All, regardless of race or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing their individual powers of mind and spirit to the utmost. This promise means that all children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature and informed judgment needed to secure gainful employment, and to manage their own lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also the progress of society itself.

— A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform
April 1983

After 20 Years of Educational Reform, Progress, But Plenty of Unfinished Business

The news about American education that morning in April, 1983, was not good, and no doubt a lot of coffee got cold as Americans, their attention riveted on the morning headlines, tried to fathom just how bad things were. According to a report to the U.S. Secretary of Education by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, the poor quality of American education had helped put the nation gravely at risk. Without major educational reform, the Commission warned, America’s future as a global leader in commerce, industry, science and technology could no longer be treated as a given.

The report, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, famously warned that “...[T]he educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people.” The report further cited appallingly high rates of functional illiteracy among adults and 17-year-olds; a decline in College Board SAT and achievement test scores; significant percentages of 17-year-olds lacking “higher order” intellectual skills; complaints from business and military leaders about the high cost of providing remediation to workers and recruits who lacked basic verbal and computational skills; and, significantly, growing evidence that American students performed behind their international counterparts in most measures of academic achievement.
Written by: Anne Grosso de León. De León writes about education. Formerly the director of public affairs at the College Board, she has also held positions directing public relations and development at the SUNY College at New Paltz and at Hostos Community College, CUNY, in the South Bronx.
The Commission outlined a set of urgent recommendations for educational reform that centered around curriculum, standards and expectations, time, leadership and fiscal support, and, that Gordian knot, teaching. How much of the substance of the report was new? The Commission concluded, somewhat poignantly, that “[S]ome of our findings are not new, but old business that now at last must be done.”

Perhaps it was the stirring, at times scalding, rhetoric of *A Nation at Risk* as much as its substance that helped keep education etched in the public’s mind and near the top of the national agenda in the years that followed. The report’s metaphorical call to arms, after all, still has a powerful emotional charge: “If an unfriendly power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today we might well have viewed it as an act of war. . . . We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral disarmament.”

*A Nation at Risk* clearly sounded the alarm for educational reform, and a diverse group of “warriors”—parents, educators, business executives, governors and legislators—stepped forward to join the struggle to fulfill America’s “promise” to its children. Failure to achieve the “twin goals of equity and high-quality schooling” would, the Commission warned, inevitably lead to “a generalized mediocrity in our society or the creation of an undemocratic elitism.” In the spring of 1983, the American zeitgeist was such that neither alternative was acceptable.

**Transforming A Nation at Risk Into A Nation Prepared**

In moving forward to meet the challenges identified in *A Nation at Risk*, Carnegie Corporation of New York sought to engage many of the best and brightest talents in education, public service, business and the foundation world. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, established in January 1985 by the Corporation to explore the link between economic growth and a well-educated citizenry, quickly appointed an Advisory Council comprising prominent leaders in government, business, and education such as John W. Gardner, formerly U.S. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and former president of Carnegie Corporation of New York; Lewis M. Branscomb, chief scientist and vice president of IBM Corporation; four-time governor of North Carolina James B. Hunt, Jr.; Donald Kennedy, president of Stanford University; and Fred Hechinger, president of the New York Times Foundation.
The Advisory Council was swift to recognize, as Linda Darling-Hammond, Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education at Stanford University, has observed, that “teaching is the profession upon which all professions rest,” and in March 1985, the Council recommended the creation of a Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Its members, too, included many of the educational and political leaders of the day: Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers; Mary Hatwood Futrell, president of the National Education Association; governor of New Jersey Thomas H. Kean; and Governor Hunt.

A scant 14 months later, the Task Force issued its report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. The report reflected the creative ferment of the time—and called for sweeping changes in education policy. Concluding that “America’s ability to compete in world markets is eroding,” the Task Force emphasized that America’s “pursuit of excellence” could not be faint-hearted. Such a pursuit—the very foundation of economic growth—they said, would “[depend] on achieving far more demanding educational standards than we have ever attempted to reach before.”

Identifying the teaching profession as America’s “best hope” for achieving those standards, the Task Force called for the redesign and revitalization of the teaching profession. Accordingly, some of the Task Force’s recommendations are still working their way into America’s vastly complex and generally unruly educational “system.” For example, the Task Force recommended that a bachelor’s degree in the arts and sciences be a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching, i.e., that teachers have a broad base of knowledge as well as a specialty knowledge of the subject they teach. Iterations of this recommendation have appeared, and reappeared, in subsequent teacher education reform efforts in the years that followed, yet many children in America’s public schools are today still at risk of being taught math or science by a teacher who has no training in either subject—or who may have no training as a teacher at all.

The Task Force on Teaching as a Profession also recommended that schools of education develop a new professional curriculum that would focus on a systematic knowledge of teaching, one that would include internships and residencies in schools and culminate in a Master in Teaching degree.

Still another recommendation became the primary legacy of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession: the establishment of a national board for professional teaching standards. Such a board would award advanced certification for teachers based on the achievement of “high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do.” Notably, the Task Force looked to the teaching profession itself to set the standards and to certify those teachers who met them. With support from Carnegie Corporation, the recommendation became a reality in 1987 with the establishment of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).
IN THIS ISSUE:

After 20 Years Of Educational Reform, Progress, But Plenty Of Unfinished Business

Breaking New Ground

According to James A. Kelly, the founding president of NBPTS who led the organization for 12 years, the fledgling organization uniquely focused on a profoundly significant challenge: identifying the attributes of excellent teaching. Until then, Kelly explains, “the entire teaching issue [had focused] on entry requirements.” The NBPTS, he says, came to grips with two vital questions: What is it that the truly accomplished teacher should know and be able to do? And how can we develop a performance-based assessment process for determining whether teachers have indeed met those standards?

The process for arriving at answers to those questions was perhaps as revolutionary as the answers themselves. Never before, Kelly notes, had teachers actually formed the majority in a major educational reform organization. Indeed, from the beginning, the 63-member board of directors has always had a majority of teachers on it. Other directors include school administrators, school board leaders, governors and state legislators, higher education officials, business and community leaders, as well as teacher union leaders. Until then, declares Kelly, teachers and teacher union chiefs had never actually “met to talk to each other about teaching.” In the last analysis, he says, the full, broad range of participants had “created a system in which [they] could have trust.”

As of summer 2003, legislative and policy action creating incentives and recognition for National Board Certification has been enacted in 49 states and in approximately 486 school districts. This national, voluntary system has certified 24,000 classroom teachers, each of whom has an average of 14 years of teaching experience. In a nation in which roughly 3.1 million teachers are employed in public schools, the challenge to produce vastly larger numbers of teachers with National Board Certification is formidable. “The main thing that is needed to increase National Board Certification,” comments now-former North Carolina Governor Hunt and current Carnegie Corporation trustee, “[is] that policymakers make available [to teachers] significant and tangible incentives and rewards.” In North Carolina, he points out, “one of the most successful states” in developing a corps of teachers with National Board Certification (5,500 of the state’s approximately 100,000 teachers have achieved it), the state covers the full cost of certification and provides candidates with three days of leave; successful candidates receive a 12 percent increase in salary.
Still, after 20 years of a national effort to improve teaching and teacher quality, a five percent accreditation rate in North Carolina, the one state in the nation that is clearly the most focused on this issue, could lead some to argue that school reform is a failure. Certainly, it underlines the philosophy that emboldens the Corporation’s long-term commitment to teacher reform: that no progress, no program, no one strategy will achieve instant national change. Reform is as much process as progress; reform demands identification of major problems, promising ideas for change and the mobilization of political will to move ideas onto the nation’s “to-do” list.

Current NBPTS President Joseph Aguerrebere expresses the hope that prospective teachers, like prospective doctors, will come to see professional certification as the culmination of their training. Following the medical model, says Aguerrebere, the hope is that “Eventually we will get to the point where all teachers...will immediately move into an induction stage after three years of teaching [and pursue advanced certification].” While only 50 percent of those who apply for advanced certification succeed the first time around, says Aguerrebere, “Even those who don’t succeed say it was the best professional development experience they’ve ever had.” Participating in the certification process, he adds, helps teachers “to be much more reflective in their practice [as teachers].” NBPTS’s emphasis on standards “adds a lot to our knowledge base,” he points out, and “the candidates [who] are putting themselves on the line” by participating in this most “public” process all contribute to and benefit from this enhanced knowledge base. Moreover, the benefits of certification extend beyond the individual teacher earning it. Aguerrebere explains that teachers who have achieved advanced certification frequently mentor other teachers, form local and statewide teacher networks, exert leadership in advocating educational policy changes and create candidate support programs.

Acutely aware that teacher education reform is a long-term enterprise, Carnegie Corporation of New York continues to add its support to initiatives aimed at strengthening and improving the licensure, certification and accreditation of teachers and the schools that train them. Included among this group of Corporation grantees are the following:

- The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), a project of the council of Chief State School Officers. INTASC works to establish stronger state licensure standards by helping member states to learn about and collaborate on the development of educational policies on teaching, new accountability requirements for teacher preparation programs; new teacher assessment techniques; and new professional development programs for teachers.
- The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) focuses on the improvement and strengthening of teacher preparation through the development of a performance-based accreditation system.
- The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) also offers a performance-based approach to accreditation, which requires that institutions of higher education provide research-based
evidence of student learning as a prerequisite to accreditation.
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Developing the Educational-Economic Connection

The efforts of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy to explore the link between education and the economy, and to develop education policies aimed at strengthening the nation’s capacity to compete economically in the global arena, broke new ground by identifying quality teaching as the essential guarantor of student achievement. Important work, however, remained to be done. In 1989, with support from the Corporation, a successor to the Forum was established to attend to this unfinished business. The new organization, the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE), appointed a Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce to lead the charge. In 1990, the Commission issued a report on its findings, America’s Choice: High Skills or Low Wages. Declaring that “America is heading toward an economic cliff,” the Commission offered a set of recommendations that provided a “framework for developing a high-quality American education and training system, closely linked to high-performance work organization.”

NCEE’s efforts in this area have continued over the past decade and most recently have focused on the important role that the leadership of principals plays in school reform. A 2002 report, based on two years of research supported by the Corporation, The Broad Foundation and the New Schools Venture Fund, entitled The Principal Challenge: Leading and Managing Schools in an Era of Accountability, focused on the central issue of school leadership.

Along with these promising ideas for reform, it became clear that only political will and national commitment on the part of public and private sector leaders could transform these ideas and move them from the educational arena to the national agenda.

Teaching as a Critical Business Investment

In 1989, a National Education Summit was convened by President George Bush and the National Governors Association, led by then-Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton and attended by the nation’s governors, business leaders and educators. This group began to work with the federal government to articulate specific national academic goals as a vital first step in ensuring that the nation’s schools prepare students for
jobs in the global marketplace—dramatically setting in motion the national standards-based reform movement. A second summit was held in 1996; in September 1999, governors, business leaders and educators convened in Palisades, New York, to attend the Third National Education Summit, where they reaffirmed earlier commitments to establish rigorous academic standards for all students and expanded their commitment to standards by achieving consensus on the need to improve teaching as the vital element in upgrading public education. Following the summit, the National Alliance of Business, in partnership with other business organizations, and with support from Carnegie Corporation and a consortium of other foundations and corporations, set out to conduct a year-long review of issues related to teacher quality. The report resulting from that review, Investing in Teaching: A Common Agenda, affirmed the commitment of business leaders to improving public education and proposed a comprehensive agenda for improving the quality of teaching.

The agenda included three key recommendations: (1) the creation of a new model of teacher preparation and professional development, one that would require higher admissions standards at the nation’s schools of education, close collaboration with arts and sciences faculties and National Board Certification; (2) the creation of a new model of compensation, including salaries competitive with other professions; and (3) the creation of a “professional environment that respects [teachers’] expertise,” allows teachers “the flexibility and freedom to achieve results,” and provides a system of “portable” credentials and pensions. The Investment in Teaching Databook, a companion piece to the report and a resource of data on issues related to teacher quality, was made available for use by states and local communities to inform and guide their efforts to achieve this ambitious agenda.

A Blueprint for Preparing Excellent Teachers

By the 1990s, a growing consensus among political, business and education leaders that quality teaching was the key to successful educational reform inevitably led to the question: What can we as a nation do to ensure the preparation of excellent teachers? Conversations about teaching between Hugh Price of the Rockefeller Foundation (Price subsequently headed the Urban League) and Linda Darling-Hammond, then with Teachers College, Columbia University, gradually led to the idea of establishing a national commission that would address the “what can we do” question. A meeting of potential funders was attended by Program Officer Karin Egan, representing Carnegie Corporation of New York, which quickly added its support.

In 1994, an extraordinary array of leaders in education, government and business came together to form the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF). The NCTAF’s task was nothing less than to design what essentially amounted to a blueprint for preparing excellent teachers, i.e., teachers who would have the requisite knowledge, skills and commitment to help all students achieve higher academic standards. Among NCTAF members were Governor Hunt, who chaired the commission; James A. Kelly, president of the National...
The NCTAF report, *What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future*, was published in September 1996. In his preface to the report, Governor Hunt captured the Commission members’ commitment to the transformational power of a good teacher: “...good teachers literally save lives,” he wrote. “However they do it—by loving students, helping them imagine the future and insisting that they meet high expectations and standards—the best of them are magic weavers. Many of us can remember such a teacher—one who changed our lives, so gifted that he or she transported us out of our own time and place and circumstances and jump-started the dreams and possibilities that lie within us all.”

*What Matters Most* placed the notion of teacher quality at the center of the nation’s educational agenda. Indeed, according to Daniel Fallon, chair of the Education Division of Carnegie Corporation, during its tenure, NCTAF “has produced seminal reports that have helped maintain momentum in the country for educational reform.” NCTAF’s recommendations called for systemic, sweeping changes in the recruitment, preparation and support of excellent teachers. Moreover, it set for itself “an audacious goal”: to provide—by 2006—every child in America with “access to competent, caring, qualified teachers in schools organized for success.” The Commission identified certain research-based benchmarks for teacher preparation, licensing and hiring that would ensure teachers were prepared to meet high standards. Included among these benchmarks: a deep understanding of the subject taught and how children learn, a knowledge of technology and demonstrated teaching skills necessary to help children achieve high standards, professional growth in pedagogy and content and the ability to instill “a passion for learning in their students.”

NCTAF’s progress toward achieving this “audacious goal” is impressive. Its partnership network has grown to include 20 states and its research-based reports and subsequent work with states and school districts have stimulated many initiatives to improve teaching, dozens of pieces of legislation and thousands of news articles on these activities. Moreover, unlike the U.S. Department of Education’s National Commission on Excellence in Education, which folded its tent after the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, NCTAF has chosen to recreate itself as an independent, nonprofit organization. In January 2003, NCTAF published *No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America’s Children*, which calls for a national effort to improve teacher retention by 2006.

Summing up the educational challenge facing America, NCTAF Chair James Hunt wrote, “Standards for students and teachers are the key to reforming American education. Access to competent teaching must become a new student right. Access to high-quality preparation, induction, and professional development must become a new teacher right.” Indeed, he added, “The reform movement...cannot succeed unless it attends to the improvement of teaching.”
A Call for Leadership

In 1998, a Presidents’ Task Force on Teacher Education, appointed by the American Council on Education in collaboration with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, set out to establish “an action agenda for college and university presidents” aimed at improving the quality of teacher preparation. A year later, a report by the American Council on Education, entitled To Touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers are Taught and prepared with the support of Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Ford Foundation, cited the need for leadership by the presidents of our nation’s higher education institutions as the sine qua non for reforming teacher education.

Observing that as many as 2.5 million additional teachers would be needed to teach the nation’s children within the next decade, the Presidents’ Task Force on Teacher Education noted, “We know from empirical data what our intuition has always told us: Teachers make a difference,” adding, “We now know that teachers make the difference.” Solid research evidence exists to support this assertion. The Task Force pointed to a Tennessee study (Sanders and Rivers, 1996), which demonstrated with data, not intuition, that “two equally performing second graders can be separated by as many as 50 percentile points by the time they reach fifth grade, solely as a result of being taught by different teachers.” If America is to prepare the kind of teachers that can make “the difference,” according to the report, then it cannot be business as usual for presidents of the nation’s colleges and universities. The report’s recommendations challenge the presidents to develop and maintain close coordination between the faculty and courses of schools of education and arts and sciences faculty and courses; periodic and independent evaluations of teacher education programs; and continued research and development in the area of teacher preparation and performance.

After years of landmark studies conducted by distinguished commissions and task forces, it is reasonable to ask the question: Where is American education now with respect to the preparation of America’s teachers? To Touch the Future offered a response: “America stands at a point in its history where the political will to improve education is strong; We know what needs to be done and what directions to take. Our call is for colleges and universities—their faculties, academic leaders, and governing boards—led by their
More than anything, observes Daniel Fallon, the Sanders and Rivers study produced “compelling evidence that teacher quality counts.” This study and others, he says, illustrate that “a radical reorientation of the intellectual environment” has taken place. Indeed, in an environment dominated since the 1960s by the work of James Coleman, followed by that of Christopher Jencks, notes Fallon, the notion that “student achievement relies on genetic endowment and poverty, race and class, and income and families, influenced the thinking [about education] until the 90s.” Implicit in this thinking, says Fallon, was the message that “teaching doesn’t matter.” Such a view also provided an escape hatch for the educational establishment, allowing it to reject responsibility for student failure to achieve. But given the growing consensus about the nature of effective teaching, Fallon says, “The time is right for intervention.”
For Carnegie Corporation of New York, that intervention has taken the form of a multimillion-dollar, five-year reform effort designed to strengthen K-12 teaching through the creation of a new model of teacher education. In July 2001, the Corporation issued an announcement and prospectus for Teachers for a New Era: A National Initiative to Improve the Quality of Teaching. The initiative represents the Corporation’s commitment to translating 20 years of research and public discussion—much of which it has vigorously supported—into substantive teacher education reform.

Directed at institutions of higher education, this initiative to redesign teacher education schools is built on three guiding principles, around which solid consensus has formed since the publication of *A Nation at Risk*.

- First, *Teachers for a New Era* is a reform design guided by research evidence. It is this research that ultimately will or will not demonstrate whether children have experienced learning gains as a result of the work of teachers who are graduates of the program.
- Second, the reform design requires the full engagement of arts and sciences faculty in the education of prospective teachers and the ongoing collaboration between university arts and sciences faculty with school of education faculty.
- Third, the design model requires a view of education as an academically taught clinical practice, one which includes close cooperation between colleges of education and participating schools; master teachers as clinical faculty in colleges of education; and two-year residencies for beginning teachers.

To date, eleven institutions have been chosen by the Corporation to receive challenge grants aimed at helping them to reform and reinvigorate their teacher education programs under the initiative. They are: Bank Street College of Education, New York City; Boston College; California State University, Northridge; Florida A&M University, Tallahassee; Michigan State University; Stanford University; University of Connecticut; University of Virginia; University of Texas at El Paso; University of Washington; and University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Other foundation collaborators, including the Annenberg and Ford
foundations, along with the Rockefeller Foundation, are also providing support.

Much hangs on the success of the higher education institutions selected to be part of this initiative, their graduates—the “teachers for a new era”—and the research produced in the next five years. If these institutions succeed, they will challenge and inspire other institutions to follow and, perhaps most importantly, help to provide policymakers with the “silver bullet” of educational reform. Indeed, says Fallon, “The participating universities will have earned the right to be viewed as the new standard-bearers for educating professional teachers.”
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## Still A Nation at Risk?

Recent reports that some states have begun to relax standards to avoid sanctions by the federal government for failing to meet benchmarks set by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 are deeply troubling. The American public continues to be barraged with media reports that unacceptably large numbers of America’s children are, in fact, being left behind, and are failing to achieve basic reading, writing and math skills in the nation’s public schools. American students still fare poorly in comparison with students in foreign nations. According to a recent 32-nation study of 15-year-olds, the gap in achievement between America’s best and worst readers is wider than for any other country participating in the study, including Mexico, Latvia and Brazil.

Clearly, America is still educationally “at risk,” and the “old business” identified so urgently by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983 remains unfinished. Even so, as Vartan Gregorian, president of Carnegie Corporation of New York, has pointed out, “The reform efforts of the last 20 years cannot and should not be perceived as Sisyphean. As a result of these efforts—and the growing body of research on how children learn and what constitutes good teaching—we are clearly not in the same place we were 20 years ago.”

Governor James Hunt recently offered his view of the contribution of Carnegie Corporation of New York to the nation’s education reform efforts since *A Nation at Risk*: “In the last 20 years,” he said, “the results of [the Corporation’s] work have been to put teacher preparation reform at the center of reform efforts in America by focusing the nation’s attention on improving the quality of teaching.”

Some of these reform efforts—the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, the National Center for Education and the Economy, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future—are ongoing, and have provided the intellectual leavening for other educational reform activities. *Teachers for a New Era*, a major intervention in the reform of teacher preparation, holds the promise of revolutionary change in teacher education. These initiatives have helped keep educational reform high on the nation’s political agenda and a topic of impassioned discussion in Congress and in state legislatures, at school board and PTA meetings, and, perhaps most importantly, around kitchen tables throughout America.
“The U.S. Constitution has not provided Americans with a national voice for education, but a chorus of 50 voices that rarely sing from the same libretto,” observes Gregorian. “Despite this, and arguably because of it,” he adds, “America has created and sustained the most successful experiment in mass public education in human history, and Carnegie Corporation of New York is proud to number among its most impassioned proponents and participants.”

As for the “unfinished business” that still lies ahead, perhaps it would be helpful to regard those unmet challenges as the late John W. Gardner might have: “What we have before us,” he observed, “are breathtaking opportunities disguised as insoluble problems.”