacher candidates.
 4. WSU faculty who teach in the pre-baccalaureate program and ECU Residency and WTQP staff received professional development in Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) and have been changing curriculum in both programs to incorporate more instruction that focuses on literacy and English as a second language. The purpose is to prepare all WSU teacher candidates to be prepared upon graduation to sit for the English as a Second Language added licensure endorsement examination at the same time apply for initial licensure examinations.
 5. Courses have been restructured to introduce to pre-service candidates knowledge of evaluation, including high-stakes examination, and the application of test results in data-driven instruction.
 6. Two meetings have been coordinated with the area Community Colleges to assist in the transition of their students into the College of Education. Brief transfer guides were written and distributed at the request of Community College advisors.
 7. Two Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty and one Fine Arts faculty are working collaboratively through grant support with the college of education to support teacher preparation candidates through teaching college of education courses and supervising field experiences.
 8. Since the ECU Residency program is a new Master of Arts in Teaching program, an entire curriculum, designed to meet WSU requirements, state standards, and national creditors' criteria, was developed.
 9. Progress has been made on using and integrating the University's Banner student record keeping system.
 10. The first workshop for partner school administrators on designing PDS learning communities was held in spring 2011.
- **Retention.** For both the pre-baccalaureate program and the Early Childhood Unified with Special Education program, new teacher on year of new teacher induction and mentoring are provided by the school district. A second year of induction which

consists of regular meetings of new school district hires in their second year of licensure is funded through the WTQP grant. Professional development is offered to the cooperating teachers who work with WSU students in both programs. There are regular meetings to discuss PDS and ECU Residency activities and concerns, and during these meetings, pedagogy and content enhancement are frequently presented. At least eight partnership workshops with faculty, WTQP staff, cooperating teachers, and contact teachers for each of the partnership schools continues in year two, and administrators from the 25 fall partner schools have met to discuss responsibilities for implementation.

Staff. The college dean is the project director for both grant priorities—the pre-baccalaureate and the early childhood residency program. An assistant to the project director and an assistant to each co-project director, an institutional technology assistant, and a part-time cooperative education coordinator facilitate the administration of the grant within the WSU College of Education. Faculty from the colleges of arts and sciences and fine arts are given release time to support disciplinary instruction and field experience activities. Four half-time liaison coordinate elementary and middle-level field experiences and provide regular daily to weekly contact with the partner schools. One full-time liaison provides the similar assistance to the high school partners, and one half-time technology liaison provides assistant to both elementary and secondary programs and supports the WTQP Web site and other social media... After the second year, it was decided to explore ways to employ a full-time field placement coordinator for the college to organize and supervise the multiple field placements and oversee the collection of required assessment and licensure data.

In the school district, the WTQP funds a stipend for a teacher named key representative at each participating school. This teacher is the school's point-person for contact with the WSU liaisons regarding WSU students in field placements and professional development within the school. The WTQP provides principals of partner schools with professional development funds to use for its staff development or for materials to enhance students' learning. The school district provides staff for the first year of new teacher induction and mentoring the WTQP provides staff for year two of the district's new teacher induction program.

Governance. The WTQP governance structure starts with two advisory boards—one for the pre-baccalaureate program and one for ECU-Residency. These boards meet monthly during the academic year to share information from the school district and the university that is relevant to the WTQP. The boards plan, conduct and evaluate the work of the partnership. A regularly published electronic newsletter provides information to faculty, administrators, and teachers in the PDS. An WTQP advisory board is chaired by the dean as project director and this board is comprised of representatives from both strands of the WTQP, community college partners, a representative of the district teachers' union, a representative of the Kansas National Education Association, WSU faculty and school district administrators. This board makes decisions about the overall direction of the WTQP.

Assessment and Evaluation. The program assessment process begins at the individual program level (e.g., secondary physics, special education, ECU Residency) with formative and summative assessments. Formative are usually administered within course work and benchmark assessments, for instance the Teacher Work Sample prepared by teacher candidate interns in their student-teaching semester, are usually not related to knowledge or skills gained in a single course. Individual students who do not score at the acceptable level on benchmark assessments

are remediated. A data management system and Banner, the university Enterprise Resource Program, collect the data and report it in frequencies and percentages. At least once yearly, the 21 program committees within the WTQP meet to analyze the data and make recommendations if needed for program improvement. All of the programs in the college are reviewed at least every seven years by the Kansas State Department of Education that evaluates how well the program standards are being met and by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. NCATE judges field experiences, assessment practices, the quality of the faculty, the commitment to equity (diversity) and its explication in preparing education professionals, and the facilities and other educational support provided by the university.

Evaluation of the WTQP is conducted by a third-party evaluator and is analyzed by the U.S. Department of Education. The main purposes of the Teacher Quality Partnership grants are to increase the overall numbers of individuals entering the field of teaching, to increase racial and ethnic representation among public school teachers, and to measure the effect on students' learning by teachers prepared in a teacher quality partnership. The evaluation, therefore, is largely numeric and is based on goals established at the beginning of the grant term, for example, a comparison of the number of students who graduated in the first pre-baccalaureate cohort with the number set by the TQP goal. Because the WTQP is only in its second year, with the first cohort graduating in spring of 2011, the full effect of WTQP prepared teachers on public school students' annual yearly progress cannot be measured until at least spring of 2012 and full impact of WTQP graduates will not be known until 2013, after the new teachers have completed the second year of their induction, have exited the WTQP program, and been fully accountable as a classroom teacher for one year.

Challenges. The Wichita Public Schools' budget cuts (\$30 million) have reduced instructional coaches, peer consultation, the Quality Improvement Services department which supervises the district assessment system, and grant management staff, and reduced coordinators for curricular support at the district level. Additionally, more than 100 teachers have been terminated and fewer teachers are being hired to begin in fall 2011 than in past years. A 12% budget cut at WSU in FY2009 resulted in the loss of 11 faculty lines and two support staff in the college and further budget reductions appear to be on the horizon. The 27 percent cut for year two of all Teacher Quality Partnership grants from the U.S. Department of Education is being subsumed in the WTQP with no changes to the structure or delivery of the grant initiatives due to the timing of our first-year hires and the budget year-lag for the contractual services with our partners.

Future goals appear attainable unless adversely impacted by reduced grant, public school or university funding. WTQP year three is included in the pending U.S. Senate education appropriations bill, August 2010. The grant original award called for new teacher induction for two years at partner schools and new teacher mentor support which will not be implemented until the third year of the grant. We hope to be funded to be able to continue the WTQP programs in progress and fund the parts of the program slated to come on line in year three.

Results. The WTQP has been a positive opportunity for approximately 500 WSU teacher candidates to experience high quality instruction and extensive field experiences in their preparation for teaching careers. The college of education's relationships with the public schools and colleagues in the liberal arts and sciences and fine arts have been enhanced. The college built stronger ties with the area community colleges. The WTQP brought to campus a cadre of liaison that energized our faculty and staff. The faculty learned new technology skills and ESOL

strategies while completely restructuring the elementary teacher preparation curriculum and enhancing the secondary teacher preparation coursework.

The grant has encouraged faculty and staff and students at a time when all around us we see restriction in funding for education. We believe it is important to keep the teacher education pipeline open. It is our hope to complete this grant, maintain the partnerships we have built, document the effectiveness of our urban teacher preparation program, offer what we learn in the process for the benefit of others .through professional development activities and publication and most importantly make a difference in learning gains for children.

Part III: The Future of School Reform

The Wichita Teacher Quality Partnership, created in 2009, is still in its infancy; nonetheless, initial gains in the early years can be documented. The total transformation of the WSU teacher education program to a Professional Development School model nears completion. WTQP is on-target to date according to the results of outside evaluation, and grant expenditures are under budget for the first two years. At this point, data is not available to make overall judgments about increases in the diversity of WSU students entering teacher education or increases in the overall number of WSU graduates who enter the teaching field. Nor is it possible at this time to determine how WSU graduates impact the annual yearly performance of the students they teach. Some observations can be made at this point that give voice to the values regarding teacher education that have come forward as the WTQP partnership travels along the road of school reform.

First, the trajectory of history illuminates the inveterate controversies and inconsistencies that arise through the democratic political process that oversees elementary and secondary education in the United States. Second, examples from the past render diametrically divergent

explanations as to where the roots of current problems in education lie. Third, given the existing situation in the urban school district served in the partnership, it becomes obvious that the old contradictory paradigm that undergirded past debates about school reform is simply an insufficient fall-back on which to argue the issues that drive school reform in a global society with a straitened economy.

Whether education is for the purpose of citizenship, workforce preparation or develop critical thinking; or whether the act of teaching is a complex proficiency or skilled labor have little bearing on what needs to be done to improve teacher education and help children prepare for life in the rapidly changing world of the 21st century. Fourth, we have come to accept that we are not facing a throwback to the Cold War Era where national competition drives teacher education to keep up with students' test scores in other countries. Neither can teacher education be driven only by the attempt to accommodate the rising population of students who are immigrants to the United States. In today's world, teacher education must do both at the same time and much more. The WTQP is following an uncharted path. There are no easy answers to public school reform. What has been learned in our two-year journey is that there are three values for growing quality teacher education. The initial two year's work within the WTQP has grown the conviction that effective teacher education functions best when it is the following:

Collaborative. Several partnerships sustain the WSU teacher education program. One is the relationship among the university, community colleges and school district to foster a "seamless" transition for high school graduates to enter higher education and transfer coursework to complete a degree in education. Another partnership exists among government agencies, community organizations and philanthropic associations. These relationships go beyond TOP and Head Start, the two WTQP grant partners. This type of collaboration offers multiple

resources to extend the work of the WTQP partners, and the flexibility of this participation draws wide public awareness and support of the partnership. Still collaboration is the relationship of the college of education faculty with that of the liberal arts and sciences and fine arts faculty who together provide the curricula for the teacher candidates. Support of the mission and scope of the faculty in the other colleges is vital to the success of preparing teachers. Finally, the most significant collaboration in the WTQP is the on-going learning community comprised of teacher candidates, university faculty and personnel, and district teachers and administrators. Regular meetings of representatives of these entities, daily contact in the schools, and institutional professional development workshops—all are central to creating not only the high quality educational experience for teachers, but enhancing the education of public school students, and augmenting the professional development of the school district staff as well.

Comprehensive. It is no longer useful to argue whether the best preparation in pedagogy is to lead teachers toward highly structured, concentrated instruction using tools of repetition and recall; or, conversely, coach them toward student-centered, learning-team instruction using tools of inquiry, scholarship, and scientific research. Both are necessary.

By the same token, it is imperative that reading and mathematics be emphasized so that no child is left behind in achieving annual yearly progress. It is also imperative that the traditional full complement of elementary and secondary curricula be taught so that learning in the sciences and social sciences, art and music, and physical education are not eclipsed by a narrow focus on reading and mathematics to the detriment of student achievement. In a diverse, multi-cultural and society, public school education in citizenship to develop democratic leadership is as vital to thorough education as career and intellectual development.

There appears to be confusion in the school reform movement as to the difference between assessment and evaluation. Assessment is a process that, through the collection of different types of data, leads to better understanding of individual programs, schools, or colleges for the purpose of continuous improvement. Evaluation is measure of achievement of a program, grant, individual student, faculty member, teacher, administrator, or dean. The current vogue of extrapolating the individual evaluation of a student to collectively assess classroom or total performance of school employees is not a valid, reliable, or fair use of data. Teacher education candidates need thorough instruction in assessment and evaluation in order to interpret data gathered for these purposes accurately be able to synthesize the data for program improvement and to apply the data in differentiating instruction in teaching. A main objective of the academy, in general, and college of education in particular should be to encourage new designs in teacher education and avoid decision making within the confines of the old paradigm.

Highly Professional. In the current climate of school reform, field experiences, residency and mentoring appear to mean different things to different groups of people in regard to teacher preparation. Within one viewpoint, teacher education should be like an “apprenticeship” where the teacher candidate is looked upon as a subordinate to be placed in a classroom with a highly qualified teacher who would then “train” the candidate in a set of duties elicited to produce the most learning in each child in the timeliest fashion. From another viewpoint, the teacher candidate is not subject to behavior modification but looked upon as an emergent professional holding an internship “appointment” in the school. From this viewpoint, the mentoring role of the teacher in the field experience is to collaborate with the candidate with the intention of guiding the candidate’s development rather than instilling in the candidate a set of rules to follow and tools to apply.

The two viewpoints each address the nature of teacher education differently, as might be expected. Since an extensive body of research over considerable time has not been able to articulate the criteria for identifying a highly effective teacher, the components of education to prepare teachers remain open to debate. Some current proponents of school reform advocate that if it is impossible to predict a successful teacher, then anyone who wants to teach should be allowed to do so. According to this rationale, specific knowledge is not necessary, only the experience of working under a successful teacher for a period of time, usually about one school year in duration, is necessary. Proponents of the opposing viewpoint believe that it is vital for teacher education to be considered a career-long endeavor, that teacher candidate field experiences need to extend over time, that a wide range university coursework in pedagogy to build expertise in working with children in poverty, English language learners, students with disabilities and students who fall into none of the aforementioned groups is necessary to produce effective teachers. From this viewpoint, master teachers usually do not achieve that status with less than a master's degree level of education and documentation that they are competent to engage in research and scholarship to continually bring new ideas to their classrooms, beginning teachers, and their extended learning communities.

The viewpoints also clash over whether teacher education should be provided solely by four-year institutions of higher education or be extended to include organizations such as community colleges, school districts, and privately funded professional development service centers who may not be required to meet the government mandates, standards, and assessment documentation that are required of colleges and universities. An extensive review of literature could not locate a profession in the United States where, over time, when the standards of performance were raised, the preparation of the workforce to meet the higher standards was

downgraded. The third path in this conflicting state of affairs may be found through judging university preparation for teachers by the success of their graduates in effecting student achievement, in overall measures of graduates' performance as teachers, and in responses of the employers of the graduates.

Forethought. The status of education in the United States in 2011 is precarious. School reform is necessary despite the extraneous forces that impact the success of schools and lie beyond the control of educational systems to address. The problems facing the schools that can be addressed by school reform are complex and many have existed for an entire century and more. Teacher quality is directly affected by teacher preparation and professional development. Key concepts in teacher education found through implementing a Teacher Quality Partnership grant in Wichita, Kansas are that the partnership preparation needs to be collaborative, comprehensive, and highly professional for the university teacher candidates and professional educators involved.

Bibliography

- Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). *Professional Development Schools: Weighing the Evidence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Anderson, N. (2011). Most Schools Could Face Failing Label Under No Child Left Behind, Duncan Says <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/09/AR2011030905748.html> Accessed on June 1, 2011
- Armstrong, J.W. (1895). The Eighth Grade Graduation Examination from Saline County Public Schools, Kansas from 1895. Smoky Valley Genealogical Society. <http://skyways.lib.ks.us/genweb/saline/society/exam.html> Accessed: June 01, 2011.
- Altenbaugh, R.J. (1999). Historical Dictionary of American Education. *Progressive Education Association* p. 303-4, Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Bankston, C.L. and Caldas, S.J. (2009). *Public Education America's Civil Religion: A Social History*. New York, NY. Teacher's College Press.
- Beck, R.H. (1959). Progressive Education and American Progressivism: Margret Namburg (book review) *Teachers College Record*, 60(4): 198-208.
- Blount, J.M. (1998). *Destined to Rule the Schools: Women and the Superintendency, 1873-1995*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bob Hotakainen and Suzanne Perez Tobias. "Changes Urged for No Child Left Behind." The Wichita Eagle (Wichita, KS). 7 July 2011: All Print.
- Bode, B. (1938). *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*. New York, NY: Newson & Co.
- Bohan, C.H. and Null, J.W. (2007). Gender and the Evolution of Normal School Education: A Historical Analysis of Teacher Education Institutions. *Educational Foundations*, 3-26.
- Brinkley, A. (2009). *American History: A Survey*, Volume. I. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Brinkley, A. (2009). *American History: A Survey* Volume. II. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Bruner, J.S. (1966). *Toward a Theory of Instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Butts, R.F. (1978). *Public Education in the United States from Revolution to Reform*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Callahan, R.E. (1962). *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Card, D. and Krueger, A.B. (1992). Does School Quality Matter: Returns to Education and the Characteristics of Public Schools in the United States. *Journal of Political Economy*. 100:1-40.
- Childs, M. (2011). *Critical Contributions: First In-Depth Analysis of Philanthropic Investment in Teachers and Teaching*. Atlanta, GA: The University of Georgia College of Education.
- Chubb J.E. and Moe, T.M. (1990). *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press
- Church, R.L. and Sedlak M.W. (1976). *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Clark, R.W. (1999). *Effective Professional Development Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Comer, J.P. (2004). *Leave No Child Behind: Preparing Today's Youth for Tomorrow's World*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Cremin, L.A. (1970). *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783*. New York, NY: Harper & Row
- Curran Bernard, S. and Mondale, S. (2001). *School: The Story of American Public Education*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda. (2011). *The Service of Democratic Education*. <http://www.thenation.com/article/160850/service-democratic-education> Accessed on June 1, 2011.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The Flat Word of Education: How America's Commitment to Equity Will Determine Our Future*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.) (2005). *Professional Development Schools: Schools for Developing a Profession*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *Schools of To-Morrow*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing.
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1900). *The School and Society*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Doolittle, G., Sudeck, M. & Rattigan, P. (2008). Creating Professional Learning Communities: The Work of Professional Development Schools. *Theory Into Practice*, 47, 303-310.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1987). *W.E.B. Du Bois: Writings: The Suppression of the African Slave-Trade/ The Souls of Black Folk/ Dusk of Dawn/Essays and Articles*. New York, NY: Library of America.

DuFresne, R. A. (1985). *Winona State University: A History of One Hundred Twenty-Five Years*. Winona, MN: Winona State University.

ESEA Reauthorization: A Blueprint for Reform. (2010).
<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/index.html> Accessed on June 25, 2011.

Fitzpatrick, M.D. and Turner, S.E. (2006). Blurring the Boundary: Changes in the Transition from College Participation to Adulthood.
<http://www.transad.pop.upenn.edu/resources/growup.html> Accessed on May 1, 2011.

Flesch, R. (1955). *Why Johnny Can't Read*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.

Friedman, T. (2005). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twentieth-First Century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Frum, D. (2000). *How We Got Here: The '70s*. New York, NY: Basic Books. **Goldin, C. (2001). The Human Capital Century and American Leadership: Virtues of the Past. *The Journal of Economic History*, 61(2).**

Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994. (2011).
<http://www.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/intro.html> Accessed on June 1, 2011.

Goodlad, J. (1980). How Laboratory Schools Go Awry. *UCLA Educator*, 21(2), 46-53.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Better Teachers for Our Nation's Schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(3), 184-194.

Gunn, S.J. (2004). *Indian General Allotment Act (The Dawes Act) (1887): An Entry from Macmillian Reference USA's Major Acts of Congress*. New York, NY: Macmillian Reference

Grisson, (1973). Education and the Cold War: the Role of James B. Conant. In Karier, C. Violas, P. and Spring, J. (1973). *Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Hanushek, E.A., Kain, J.F. and Rivkin, S.G. (2009). New Evidence About Brown v. Board of Education: The Complex Effects of School Racial Composition and Achievement. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 27(3) 349-383.

Hanushek, E.A. and Rivkin, S.G. (2009). Harming the Best: How Schools Affect the Black-White achievement Gap. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 28(3) 366-393.

Harper, C.A. (1970). *A Century of Public Teacher Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Hewitt, W.F. (1934). Samuel Breck and the Pennsylvania School Law of 1834. *Pennsylvania History* 1(2):63-75

[Hoover Institution Stanford University. \(2011\). http://www.hoover.org](http://www.hoover.org). Accessed on June 1, 2011.

[Improving America's Schools Act, 1994. \(2011\). http://cwx.prenhall.com](http://cwx.prenhall.com) Accessed on June 1, 2011.

Iorio, S. (2009). *Teacher Ed Pro-Con Missed Point*. Appeared in the Wichita Eagle Newspaper on Wednesday, September 10, 2009.

Karier, C. Violas, P. and Spring, J. (1973). *Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Karier, C.J. (1973). Business Values and the Educational State. In Karier, C.J., Violas, P. and Spring, J. (1973). *Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Knoll, M. (1997). The Project Method: Its Vocational Education Origin and International Development. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*. 34(3).

Kohn, A. (1999). *The Schools Our Children Deserve*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Lamson, M.S. (1903). *Records of the First Class of the First State Normal School in America: Established at Lexington, Massachusetts, 1839*. Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press.

Lazerson, M. and Grubb, N. (1974). *American Education and Vocationalism: A Documentary History 1870-1970*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Leiding, D. (2009). *Reform Can Make a Difference: A Guide to School Reform*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Levine and Trachtman. (1997). *Making Professional Development Schools Work*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lowenberg, D. and Forzani, F.M. (2010). What Does it Take to Make a Teacher? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(2), 8-12.

Meriam, J.L. (1905). *Normal School Education and Efficiency in Teaching*. New York, NY: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Columbia University.

- Miller, J. (2004). *The Little Rock Nine: Young Champions for School Integration*. New York, NY: Rosen Publishing Group.
- Morey, A.I., Bezuk, N. and Chiero, R. (1997) Teacher Preparation in the United States. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72 (1), 4-24.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *Projections of Education Statistics to 2019*. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011017.pdf> Accessed on June 1, 2011.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=1999022> Accessed on June 1, 2011.
- National Education Association. (2011). <http://www.nea.org/home/1704.htm>. Accessed on June 1, 2011.
- National Education Association (NEA). (2011). [http://wn.com/National Educational Association](http://wn.com/National_Educational_Association) Accessed on May 31, 2011.
- Nations Report Card. (2011). <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/FAQ.asp> Accessed on June 1, 2011.
- NCATE A. (2010). <http://www.ncate.org/public/pdswhat.asp?ch=133>. Accessed on July 26, 2010.
- NCATE B. (2010). <http://www.ncate.org/public/pdsImportant.asp?ch=133>. Accessed on July 26, 2010.
- NCATE C. (2010). <http://www.ncate.org/public/pdswHY.asp?ch=133>. Accessed on July 26, 2010.
- New York Times (1890). *The First Normal School*. The New York Times, August 4. <http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=F10D1FFB385F10738DDDAD0894D0405B8085F0D3> Accessed on June 01, 2011.
- Odden, A. (1986). "Sources of Funding for Educational Reform." *Phi Delta Kappan* 67, 5: 335–340.
- Ofsted News. (2010). <http://ofstednews.ofsted.gov.uk/?cmd=audiences.printable&issue=36&audience=insideview>. Accessed on September 1, 2010.
- Ogren, C.A. (2005). *The American State Normal School: An Instrument of Great Good*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ornstein, L. (1993). *Foundations of Education*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Pratt, C. (1948). *I Learn from Children*. New York, NY: E.P. Dutton.

Pew Social Trends Staff. (2010). How the Great Recession Has Changed Life in America.

<http://pewsocialtrends.org/2010/06/30/how-the-great-recession-has-changed-life-in-america/> Accessed on January 25, 2011.

Proefriedt, W. (2011). *Schools of Education: Doing One Thing Well*.

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/06/29/36proefriedt.h30.html?qs=schools+of+education:+doing+one+thing+well> Accessed on July 1, 2011.

Ravitch, D. (2011). *Waiting for a School Miracle*.

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/01/opinion/01ravitch.html?_r=1 Accessed on June 1, 2011.

Ravitch, D. (2010). *The Great American School System: How Testing and Choice are Undermining Education*. Philadelphia, PA: Basic Books.

Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Rivkin, S.G. and Welch, F. (2006). Has School Desegregation Improved Academic and Economic Outcomes for Blacks? *Handbook of the Economics of Education*. Amsterdam: North Holland: 1019-1049.

Sawchuk, S. (2011). *NEA Leaders Propose Teacher-Evaluation Shift*.

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/05/11/31nea.h30.html?qs=NEA+Leaders+propose+teacher-evaluation+shift> Accessed on June 1, 2011.

Schwegler, Stephan J. (1982). *Academic Freedom and the Disclaimer Affidavit of the National Defense Education Act: The Response of Higher Education*. Dissertation: Teacher's College, Columbia University.

Sharon Iorio. "Growing Teacher Shortage is Endangering Education." *The Wichita Eagle* (Wichita, KS) 27 February 2008: All Print.

[Sputnik Moment \(2010\). Obama: America Faces New Sputnik Movement.](#)

<http://www2.journalnow.com/news/2010/dec/06/obama-arrives-triad-ar-594914>
Accessed on January 23, 2011.

Summary of the Minutes of the Central regional Advisory Committee Public Meeting. (2011).

http://www.seiservices.com/rac/SummaryFiles/35_49_Summary%20Minutes%20of%20the%20Central%20Regional%20Advisory%20Committee%20%20revised2.pdf Accessed on June 1, 2011.

- Symonds, W.C. (2000). For Profit Schools, They're Spreading Fast. Can Private Companies do a better job of educating America's Kids?
http://www.businessweek.com/2000/00_06/b3667001.htm Accessed on June 1, 2011.
- Taylor, G.D. (1980). *The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism: The Administration of the Indian Reorganization Act, 1934-45*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Taylor, (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
- The History of Public Schools in America. (2011)
<http://people.howstuffworks.com/public-schools1.htm> Accessed June 1, 2011.
- The National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA). (2011)
<http://federaleducationpolicy.wordpress.com/2011/06/03/national-defense-education-act-of-1958-2/> Accessed June 1, 2011.
- The No Child Left Behind Act. (2011).
<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html> Accessed on June 1, 2011.
- Thomas L. Friedman. "The New Untouchables." The New York Times (New York, NY) 21 October 2009: All Print.
- Thornbrough, E. L. (1969). *Great Lives Observed: Booker T. Washington*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Tyack, D.B. and Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- United States National Commission on Excellence. *A Nation at Risk*. (1983). Washington, DC: U.S Government Printing Office.
- Urban, W.J. (2010). *More Than Science and Sputnik: The National Defense Education Act of 1958*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Vinovskis, M.A. (2005). *The Birth of Head Start*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Von Glaserfeld, E. (1987). Learning as a Constructive Activity. In C. Janiver *Problems of Representation in the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics*. 3-18. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Washburne, C.W. (1952). *What is Progressive Education?* New York, NY: J. Day.

Work Permit. (2011). US Manufacturers Say Skilled Jobs Staying Unfilled.

http://www.workpermit.com/news/2005_12_02/us/manufacturers_need_skilled_workers.htm Accessed on June 1, 2010.

Zacharias, J. (1969). Zacharias on Professional Education. *Change in Higher Education*. 1(1), 30-32.

Zhao, Y. (2009). *Catching Up or Leading the Way*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.