

Recruitment and Selection In educator preparation

A paper for consideration by the
CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting

EJE for the CAEP Commission
November 29, 2011 and May 17, 2012

This paper advocates that:

Recruitment and selection of candidates for teaching
should be integral elements of new CAEP standards
and that
CAEP should play a continuing role in advancing knowledge
about teacher preparation recruitment and selection as factors in student learning

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) has committed itself to prepare new standards to serve as the basis for accreditation. These standards are to be “higher, clearer, and fewer.” The challenge faced by the Commission is to create standards that are explicit enough to have some bite—to make judgments between institutions meeting them and institutions that do not—yet not overly prescriptive so they impede innovation.

This is not just a rhetorical challenge. Compelling research evidence is notably thin about the nature of teacher preparation that can reliably develop candidates to become effective teachers who are successful in helping students learn challenging material. We should be humble about that. Yet there have been arguments made from widely differing perspectives that converge on recruitment and selection as among the few really critical dimensions of preparation. Public opinion, research, international experience, policymakers and critics—and the experience of both “traditional” and alternative pathway programs—concur that recruitment outreach and selection criteria are essential to building our pool of new teachers. These are strategies that the nation needs in order to ensure an able and diversely inclusive teacher workforce.

This paper explores these differing perspectives, suggesting how they converge, and recommends inclusion of language in CAEP standards intended to bring greater rigor to accreditation while fostering innovation. Three options that move progressively toward higher bars for recruitment efforts, selection criteria, and accreditation evidence are suggested for Commission consideration. Follow up implementation actions are also recommended for CAEP.

INTRODUCTION

Recruitment and selection of candidates upon entry into teacher preparation have not been topics of critical concern to education accreditors. The preconditions for NCATE candidacy anticipate that schools, departments, or colleges of education will have recruitment or admission requirements and ask that “published criteria for admission to and exit from” preparation programs appear in the submission. There is no reference to recruitment or selection in NCATE standards, although there is a description of the preparation program’s assessment system that states, “regular and comprehensive information on applicant qualifications” would reside in that system.

One of the TEAC quality principles addresses evidence of faculty learning and inquiry that encompasses an “influential quality control system” by which the faculty promotes continual improvement. One dimension of that principle reads: “admissions and mentoring policies encourage the recruitment and retention of

diverse candidates with demonstrated potential as professional educators, and must respond to the nation's needs for qualified individuals to serve in high demand areas and locations.” In the internal audit of its quality control system, the faculty examines the program's admissions policies and their implementation, noting in the inquiry brief how faithfully the program follows its policies. The results of the internal audit may be examined during the site visit.

So whether selection criteria are or are not an important element of an institution's admissions decisions, or those of the education unit, both accreditors have placed their focus on readiness to teach as candidates complete their preparation, in contrast with the intake criteria. Would CAEP differ? Should it? The CAEP initial standards contain a standard that reads: “Resources and practices support candidate learning,” and one of the supporting items is: “admissions and mentoring policies encourage the recruitment and retention of high quality candidates.” Is this level of attention sufficient—at a time when the national policy requirement is for teachers who will succeed in challenging situations? That is the essential underlying issue addressed in this paper.

The limited acknowledgement of recruitment and selection as critical strategies in accreditation conflicts with perspectives found in numerous other sources. The American public believes, according to Gallup polls, that more selectivity should be exercised when teachers are hired. A National Academy of Sciences consensus panel reviewing teacher preparation research has concluded that “quality of teachers” (meaning program selectivity, its interaction with preparation, and the effects of both on student learning) is one of three factors in teacher preparation that are “highly likely” to be associated with higher levels of P-12 student learning (the others are content knowledge and field and clinical experiences). New research on Teach for America¹ indicates greater learning when students are taught by TFA teachers who score higher on rigorous selection criteria. Recent reports indicate that policy choices made in several nations to select teachers from the upper academic level of students are associated with higher P-12 student performance. And, finally, many preparation programs and alternative providers illustrate actual experience with selection criteria. Collectively these perspectives exhibit an instructive array of similar and differing criteria. Policymakers and critics are proposing policy actions that give more prominence to recruitment and selection of individuals who prepare for and enter teaching.

The following sections of this paper first explore these perspectives in greater detail, then turn to caveats or concerns surrounding recruitment and selection strategies in preparation that must be part of the context for the CAEP Commission. The final section summarizes the line of argument formed in the paper and draws conclusions for Commission consideration.

PERSPECTIVES

Public opinion

The 2011 Gallup Phi Delta Kappan education poll reported on recruiting and retaining great teachers. It found that 76% of the U. S. adult public agreed that “high-achieving” high school students should be recruited to become teachers. Some 74% said they would “encourage” “the brightest person you know” to be a teacher. About equal percentages thought that encouraging high school and college students with appropriate skills to become scientists, or to become teachers of science or math, is “most important for our nation's future.”

Some 71% said they “have trust and confidence in the men and women who are teaching children in the public schools.” While 70% thought that “ability to teach or instruct students” was more “the result of natural talent” than “college training” (28%), the 2008 Gallup PDK poll found that 77% of Americans believe we should have “national competency tests” for certification of public school teachers.

¹ *Teacher Characteristics and Student Achievement Evidence from Teach for America*, Will Dobbie, Harvard University, July 2011

So the public thinks teaching is important and should attract high-achievers, and they have confidence in teachers. But even though they think that good teachers are born, not “made,” they still want them to pass some threshold national benchmark level of competence.

Research

Numerous studies have been undertaken in the past decade to synthesize research on questions about teacher quality and teacher education. Among the authors of such studies are Goe and Strickler at ETS², Michael Allen for the Education Commission of the States³, and Wilson, Floden and Ferrini-Mundi from Michigan State University⁴. Especially wide ranging examinations of research literature were prepared by the American Education Research Association⁵ and the National Academy of Education⁶. More recently the pool of available studies has been considerably strengthened by the proliferating “CALDER”⁷ (Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research) studies using state longitudinal data on student performance at the Urban Institute, and a report on teacher preparation from the National Research Council⁸.

These numerous attempts to synthesize what research has to say about teacher preparation and teacher quality have reiterated a few themes. A frequently cited finding in such reports is the **effect of teacher verbal and cognitive ability on student achievement**⁹, said by then Institute for Education Sciences Director, Russ Whitehurst, to account for more variance in student achievement than any other measured characteristics of teachers.

Everything else about teacher characteristics as predicting student learning is weak, ambiguous, certainly heavily caveated, and sometimes contradictory. A CALDER study¹⁰ using New York City data reported that “. . . some individual qualifications affect outcomes in important ways, (but) often the effects are small in magnitude when compared with the variation in student learning over a school year.” The measures used in this study were quite extensive, among them **experience, pass or fail on first taking the state licensure test, selectivity of undergraduate institution, SAT verbal score, SAT math score**, and others. The research found that performance of students in elementary math was increased when “better qualified teachers” were recruited and hired. The report concludes with a statement that the research “suggests that selection of teachers with stronger qualifications has made an important difference in New York City public schools and that recruitment and retention of teachers with stronger measurable characteristics can lead to improved student learning.”

² *Teacher Quality and Student Advancement: Making the Most of Recent Research*, Laura Goe and Leslie M. Strickler, ETS, 2008

³ *Eight Questions on Teacher Preparation*, Education Commission of the States, 2003

⁴ *Teacher Preparation Research: Current Knowledge, Gaps, and Recommendations*, Michigan State University, prepared for the University of Washington Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, 2001

⁵ *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*, Edited by Marilyn Cochran-Smith and Kenneth M. Zeichner, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., publishers for AERA, 2006

⁶ *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do*, Edited by Linda Darling-Hammond and John Bransford, Jossey-Bass, Sponsored by the National Academy of Education, 2005

⁷ Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, located since mid-2011 at AIR, the American Institutes for Research

⁸ *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy*, Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States, National Academies Press, Washington, 2010

⁹ The example is a Grover Whitehurst (then Director of the Institute for Education Sciences at the U. S. Department of Education) paper for the White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers, 2007. Whitehurst cites studies from 1994 to 1996 as the basis for his claim.

¹⁰ *The Narrowing Gap in New York City Teacher Qualifications and Its Implications for Student Achievement in High-Poverty Schools*, Donald Boyd, Hamilton Lankford, Susanna Loeb, Jonah Rockoff, and James Wyckoff, CALDER, Working Paper 10, Urban Institute, 2007

One example of ambiguous and conflicting findings in education research is in the synthesis prepared for the Education Commission of the States in 2003. The audience for this study was state legislators and governors who must make teacher education policy. One of the eight questions on teacher preparation addressed in the study was: Is setting more stringent teacher preparation program entrance requirements, or conducting more selective screening of program candidates, likely to ensure that prospective teachers will be more effective? The overall finding was that the **answer is “inconclusive.”** The report found that two studies concluded there is a correlation between the **strength of teachers’ academic success** and direct or indirect measures of teaching success. A third study, however, suggested that raising academic requirements for admission to teacher preparation programs would **reduce the pool of teacher candidates, particularly minorities.**

Goe and Strickler reported on several attributes that are relevant for hiring of teachers, rather than for selection into preparation. **Teachers’ knowledge of math matters for student learning of math at all levels**, particularly in high school, and knowledge of math is demonstrated by **course taking, certification, or degrees. Teacher experience matters, but only for the first five years. Licensure test scores are a mixed indicator of quality, largely because of low state cut scores. Subject area certification is most consistently and strongly associated with improved student achievement.** And content-based pedagogical knowledge is substantially positively associated with students math achievement at all levels. The same study finds there is **not a substantial benefit to study for advanced degrees** in terms of student learning, and it **may even be negative** in some cases. The authors found that **selectivity of undergraduate institutions attended has not been supported by recent studies as a factor in student learning** (although they report that it had been in some earlier studies). **“Certification” in general may be positively related to student learning, or may be unrelated, and emergency certification is negatively related to student achievement.**

The National Research Council 2010 report is the most recent general synthesis of research about preparation. It lamented limited research evidence that particular features of preparation are efficacious. And it concluded that research is “badly needed” to find “definitive evidence that particular approaches to teacher preparation yield teachers whose students are more successful than others.” However, the panel found that “existing research provides some guidance on **three topics in teacher preparation that are likely to have the “highest potential effects on outcomes for students¹¹”: content knowledge, field experience, and the quality of teacher candidates.**” Quality of candidates, defined as “**academically able people who have the potential to be effective teachers,**” is directly relevant to consideration of recruitment, selection, and admissions. The NRC extended the description of “able, high-quality” to assert that “there is reason to believe that **some pathways and programs are much more attractive than others** for such potential teachers.” The panel continued, “Less clear are the factors that attract the best candidates, **the way program selectivity and preparation interact** and the effect of each on student learning, and the extent to which the importance of these factors vary depending on the attributes (such as grade level and ability) of the students whom these teachers ultimately teach.”

Some research on whether differences in selectivity matter for teacher effectiveness appears to indicate that **general ability does matter;** and “**some research has shown that there may be value in matching students and teachers by race.**” The research “is not conclusive,” according to the NRC Committee, but “points to the potential importance of program selectivity as one of several important factors in the preparation of high-quality teachers.” The Council cites small scale work that indicates “promising avenues for further investigation.” It found more variance within traditional and within alternative pathways than between the two, so it would be necessary to look at specific programs instead (e.g., TFA or the practices of particular institutions) to see the current range in practice.

The final research study cited here was released subsequent to the NRC report. A new Harvard graduate student report examines particular factors that TFA uses in selection that appear to be associated with greater

¹¹ NRC, op cit., p. 186

student learning¹². In math, the factors are "achievement, leadership, and perseverance," and in English Language Arts, "leadership experiences and commitment to TFA goals." The study also finds a decrease in student behavior problems among teachers who score higher on these selection criteria. There are lots of caveats, but the study concludes that it would be **far more practical and effective to look at teacher qualities such as those used for selection by TFA before teachers are hired than to look, after they are employed, at how their students perform.**

International experience

Over the past three years or so there has been a close examination of the qualities of the teaching workforce and policies associated with teacher professional development in several countries. Among other studies are ones from OECD¹³, Marc Tucker at the National Center on Education and the Economy¹⁴, the Asia Society in cooperation with the Council for Chief State School Officers¹⁵, Linda Darling-Hammond and Robert Rothman¹⁶ writing for the Alliance for Excellent Education and the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education, and management consultants, McKinsey & Company¹⁷. The country experiences that form the basis for these reports come from Singapore, Finland, South Korea, Shanghai, Japan, Ontario, England and Australia. Some of these countries or provinces were chosen because their students perform at high levels on the OECD "PISA" tests in reading, mathematics and science of fifteen year olds. Others illustrate nation's that have taken policy initiatives to change the teacher workforce characteristics.

With explicit regard to recruitment and selection of candidates into the teaching workforce, Singapore, Finland, and South Korea, all high performers on international tests, are selected by McKinsey as examples of the effects of insisting on recruitment among the top high school performers—the "top-third graduates"—and McKinsey recommends that (top third) standard for admission of candidates to U. S. teacher preparation. Other attributes of high selectivity policies include government subsidies for tuition and fees, covering living expenses during training, and likening preparation of teachers to medical school and residency experiences. Countries that employ stipends and cover tuition expect a commitment for service as a teacher for some period of years.

Darling-Hammond and Rothman describe a second level of selectivity in Finland, following matriculation examination results, high school record, and out-of-school accomplishments. In the second phase candidates must complete a written exam on assigned books on pedagogy, engage in an observed clinical activity replicating school situations, and participate in an interview in which they are asked to explain why they have decided to become teachers¹⁸.

Jane Hannaway and Dan Goldhaber¹⁹ report findings from international research in their Urban Institute book on the teaching profession, which they view from the perspective of human capital resource

¹² Harvard University, Dobbie, op. cit., pp. 8-11

¹³ *Building a High-Quality Teaching Profession: Lessons from Around the World*, prepared by OECD as a background report for the U. S. Department of Education International Summit on the Teaching Profession, March 2011

¹⁴ *Standing on the Shoulders of Giants: An American Agenda for Education Reform*, National Center on Education and the Economy, prepared at the request of OECD, 2011

¹⁵ *International Perspectives on U. S. Education Policy and Practice: What Can We Learn from High-Performing Nations?*, Asia Society and the Council of chief State School Officers, report on a conference held April 2010

¹⁶ *Teacher and Leader Effectiveness in High-Performing Education Systems*, Linda Darling-Hammond and Robert Rothman, editors, for the Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE) and Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education (SCOPE), Washington, DC and Stanford, CA, 2011

¹⁷ *Closing the talent gap: Attracting and retaining top-third graduates to careers in teaching*, subtitled, "An international and market research-based perspective," September 2010

¹⁸ AEE and SCOPE, of cit., p. 14

¹⁹ *Creating a New Teaching Profession*, Jane Hannaway and Dan Goldhaber, editors, CALDER, Urban Institute, 2010

management in education. These show greater diversity in teacher training in the US than in other countries. **Our licensure tests typically winnow out very few teacher candidates** and the effects can differ substantially from state to state. Goldhaber suggests a national entry-level credential (similar to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification—but for entering teachers), more use of alternative routes into teaching, and more experiments with incentives²⁰.

OECD reported on Blair administration actions to address a severe shortage of teachers in England. Described as a “sophisticated recruitment campaign,” the policy initiative is portrayed as converting “one of the worst shortages of teachers in history” to, five years later, a situation where there were eight applicants for every opening. Blair raised compensation significantly and changed teachers’ work environment as well. The campaign was focused on the idea of teaching “making a difference,” and emphasized “the flexibility and diversity of the skills teachers acquire, the variety of routes into teaching, and the possibility of doing it as a ‘first career’ before moving on to other things.”

The message for the United States from a report authored by the Asia Society/CCSSO was clear and direct: “emphasize recruiting, preparing, supporting and compensating teachers on the front end rather than reducing teacher attrition and firing weak teachers on the back end.” This might well serve as a summary across all the international research described in this section. Recruitment and selection are essential for assuring a diverse pool and identifying potential high performers, but don’t stand alone as a single all purpose reform. Looking at educator workforce quality in “systems” terms is discussed, below, in a section on “Interdependence of Teacher Workforce Reforms.”

Policymakers and critics

The examples of policymaker and critic perspectives in this section are, of course, just a tiny sample across the wide range of possible sources that might be included. There is only one example to illustrate views from the U. S. Congress due to the lack of agreement on NCLB and other legislation, or even committee action that reached the House or the Senate floor. The paragraphs below take up recommendations from the U. S. Department of Education and Senator Alexander’s bills in the Senate. The Education Sector, the Gerstner report, and a NASBE report serve to illustrate nonprofits. The National Center on Teacher Quality and Arthur Levine are examples of critics.

U. S. Department of Education—In September 2011, the Secretary of Education released a report²¹ on teacher education that gives recruitment and selection prominent roles. It states that “. . . **strong programs recruit, select,** and prepare teachers who have or learn the skills and knowledge they need to be hired into teaching positions. . . .” It then draws a contrast with “weak programs” that:

“. . . set minimal standards for entry and graduation. They produce inadequately trained teachers whose students do not make sufficient academic progress. . . . As a whole, America is **not following the lead of high-performing countries and recruiting the nation’s best and brightest into teaching.** Instead, only 23% of all teachers, and only 14% of teachers in high-poverty schools, come from the top third of college graduates.”

The Secretary’s foreword elaborates on this theme and identifies states as the critical point of action:

“. . . some of our existing teacher preparation programs are not up to the job. . . too many are not attracting top students, and too many states are not setting a high bar for entry into the profession.”

²⁰ Hannaway and Goldhaber, pp. 101-104

²¹ *Our Future, Our Teachers: The Obama Administration’s Plan for Teacher Education Reform and Improvement*, U. S. Department of Education, September 2011

The Department’s comprehensive agenda is said to “recruit, prepare, place, support, develop, and advance teachers to promote effective teaching at every stage of the career pipeline.”

The Department would require that States set rigorous standards for identifying top-tier and low-performing teacher programs, including but not limited to outcome data, such as student learning growth, job placement and retention, and customer satisfaction survey results.

Congress—The Department proposals are intended to influence Congressional action on the long-awaited reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In September of 2011, Senator Alexander introduced a series of bills in the Senate intended to remedy some of the effects of the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act that have been most problematic. Two of these measures, S. 1569 and S. 1571, bear on teacher selection, but for teacher employment rather than for preparation. The bills would eliminate the requirement that all teachers be “highly qualified,” substituting a mandate that teachers meet applicable state certification and licensure requirements. They would authorize grants for teacher training and recruitment—**recruitment by the hiring districts**. There is no mention in these bills of initial preparation, but instead grant activities are to assure that teachers “have the necessary subject matter knowledge and teaching skills in the academic subjects” they will teach, support for evaluation systems “based in significant part on evidence of student achievement,” actions to establish, expand or improve “alternative routes” for certification, and developing and implementing mechanisms “to assist local education agencies and schools in effectively recruiting and retaining teachers . . . who are effective in improving student academic achievement.”

Nonprofit organizations—Turning to “think tank” proposals, **Education Sector**²² structured its recommendations around Federal grant activities and an accountability system. Every state would be required to collect and report data for individual preparation programs on learning outcomes for each teacher’s students, employment and retention rates, placements in high-need fields, in addition to entry requirements for the preparation program. State applications for Federal grants would be required to address “how states are using or planning to use outcomes data to reward high-performing programs or consortia of programs” and improve low-performing ones. Also, states would describe how they will “**substantially increase the selectivity**, curricular quality, and connection to the classroom among teacher preparation programs.” Low-performing institutions receiving grants must “**immediately raise entrance requirements**,” as well as change curriculum and clinical experiences, demonstrate improvements on employment, retention and employer satisfactions rates, and demonstrate that teacher improve in principal evaluations and in learning outcomes of their students.

The **National Center on Teaching Quality** (NCTQ) has proposed that the current over-supply of teachers and budget-induced teacher layoffs be seized as an opportunity for a change in state policy²³. “State regulations and institutional policies should work in tandem to **narrow the teacher candidate pipeline** well before student teaching begins, primarily at the **point of admission** into a preparation program.” NCTQ would insist that only applications in the **top half of the college-going population** be admitted into a teacher preparation programs. Admission should be “conditioned on content mastery,” which would be judged by their success on state licensure exams “as a condition for program admission, not program exit,” and states should lift their passing scores at least to the 50th percentile of test taker performance on those exams. The proposals would also “condition admission on success in a **lesson audition or performance assessment**” and “ideally go beyond these auditions to include ones that **assess problem-solving skills, interpersonal skills** that help to establish relationships, and the capacity to **persevere** in the pursuit of improved student outcomes.”

²² *A measured Approach to Improving Teacher Preparation*, Chad Aldeman, Kevin Cary, Erin Dillon, Ben Miller, and Elena Silva, Education Sector 2011

²³ *Student Teaching in the United States*, Julie Greenberg, Laura Pomerance and Kate Walsh, National Center for Teaching Quality, 2011

Two brief additional “non-profit” examples: The 2004 **Teaching Commission** report²⁴ called on college and university presidents to “revamp the teacher education programs and make teacher quality a top priority.” Among other things, the Commission urged presidents to “ensure that admission and performance standards in teacher education are commensurate with those of other university departments,” and that included “**recruiting stronger students** from all major fields of study.” And a recent report from the **National Association of State Boards of Education**²⁵ insists that new teachers “must pass a **rigorous and comprehensive assessment** to complete the teacher preparation program.” Local districts would use the results in their recruitment and placement of teachers in schools. While an end-of-program exam is not the same as selective admissions criteria, it could have a similar effect on lifting the quality of the workforce pool.

An independent critic—There is a strongly held belief among those engaged in current education reform efforts that teaching fails to attract the most able students, as it had in some past decades. The argument is that this failure is due to salary structures and working conditions, as well as to employment opportunities for women in a much wider array of professional positions, and it must be corrected. The reformers’ solution is to recruit and admit “the best” and select out those who are less likely to be good teachers. Reformers would take other steps to make a teaching career more enticing—e.g., portable pensions, earlier vesting, more collegial workplace, more differentiated roles, etc. Some of them also think it is unrealistic to conceive school staffs as comprised primarily of individuals who remain as teachers over a four decade career. Especially among the younger workforce in their 20s and 30s, frequent changes in employment venues is a strong characteristic.

An example of these perspectives is found in Arthur Levine’s 2006 report, *Educating School Teachers*²⁶. Drawing from a study by Drew Gitomer²⁷, Mr. Levine clarifies that currently completing teachers are *not* at the bottom of the academic ladder, but still concludes, like many others, that standards for admission are too low. The widely held belief that teacher education students are among the weakest in the university is false. Future secondary school teachers are “on a par with their peers” across college graduates, although those preparing for elementary teaching positions “score significantly lower.”

Levine describes steps that states could take to “improve both the quality and the quantity of the teacher force” by increasing salaries, paying higher amounts for teaching in low-performing schools, and introducing salary scales tied to teacher “qualifications and performance” that rewards “the best teachers and encourage(s) them to remain in their classrooms.”²⁸ But he is sharply critical of university financing of education programs and its interaction with selective admissions:

There was a tendency to consider affirmative action and a commitment to providing access to college as justification for failing to establish minimum admission standards. Too often a commitment to access was simply a cover for increasing enrollments and using education schools as cash cows, even while speaking of the need for quality in education.²⁹

Levine’s prescription is equally sharp:

The standards for admitting students to the nation’s teacher education programs are too low. Admission standards for future elementary school teachers are lower than those for their classmates in secondary education and the rest of the university. These shortcomings result in part from the

²⁴ *Teaching at Risk: A Call to Action*, The Teaching Commission, Louis V. Gerstner, Jr., Chair, 2004, pp. 35, 36.

²⁵ *Gearing Up: Creating a systemic Approach to Teacher Effectiveness*, National Association of State Boards of Education, Summary and Recommendations, 2011, p. 5

²⁶ *Educating School Teachers*, Arthur Levine, The Education Schools Project, 2006, pp. 55, 56

²⁷ *Teacher Quality in a changing Policy Landscape: Improvements in the Teacher Pool*, Drew H. Gitomer, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ, 2007

²⁸ Levine, op cit., p. 104

²⁹ Levine, op. cit., p. 58

unattractiveness of teaching as a career for many of our most able students. They are also a product of the traditional lack of respect universities have for their education schools and the historic confusion teacher education has about its mission, place in the university, and relationship with the P-12 schools.³⁰

There are varying ways that policymakers and critics write about recruitment and selection. Most address selection as an attribute of admission to teacher preparation. Some address it from the perspective of the hiring school district and its needs. While not exemplified by the sources selected for this section, some reformers support selectivity by their call for alternative pathways into teaching that are themselves selective. Others acknowledge that maybe the current teacher workforce has more academic ability than we have thought, but even so, “the standards for admitting students to the nation’s teacher education programs are too low.” In summary, policymakers and critics perceive selection of able individuals into teaching as an essential lever for improved student learning.

Admissions criteria in actual practice

A necessary part of any consideration of recruitment and selective admissions in CAEP standards is what any actual criteria might be. Is it just GPA or rank in class? The answer is that there is substantial experience with use of criteria for teacher preparation and this section of the paper provides some examples. These are taken from a small number of cases that include a few well known college and university preparation programs (e.g., Michigan State, Alverno, Bank Street, and Eastern Michigan), as well as three alternative teaching pathways, Teach for America and residency programs in Boston and New York. While the examples are few, they do provide a perspective from actual practice³¹.

These institutions practices are quite different, one from another. Bank Street, for example, only conducts graduate programs, but all the others include undergraduate preparation in their portfolio. All except Alverno have a GPA requirement (the highest, 3.0 at Bank Street, with MSU at 2.75, and EMU at 2.5 for courses taken at the University but 3.0 for courses transferred). With its focus on admission of undergraduates, Alverno includes ACT/SAT results (no score specified), and distribution of 17 high school academic credits (4 in English, 3 in history/social studies, 3 in math, 3 in science, and 2 preferred in a foreign language). For individuals not having formal high school credentials, Alverno offers an alternative admission through the “Communication Placement Assessment” with components for listening, reading, computer literacy, writing, and quantitative skills. MSU and Eastern both require passing of the state basic skills tests in reading, writing, and math, and both require convictions disclosure.

These might be considered traditional measures, but there is a variety of experience with additional filters for entry into teacher preparation. Bank Street describes qualities it seeks in applicants, beginning with their belief “that professionals in education require intelligent, reflective, flexible and creative individuals with strong ethical standards.” While the web site is not explicit about how the following attributes are judged, the admission expectations are stated as follows:

- We seek applicants who demonstrate sensitivity to others, flexibility, self-awareness, and a willingness and capacity to engage in self-reflection.
- We seek applicants who demonstrate clear evidence of positive interpersonal skills and relationships with both children and adults.
- We seek applicants who demonstrate evidence of healthy motivation and commitment to learning and to children.

Michigan State requires a “timed, proctored essay” to be written at a campus site, but does not say anything about the subject of that task, the length of the exercise, or judging criteria. Eastern requires a statement

³⁰ Levine, op. cit., p. 60

³¹ The resources for material in this section are from the individual web sites for the cited institutions.

about the applicant's experiences with youth/children and explaining why the applicant wants to become a teacher. This statement will be read for content, grammar and punctuation.

So, altogether, there is an emphasis on communication skills, an "adequate," but not spectacular academic record, and on distributional and concentration courses. The Michigan State essay may or may not address anything like the Bank Street criteria that give weight to interpersonal skills and flexibility and self-reflection, but also to "healthy motivation and commitment to learning."

The alternative programs reviewed in this paper, Teach for America, the Boston Teacher Residency, and the New York Urban Teacher Residency, are all at the post baccalaureate level and all require citizenship. TFA has a GPA requirement of 2.5 (but it recruits from elite schools), and UTR's requirement is a GPA of 3.0. The Boston Teacher Residents requirements are rather sketchily stated on the web, but they do include passing scores on Massachusetts exams for communication and literacy, and a TOFEL test (Test of English as a Foreign Language) for speakers of other languages.

The additional requirements are, perhaps for this paper, the most interesting aspects of these programs. TFA is looking for "leadership" qualities, and states there are multiple ways to demonstrate such qualities:

- Demonstrated past leadership and achievement: achieving ambitious, measurable results in academic, professional, extracurricular, or volunteer settings
- Perseverance in the face of challenges
- Strong critical thinking skills: making accurate linkages between cause and effect and generating relevant solutions to problems
- Superior organizational ability: planning well and managing responsibilities effectively
- Respect for individuals' diverse experiences and effectively working with people from a variety of backgrounds
- Superior interpersonal skills to motivate and lead others
- Thorough understanding of and desire to work relentlessly in pursuit of our vision

In addition, TFA seeks "evidence that applicants operate with professionalism and integrity, and meet basic writing standards." Professionalism is further defined as arriving at an interview early and prepared, and dressing professionally (button-down shirt, tie, slacks; skirt of reasonable length or dress; casual attire not professional; err on the conservative side) and speaking professionally. TFA evaluates writing across rubrics describing "not acceptable" (does not answer the question, no clear thesis or point, unconnected ideas, etc.) and "exemplary" (answers questions, makes a profound point, stays on topic, logical and insightful, varies sentence structure, etc.).

UTR lists the following admissions qualifications:

- strong oral and written communication skills
- leadership ability
- belief that it is a teacher's responsibility to address the learning needs of all students and that all students can learn
- commitment to educational equity
- high level of personal responsibility and maturity
- demonstrated ability to:
 - work collaboratively
 - reflect critically on his or her own work
 - respond constructively to feedback
 - respond persistently to challenges
 - succeed in a complex environment and in multiple roles'
 - work effectively in a diverse community.

The selection criteria illustrated by this group of college and university preparation programs and three alternative pathways seem diverse, yet they do concentrate on a few key expectations. One, of course, is **academic ability** as exemplified by grades or tests. A demonstration of **communications skills** is another, demonstrated through interviews, and writing. **Flexibility, personal responsibility, and persistence** are commonly sought traits in these preparation program criteria, and, especially for the post-baccalaureate programs, evidence of **leadership and achievement**—attaining ambitious goals. And **commitment to collaboration and important goals** round out the categories. These are consistent with the conclusions from international research, perhaps with a little adjustment for a strong American taste for “grit” (as TFA calls it) and entrepreneurship.

CAVEATS ABOUT RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

Searching through the resources consulted in preparation of this paper, one striking finding is the frequency with which the authors place boundaries on the interpretations of their conclusions. The message seems to be that selectivity into preparation is essential, but it is not sufficient, by itself, to bring about the increases in student learning, the closing of achievement gaps, or the experiences with problem solving and critical thinking that education reformers seek. This section of the paper describes four areas of caution against over-interpreting the strength of the arguments that have been advanced in favor of recruitment efforts and selection criteria for admissions. These are the interdependence of actions to raise the quality of the teacher workforce, the quality of research evidence, potential consequences of selection criteria for diversity of the new teacher workforce, and changing aspirations for lifetime careers. These four caveats are addressed in the following sections.

Interdependence of teacher workforce reforms

By its focus on recruitment, selection, and admissions, this paper oversimplifies many complexities about what makes for good teaching and what policies will actually bring about better student learning. It is not just who enters into preparation, and how they are prepared, that matters, but a wide context that would include, e.g., induction, the classroom environment, school leadership, the pay structure, the evaluation arrangements, the opportunities to work with colleagues to strengthen their practice, continuing professional development, pension portability, differentiated teaching responsibilities, and more. The need for aligning selectivity with other policy actions is especially exemplified in the international perspectives that were reported, above, in this paper.

The authors of the international studies all note that teacher applications and selection criteria cannot be successful by themselves in raising student achievement. McKinsey insists on competitive compensation (described as initial salaries of \$65,000 and a maximum of \$150,000), performance bonuses of 20%, and opportunities for advancement and growth in a professional working environment. Tucker adds expectations that instruction must be changed so it fosters real engagement of students with content, and the roles of principals, equitable school finance, and sensible responsibilities for states balanced with local boards are all contributors to “system coherence.” He asserts that none of the leading performance countries “has gotten there by implementing any of the major agenda items that dominate the education reform agenda in the United States”—such as charter schools, vouchers, education entrepreneurs, and extensive use of standardized tests and value added teacher evaluation.

OECD and the Asia Society/CCSSO reports also emphasize that teacher selection is only part of a thorough-going set of changes. OECD suggests that the U. S. adopt explicit “profiles” of what teachers are to know and be able to do in specific subject areas, and that preparation move to school settings “with an appropriate balance between theory and practice.” There should also be more flexible structures for initial preparation, “new routes into teaching without compromising the rigor of traditional routes.” The Asia Society/ CCSSO

would engage teachers in the design of curriculum, instruction and assessment, and routinely scan the world for ideas and best practices.

Hannaway and Goldhaber call for more differentiated roles in teaching, and more effective use of technology as ways to pull the profession into a structure that may be more appealing for today's graduates³². Defined-contribution pension plans, portable across professions or even states is another change in structure they recommend. Reformers should be cautious about creating performance incentives for teachers, however., because of concerns "about using value-added measures in a simple, mechanical way to evaluate teacher effectiveness." They conclude:

"... we cannot begin to know what works without trying various alternatives. For this reason, we argue for tolerating and even fostering disruption in the predominant systems of human capital management that govern the teaching profession. We advance this idea believing the authors in this volume have made a good case that the teaching profession appears in many ways to be stuck in the past, ruled by policies and practices that largely ignore significant changes in the broader labor market."³³

Characteristics of the underlying research

Anyone who looks into the research about preparation and its relationship with student outcomes is struck with the often frustratingly weak conclusions that can be drawn to inform policymakers or administrators. The Education Commission of the States³⁴ examined eight questions of policy interest and for many of them concluded that research was insufficient to serve as a basis for policy action recommendations. The example that appears under the research subheading in this paper, raising entrance requirements or conducting more selective screening prior to admissions, determined that the research was "**inconclusive.**" It found two studies that seemed to support higher selection criteria and another that questioned whether raising the criteria would decrease the proportion of minority teacher candidates.

The most recent, and authoritative, attempt to synthesize what research about preparation had to say was the 2010 National Research Council report referenced above. One of the study's charges was to define "to what extent is the required coursework and experiences in reading, mathematics, and science across teacher preparation programs consistent with converging scientific evidence." The panel report described the available data relevant to their charge as "patchy." They went on to observe that "there are no well-formed theories that link teacher preparation to student outcomes," and explained why the complex nature of schooling makes it difficult to identify the role of teacher preparation empirically from the many intertwined influences on student outcomes. The NRC report concludes that while "there has been a great deal of research on teacher education . . . **few issues are considered settled.**" Moreover, the report's authors "found that the existing studies have generally been **insensitive to the details of teacher preparation** that are most likely to result in differences in quality." The conclusion from their extensive examination of research is both practical and of direct relevance to this paper³⁵.

In our judgment, the simplest and most effective way to produce a clearer picture would be to focus research on the **aspects of preparation that have the highest potential for effects on outcomes for students.** Existing research provides some guidance on three aspects of teacher preparation that are likely to have the strongest effects: content knowledge, field experience, and the quality of teacher candidates.

Expanding on the "quality of teacher candidates" topic, the NRC notes the potential for interaction between attributes of candidates and the field and/or grades for which they are preparing to teach³⁶:

³² Urban Institute, op. cit., pp. 301-311

³³ Hannaway and Goldhaber, op. cit., p. 310

³⁴ ECS, op. cit., p. 5

³⁵ NRC, op. cit., p. 180

³⁶ NRC, op. ct., pp. 181, 182

The quality of new teachers entering the field depends not only on the quality of the preparation they receive, but also on the **capacity of preparation programs to attract and select academically able people** who have the potential to be effective teachers. . . . there is reason to believe that **some pathways and programs are much more attractive than others** for . . . potential teachers. Less clear are the factors that attract the best candidates, the way program selectivity and preparation interact and the effect of each on student learning, and the extent to which the importance of these factors vary depending on the attributes (such as grade level and ability) of the students whom these teachers ultimately teach. That is, **though some programs are more selective and attractive to academically accomplished candidates, researchers have not clearly established whether those candidates make the best teachers.**

Concerns about effects on diversity of the teacher workforce

In its plan for teacher preparation, the U. S. Department of Education notes, “research indicates that disadvantaged students benefit academically and socially from having teachers with whom they can identify,” a finding that also appeared in the NRC April 2010 report on teacher preparation. The Department publication goes on: “But such teachers are underrepresented in the workforce: 14 percent of teachers identify as African-American or Hispanic, compared to 38 percent of students. Only 2 percent of teachers are African-American men and only 2 percent are Latino men.”

There is a continuing concern as proposals are advanced for more selectivity—in preparation admissions or in licensure test scores, for example—that a more than proportionate effect will fall on minority students whose preparation has too often not equipped them to reach rigorous standards. Among the references cited in this paper, the 2003 Education Commission of the States report found a study that “suggested that raising academic requirements for admission to teacher preparation programs would reduce the pool of teacher candidates, particularly minorities.” The National Academy of Education volume places a learning context around this concern³⁷:

A key building block for the curriculum of any school, from pre-K through graduate school, is the knowledge and set of experiences of those who are members of the learning community. When a diverse group of people gather to teach and learn from one another they become resources for each other. The opportunities for in-depth conversations, teaching examples, inquiry, and other opportunities to learn and grow are enhanced as people with diverse prior experiences come together. It is for this reason that scholars and practitioners have emphasized the recruitment of more faculty of color in teacher education programs as well as the recruitment of individuals who have taught successfully in settings serving diverse learners. Similarly, having a diverse population of teacher candidates contributes to the learning climate for developing a culturally responsive pedagogy.

The National Research Council 2010 report³⁸ on teacher preparation also addresses this topic:

. . . the important question is whether differences in selectivity matter in terms of teacher effectiveness. Some scholars have argued that high standards for academic preparation (e.g., college-entrance test scores, quality of undergraduate institutions, enrollment or achievement in undergraduate courses) are essential characteristics of good teacher preparation programs . . . And some research has shown that there may be value in matching students and teachers by race, suggesting that explicitly recruiting teachers of color may be associated with teacher effectiveness . . .

But alarm about the potential for less diversity in the new teacher pool as a result of selection may have more facets or subtleties than first appear. An ETS study³⁹ described characteristics of prospective teachers,

³⁷ NAE, op. cit., pp. 273, 274

³⁸ NRC, op. cit, pp. 58, 59

³⁹ ETS, Gitomer, op. cit., pp. 11-26

comparing those who took the Praxis licensure exams between 2002 and 2005, with an earlier cohort of 1994 through 1997. The dates were selected to represent periods before and after enactment of the “Highly Qualified Teacher” provisions in the No Child Left Behind Act. ETS found that the demographic characteristics of the Praxis licensure test takers had changed relatively little. However those in the more recent cohort had stronger undergraduate GPAs, were more likely to take Praxis tests well after they had completed college, more frequently had prior teaching experience, and were more likely to pursue teaching through alternative routes. Praxis passing rates had decreased substantially—probably because more demanding testing requirements had been put into place by states. Graduating candidates were stronger in the newer cohort. Significantly, the improvements were consistent for both males and females, across racial/ethnic groups and across licensure areas. The report concludes “that raising the bar for teacher certification has not resulted in a decrease in the proportion of minority candidates,” but the overall result was that the prospective teaching pool “is no more diverse than it was a decade ago,” and diversity remains a challenge.

The Department’s teacher preparation proposals include two features that illustrate strategies toward a more diverse pool of new teachers: one, a focus on institutions that train large proportions of minority students who enter teaching, and two, outreach (recruitment) efforts to minority populations who exhibit attributes sought for an able teacher pool.

- The “Hawkins Centers for Excellence at Minority Serving Institutions,” is a competitive grant program to support reforms at minority serving institutions in partnership with other institutions of higher education. The proposed grants could be used for such purposes as “heightened entry and/or exit standards for teacher candidates,” and “comprehensive interventions to help promising candidates meet heightened standards, particularly passing rigorous entry and licensure exams.”
- The Department’s “National Teacher Recruitment Campaign,” that began in September 2010, provides information and resources for students and prospective teachers. A Department announcement describes an “interactive ‘pathway to teaching’ tool designed to help individuals chart their course to becoming a teacher.” The goals are (1) to increase the number, quality and diversity of people seeking to become teachers—particularly in high-need schools and subject areas in greatest demand (STEM, ELL, and special education); (2) to connect aspiring teachers with information about the pathways to teaching including preparation, certification, training and mentoring; and (3) to celebrate and honor the profession of teaching. A particular focus is to encourage more minority males to pursue careers in the classroom.

Another demonstration of high selectivity combined with aggressive recruitment can be found in the experience of Teach For America. TFA has taken on the mission of creating a pool of teachers who have been selected through rigorous criteria, but that will, on the whole, represent America’s diverse student populations. For its 5200 TFA members in academic year 2011-2012, it reports the following descriptive characteristics:

- 65% Caucasian
- 33% minorities
- 31% received Pell grants
- 22% are the first in their family to attend college
- Recruited from 460 colleges and universities

The dual goal is achievable, but it requires continuing effort, according to the TFA research director.⁴⁰

Changing aspirations for lifetime careers

⁴⁰ Discussion of Jim Cibulka and Emerson Elliott with Heather Harding, TFA research director, September 2, 2011

A theme that is appearing in current literature about teaching careers has borrowed from recent data about career patterns of young professionals entering the workforce. In brief, the message is that while most participants and observers tend to think of preparation for teaching over a life career, the patterns are changing among young professionals who have already had several different employment experiences by their early thirties. For some these data suggest that we need to think about a much larger portion of the teacher workforce as comprised of individuals who enter teaching at different points in their career, teach for a few years, and then move on.

In the Urban Institute *Creating a New Teaching Profession*⁴¹ volume, Corcoran expects that today's skilled graduates will make multiple career transitions during their lifetimes and are less willing to invest in teaching-specific skills that cannot be taken with them. By contrast, he sees alternative routes such as Teach for America and Teaching Fellows have shown promise in attracting talented students and professionals into teaching even though such programs will "never supply more than a minuscule fraction of the whole teaching force, and cannot be relied upon to raise the overall level of quality."

And Frederick Hess, in the same book, adds to his painting of "the field" of teaching an observation that currently the average college graduate has held four jobs by the age of 30. It is unrealistic to assume that teacher programs can be constructed in the expectation that most aspiring teachers will decide on a lifelong teaching career when they are enrolled in college. Also, pension plans punish people who leave after five or ten years, salaries are structured to reward continuous service, state specific credentials limit transfers, and pension plans that are not portable are a further impediment to teaching as a field. The field needs "more differentiating of roles" and "more specialists."⁴²

Whether these are overdrawn warnings about the emerging teacher workforce because they are based on few data, or are prescient forecasts of a new trend may not be possible to say. Surely, however, responsible administrators who actually do the hiring in our public schools will have informed opinions.

SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

In summary, this paper has laid out arguments for members of the CAEP Commission to consider recruitment practices and selective admissions in CAEP standards. The argument has two components:

One: Accreditors have failed to use recruitment practices and selection criteria for admissions as critical levers to assure that newly prepared teachers are more consistently capable of enhancing student learning.

Two: That failure is in conflict with converging perspectives.

The public believes that **high achieving high school students should be recruited into teaching** and that that new teachers should **pass national competency** tests before they are permitted to teach.

Research studies have identified a few characteristics associated with effective teaching—such as general intelligence and verbal ability, mathematical knowledge for math teachers, experience at least for the first years of teaching, selectivity of undergraduate institutions. Degrees, certification and preparation in an accredited preparation program have not been found to correlate with the performance of a teacher's students⁴³. Research on teacher preparation has often been weak, frequently conflicting, and even basic descriptive data are just not available. However, a compelling and directly relevant finding for this paper is

⁴¹ Hannaway and Goldhaber, op cit., p. 46

⁴² Hannaway and Goldhaber, op. cit., pp. 127-132

⁴³ ETS Goe and Stickler, 2008, pp. 3-6

that the National Research Council concludes **“teacher quality” is one of three dimensions of preparation that are likely to have the “highest potential effects on outcomes for students.”**⁴⁴

Experiences from **several nations with high performing students illustrate commitment to policies that admit only the top 1/3 of high school completers**—and, even when that criterion is met, subject applicants must undergo **further sifting** through essays, interviews, and other filters. However, these are national decisions, and they are made as **part of comprehensive policies to build a professional and highly effective teacher workforce** with specific curricular goals and teacher roles as well. Researchers who study employment of teachers as “human resources,” also propose that teachers be drawn from the upper end of the academic ability spectrum, but, as in the international studies, insist that **selectivity be aligned with pay, induction, working conditions, pensions, evaluation, and other aspects of school operations.**

Obama Administration proposals give a strong voice to **selectivity of able students into teacher preparation**, as part of their recommendations for a **diverse and well prepared teacher workforce.** Holding preparation programs **accountable** by returning teacher evaluation results to those providers, **recruitment of able individuals** into teaching, and **raising selection standards in minority serving institutions** are all part of the Department’s agenda. Senator Alexander’s proposed Elementary and Secondary Education amendments would leave definition of “highly qualified teachers” to states, support alternative pathways into teaching, transfer accountability data to preparation programs, and directly support **selection factors at the point of recruitment and hiring by local school districts.** Numerous reform reports, such as those from Education Sector, the NCTQ, and Arthur Levine, insist on more **selective admissions policies for teacher preparation** and most support exchange of data for accountability purposes.

While selection has not served as a critical factor for accreditors, institutions and alternative providers have employed their own selection criteria. Their criteria have included obvious requirements such as **GPA, SAT/ACT scores, high school credits and course distribution, and basic skills tests.** However, they have also employed a **variety of “soft” skill selective factors such as: interviews, essays, leadership qualities, flexibility, self-reflection capacity, positive interpersonal skills, persistence, motivation and commitment, and “grit” (in Teach for America).**

The argument, then, leads to a conclusion that new CAEP standards should make explicit provision for inclusion of recruitment practices and selection criteria for admissions.

The next issue would be the implications of such a step. Two are described here. The first takes the form of suggesting **optional approaches for language** that might appear in the CAEP standards, each with a description of the accompanying evidence. The second is **supporting actions that CAEP should consider taking** to increase the chances that recruitment actions and selection criteria in teacher preparation are integral parts of a system change—a change in which essential elements for an effective teacher workforce and gains in student learning are all in place.

First, constructing options for CAEP standards and implications for evidence

Appropriate language for a CAEP standard should take advantage of the convergence of support for recruitment outreach and selection criteria, but without specifying criteria. Instead, CAEP should stake out its position as the education accreditor that is committed to advance knowledge in the field and to support “continuous improvement.” The following options outline three progressively rigorous approaches to construction of selection criteria and accompanying evidence consistent with these goals. The evidence statements for the second and third options are written to anticipate a CAEP role in gathering, analyzing and

⁴⁴ NRC, op. cit., p. 186

sharing data about the results of recruitment and selection along two strands: (1) the qualities of the pool of candidates being prepared, and (2) the subsequent information about performance of former candidates after they are on the job.

Option #1

STANDARD: Preparation programs recruit candidates and administer selection criteria for admissions to assure a high ability and diverse pool of candidates.

EVIDENCE:

- Providers systematically monitor the progress and effects of recruitment and selection criteria in terms of candidate proficiencies for professional practice and candidate's effects on P-12 student learning, then use the data to inform decisions about needed changes to improve the program's effectiveness.

CRITIQUE: Option #1 states an expectation that providers will administer recruitment and selection policies and an expectation that they will systematically gather data and make use of them for decisions about program improvement. The suggested language does not actually state any explicit criteria for selection and does not define an expectation for the form of recruitment. Note that the conclusion of the standard addresses the result—that is, characteristics of the pool of candidates who have been admitted, not just the criteria or recruitment practices that were employed.

The approach would build on the phrasing of the initial CAEP standards (i.e., “admissions and mentoring policies encourage the recruitment and retention of high quality candidates”), unlike current NCATE and TEAC approaches that give weight primarily to readiness to teach at the completion of preparation. But it would be stronger than the interim standard language because it explicitly includes diversity as a characteristic of the pool of admitted candidates. In addition, it would not be buried as a subsidiary part of a standard on resources.

Option #2

STANDARD: Preparation programs recruit candidates and administer selection criteria for admissions to assure a high ability and diverse pool of candidates, gather data on the effects of these policies, and provide information to CAEP on how they interpret results and use them to improve practice.

EVIDENCE:

- Providers systematically monitor the progress and effects of recruitment and selection criteria in terms of candidate proficiencies for professional practice and candidate's effects on P-12 student learning, then use the data to inform decisions about needed changes to improve the program's effectiveness.
- Accreditation submissions include data on effects of recruitment and selection practices and how the institution uses data findings to improve practice.

CRITIQUE: Differs from option #1 by an explicit requirement to provide information to CAEP about the effects from its recruitment practices and selection criteria and how those data findings were used to improve programs. The accreditation judgment would emphasize use of the data in making improvement decisions, but not insist on particular recruitment or selection practices nor on particular results from those practices. CAEP would provide guidelines about criteria and measures that have been used and examples of changes in recruitment and selection practices.

Option #3

STANDARD: Preparation programs recruit candidates and administer selection criteria for admissions to assure high ability and diverse candidates among the top one-third of the

potential pool. They gather data on the effects of these policies, and provide information to CAEP on how they interpret the findings and use them to improve practice.

EVIDENCE:

- Providers systematically monitor the progress and effects of recruitment and selection criteria in terms of candidate proficiencies for professional practice and candidate's effects on P-12 student learning, then use the data to inform decisions about needed changes to improve the program's effectiveness.
- Accreditation submissions include data on effects of recruitment and selection practices and how the institution uses data findings to improve practice.
- [*Possible feature:* Institutions that already have recruitment and selection practices in place would be exempt from this requirement]

CRITIQUE: Option #3 differs from options #1 and #2 by establishing a floor (consistent with international experience) selection criterion—one means to make the standard more rigorous. However, the standard would not define the “top one-third” but leave it to providers to define in their own way. This accommodates both the fact that “top one-third” necessarily has differing meanings for initial preparation at the undergraduate level vs. at the post BA level and the fact that research so far has not settled on particular criteria for selection. In addition, the term would have different applications for initial teacher preparation compared with leadership positions or other advanced level specialized positions.

It seems likely that use of college admissions test results, GPA, and class rank would be customary measures for undergraduate initial preparation. CAEP could encourage institutions to try additional measures described in this paper—e.g., interviews, essays, evidence of persistence to complete a task, evidence of leadership, etc. As with option #2, the accreditation judgment would emphasize use of the data in making improvement decisions. CAEP could provide guidelines about criteria and measures that have been used and examples of changes in recruitment and selection practices.

The concept of some kind of “exemption” for institutions that have had recruitment outreach and selection criteria in place, and gathered data about them, could be developed and considered by the Commission.

Second, additional roles for CAEP

This paper concludes that recruitment and selection should occupy a prominent place in CAEP standards. And the context for CAEP is that the descriptive data base and research findings both need strengthening. Together, these factors call for an additional CAEP role: CAEP must be prepared to take forceful action regarding the evidence gathered for a recruitment and selection standard. The following three actions are identified:

- CAEP, itself, must **keep informed about research findings** on recruitment and selection in teacher preparation and make it a regular practice to inform preparation providers about such research findings. It should regularly follow such potential sources as the National Academy of Sciences and National Academy of Education studies, AERA reports, and CALDER research.
- CAEP should play an **advocacy role** through partnerships with states and also with its member organizations for **alignment of policies in licensure, pay, evaluation, workplace conditions, collaboration, pensions and other elements of comprehensive teacher policies** and that, together, will make recruitment, selection, and admissions practices have their intended effects.
- CAEP should prepare periodic [annual?] **reports to the public and to institutions/providers** on the data provided by accredited programs. Forming a version of the Carnegie Foundation/ Tony Bryk “networked learning communities,” such a report could be a critical way both to describe and to leverage performance in the field.