

**HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS
AND RAISING STUDENT
ACHIEVEMENT**

FIELD HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY
COMPETITIVENESS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE WORKFORCE

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

May 27, 2004 in Phoenix, Arizona

Serial No. 108-61

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and the Workforce



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/house>
or
Committee address: <http://edworkforce.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

93-983 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2004

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	George Miller, California
Cass Ballenger, North Carolina	Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
Peter Hoekstra, Michigan	Major R. Owens, New York
Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, California	Donald M. Payne, New Jersey
Michael N. Castle, Delaware	Robert E. Andrews, New Jersey
Sam Johnson, Texas	Lynn C. Woolsey, California
James C. Greenwood, Pennsylvania	Rubén Hinojosa, Texas
Charlie Norwood, Georgia	Carolyn McCarthy, New York
Fred Upton, Michigan	John F. Tierney, Massachusetts
Vernon J. Ehlers, Michigan	Ron Kind, Wisconsin
Jim DeMint, South Carolina	Dennis J. Kucinich, Ohio
Johnny Isakson, Georgia	David Wu, Oregon
Judy Biggert, Illinois	Rush D. Holt, New Jersey
Todd Russell Platts, Pennsylvania	Susan A. Davis, California
Patrick J. Tiberi, Ohio	Betty McCollum, Minnesota
Ric Keller, Florida	Danny K. Davis, Illinois
Tom Osborne, Nebraska	Ed Case, Hawaii
Joe Wilson, South Carolina	Raúl M. Grijalva, Arizona
Tom Cole, Oklahoma	Denise L. Majette, Georgia
Jon C. Porter, Nevada	Chris Van Hollen, Maryland
John Kline, Minnesota	Tim Ryan, Ohio
John R. Carter, Texas	Timothy H. Bishop, New York
Marilyn N. Musgrave, Colorado	
Marsha Blackburn, Tennessee	
Phil Gingrey, Georgia	
Max Burns, Georgia	

Paula Nowakowski, *Staff Director*
John Lawrence, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California, *Chairman*

Johnny Isakson, Georgia, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
John A. Boehner, Ohio	John F. Tierney, Massachusetts
Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin	Ron Kind, Wisconsin
Michael N. Castle, Delaware	David Wu, Oregon
Sam Johnson, Texas	Rush D. Holt, New Jersey
Fred Upton, Michigan	Betty McCollum, Minnesota
Vernon J. Ehlers, Michigan	Carolyn McCarthy, New York
Patrick J. Tiberi, Ohio	Chris Van Hollen, Maryland
Ric Keller, Florida	Tim Ryan, Ohio
Tom Osborne, Nebraska	Major R. Owens, New York
Tom Cole, Oklahoma	Donald M. Payne, New Jersey
Jon C. Porter, Nevada	Robert E. Andrews, New Jersey
John R. Carter, Texas	Rubén Hinojosa, Texas
Phil Gingrey, Georgia	George Miller, California, <i>ex officio</i>
Max Burns, Georgia	

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on May 27, 2004	1
Statement of Members:	
McKeon, Hon. Howard P. "Buck", Chairman, Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, Committee on Education and the Workforce	1
Prepared statement of	4
Porter, Hon. Jon C., a Representative in Congress from the State of Nevada	5
Prepared statement of	8
Statement of Witnesses:	
Butterfield, Dr. Karen, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Innovative and Exemplary Programs, Arizona Department of Education	14
Prepared statement of	18
Additional statement submitted for the record	53
Noone, Dr. Laura Palmer, President, University of Phoenix	23
Prepared statement of	25
Simon, Raymond, Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education	9
Prepared statement of	11
Solmon, Dr. Lewis C., Executive Vice President, Director, Teacher Advancement Programs, Milken Family Foundation	31
Prepared statement of	35

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS AND RAISING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Thursday, May 27, 2004

U.S. House of Representatives

Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Phoenix, Arizona

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11 a.m., at the University of Phoenix, 4615 East Elwood Street, Phoenix, Arizona, Hon. Howard P. McKeon [Chairman of the Subcommittee] Presiding.

Members Present: Representatives McKeon and Porter.

Staff Present: Mr. Rich Stombres, Professional Staff Member.

Chairman McKEON. The quorum being present, the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness of the Committee on Education and the Workforce will come to order.

We're meeting today to hear testimony on highly qualified teachers and raising student achievement.

I'd like to thank the University of Phoenix for hosting this hearing today. I'm eager to hear from our witnesses.

But before we begin, I ask for unanimous consent for the hearing record to remain open 14 days to allow members' statements and other extraneous material referenced during the hearing to be submitted in the official hearing record.

No objections, so ordered.

STATEMENT OF HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON 21st CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

Good morning. I'd like to welcome each of you to this beautiful sunny area, the field hearing on the Subcommittee as we continue to focus on teacher quality.

This will be the fourth hearing since the opening of the 107th Congress that we have met to learn about teacher preparation, credentials, and ways to ensure our students are learning from capable and competent teachers.

The purpose of today's hearing is to discuss the importance of highly qualified teachers in improving academic achievement for all students regardless of race, income, geography, English-fluency, or disability.

The success of education reform efforts is increasingly seen as directly dependent on the quality of classroom instruction, and ensuring the quality of America's 3.2 million teachers is an essential part of providing an excellent education to all of our children.

A growing number of studies provides conclusive evidence that teacher quality is the primary school-related factor affecting student achievement.

Students who are taught by effective and competent teachers excel quickly, while those who are assigned to the least effective teachers lag behind and often never catch up.

Especially troubling is the evidence that disadvantaged students whose futures depend most on the positive school experience are often assigned the least qualified teachers.

For example, a report from the Education Trust, a nonprofit organization whose mission it is to make schools and colleges work for all of the young people they serve, found that in every subject area, students in high-poverty schools were more likely than other students to be taught by teachers without even a minor in the subjects they teach.

The bipartisan No Child Left Behind law asks each state, in exchange for billions of dollars in Federal teacher quality aid, to develop and implement a plan to place a highly qualified teacher in every public classroom by the close of the 2005–2006 school year.

States have been given vast flexibility in defining what constitutes a highly qualified teacher.

At a minimum, teachers must have full state certification, a Bachelor's degree, and demonstrate competency in core achievement subjects they teach.

Individual states, not the Federal Government, design and implement measures to assess subject matter competency, which may include rigorous state academic tests, a Bachelor's degree in a core academic subject, or the high, objective, uniform state standard of evaluation, or HOUSSE procedure for veteran teachers.

Since No Child Left Behind was enacted more than 2 years ago, Congress and President Bush have continued to provide record teacher quality aid to states and local school districts at levels far higher than provided under the previous administration.

Federal teacher quality aid has been increased by more than 35 percent under President Bush, who requested nearly three billion dollars in annual teacher quality funding for states and teachers in his 2005 budget request to Congress, compared with just 787 million dollars provided under President Clinton's final budget.

In addition, President Bush and Congress have taken numerous steps since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act to help teachers, local educational agencies and states meet the law's highly qualified teacher provisions.

To provide incentives for good teachers to remain in the teaching profession, President Bush and congressional Republicans in 2002 enacted legislation allowing teachers to take a \$250 tax deduction when they pay money out of their own pockets for classroom expenses, such as crayons and books, paper, pencils. We're currently working to expand the so-called Crayola credit to \$400 or more.

During the 108th Congress, the House passed legislation to more than triple the amount of Federal student loan forgiveness avail-

able to highly qualified reading specialists and math, science, and special education teachers who commit to teaching in high-need schools for 5 years.

The Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act would increase maximum Federal loan forgiveness for such teachers from \$5,000 to \$17,500.

In 2003, the House also passed legislation to strengthen teacher training programs at America's colleges.

The Ready to Teach Act would reauthorize and strengthen teacher training programs under the Higher Education Act to ensure tomorrow's highly qualified teachers are prepared to meet the needs of the nation's students.

It's important to note that Members of the Committee reintroduced these bills last week as part of a competitiveness package aimed at helping teachers receive quality training they need to improve student achievement.

Recognizing that outdated Federal rules are pushing some good teachers out of the classroom, the House also passed legislation to be revamp the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and reduce paperwork burdens for Special Education teachers who are striving to meet the No Child Left Behind's high standards.

This bill includes a proposal to reduce paperwork for Special Ed teachers by allowing parents of children with special needs to select a 3-year individualized education program, or IEP, for their children instead of an annual one.

Earlier this year the Department of Education provided states with new guidance on the highly qualified teacher requirements, giving additional flexibility to teachers in rural school districts, streamlining procedures for veteran teachers to demonstrate subject matter competency, and clarifying state authority over requirements for science teachers.

Also, the Department of Education has implemented a new outreach initiative to recognize teachers' outstanding achievements.

The four-part initiative includes teacher roundtables, teacher-to-teacher workshops, a research-to-practice summit, and updates on timely topics affecting teachers.

Today we're in Arizona to learn about state efforts to maintain and improve teacher quality.

Last November the U.S. Department of Education's Teacher Assistance Corps visited Arizona to assist the state Department of Education in implementing No Child Left Behind's highly qualified teacher requirements.

The U.S. Department of Education found several positive aspects in Arizona's efforts with regard to teacher quality and noted that Arizona is planning to use their HOUSSSE standards to drive content-specific professional development in making teachers highly qualified and asks school districts to require that professional development be directly linked to student achievement.

I'd like to thank everyone for attending here today, and I'd especially like to thank our distinguished panel of witnesses for their participation. I look forward to your testimony.

And I'd now like to recognize my colleague on the Education Workforce Committee, Mr. Porter, your neighbor to north—I'm

your neighbor to the west—and ask Mr. Porter for any opening statement that he wishes to make at this time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McKeon follows:]

Statement of Hon. Howard “Buck” McKeon, Chairman, Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, Committee on Education and the Workforce

Good morning. I'd like to welcome each of you to our field hearing this morning as the Subcommittee continues its focus on teacher quality. This will be the fourth hearing since the opening of the 107th Congress that we have met to learn about teacher preparation, credentials, and ways to ensure our students are learning from capable and competent teachers.

The purpose of today's hearing is to discuss the importance of highly qualified teachers in improving academic achievement for all students—regardless of race, income, geography, English-fluency, or disability.

The success of education reform efforts is increasingly seen as directly dependent on the quality of classroom instruction, and ensuring the quality of America's 3.2 million teachers is an essential part of providing an excellent education to all our children. A growing number of studies provide conclusive evidence that teacher quality is the primary school-related factor affecting student achievement. Students who are taught by effective and competent teachers excel quickly, while those who are assigned to the least effective teachers lag behind and often never catch up.

Especially troubling is the evidence that disadvantaged students, whose futures depend most on a positive school experience, are often assigned the least qualified teachers. For example, a report from the Education Trust—a nonprofit organization whose mission is to make schools and colleges work for all of the young people they serve—found that in every subject area, students in high-poverty schools were more likely than other students to be taught by teachers without even a minor in the subjects they teach.

The bipartisan No Child Left Behind law asks each state—in exchange for billions of dollars in federal teacher quality aid—to develop and implement a plan to place a highly qualified teacher in every public classroom by the close of the 2005–2006 school year. States have been given vast flexibility in defining what constitutes a highly qualified teacher. At a minimum, teachers must have full state certification, a Bachelor's degree, and demonstrate competency in core academic subjects they teach. Individual states—not the federal government—design and implement measures to assess subject matter competency, which may include rigorous state academic tests; a Bachelor's degree in a core academic subject; or the high, objective, uniform state standard of evaluation—or HOUSSSE procedure—for veteran teachers.

Since No Child Left Behind was enacted more than two years ago, Congress and President Bush have continued to provide record teacher quality aid to states and local school districts, at levels far higher than provided under the previous Administration. Federal teacher quality aid has been increased by more than 35 percent under President Bush, who requested nearly three billion dollars in annual teacher quality funding for states and teachers in his 2005 budget request to Congress—compared with just \$787 million provided under President Clinton's final budget.

In addition, President Bush and Congress have taken numerous steps since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act to help teachers, local educational agencies, and states meet the law's highly qualified teacher provisions.

To provide incentives for good teachers to remain in the teaching profession, President Bush and congressional Republicans in 2002 enacted legislation allowing teachers to take a \$250 tax deduction when they pay money out of their own pockets for classroom expenses, such as crayons and books. We are currently working to expand this so-called “Crayola Credit” to \$400 or more.

During the 108th Congress, the House passed legislation to more than triple the amount of federal student loan forgiveness available to highly qualified reading specialists and math, science, and special education teachers who commit to teaching in high-need schools for five years. The Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act would increase maximum federal loan forgiveness for such teachers from \$5,000 to \$17,500.

In 2003, the House also passed legislation to strengthen teacher-training programs at America's colleges. The Ready to Teach Act would reauthorize and strengthen teacher-training programs under the Higher Education Act to ensure tomorrow's highly qualified teachers are prepared to meet the needs of the nation's students.

It is important to note that members of the Committee re-introduced these bills last week as part of a competitiveness package aimed at helping teachers receive quality training they need to improve student achievement.

Recognizing that outdated federal rules are pushing some good teachers out of the classroom, the House also passed legislation to revamp the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and reduce paperwork burdens for special education teachers, who are striving to meet No Child Left Behind's high standards. This bill includes a proposal to reduce paperwork for special education teachers by allowing parents of children with special needs to select a three-year Individualized Education Program—or IEP—for their children instead of an annual one.

Earlier this year, the Department of Education provided states with new guidance on the highly qualified teacher requirements giving additional flexibility to teachers in rural school districts; streamlining procedures for veteran teachers to demonstrate subject matter competency; and clarifying state authority over requirements for science teachers. Also, the Department of Education has implemented a new outreach initiative to recognize teachers' outstanding achievements. The four-part initiative includes teacher roundtables, teacher-to-teacher workshops, a research-to-practice summit, and updates on timely topics affecting teachers.

Today we are in Arizona to learn about state efforts to maintain and improve teacher quality. Last November, the U.S. Department of Education's Teacher Assistance Corps visited Arizona to assist the State Department of Education in implementing No Child Left Behind's highly qualified teacher requirements. The U.S. Department of Education found several positive aspects in Arizona's efforts with regard to teacher quality and noted that Arizona is planning to use their HOUSSE standards to drive content specific professional development in making teachers highly qualified and asks school districts to require that professional development be directly linked to student achievement.

We have a distinguished panel of witnesses for today's hearing. I would like to thank each of you for your appearance before the Subcommittee and I look forward to your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JON C. PORTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA**

Mr. PORTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is John Porter, and I'm a Member of Congress from southern Nevada, the Las Vegas area. As they say, what happens in Las Vegas stays in Las Vegas.

But my background is such that I'm fortunate to be married to an educator for over 18 years who has since retired. And she was an elementary school librarian in a very transient, transitional part of southern Nevada.

So I have the insights of a professional in my wife, but also I have spent a lot of time in the schools trying to learn just as much as I can to try to make a difference, and having been a state legislator before.

But I guess I state that for the record so you'll know that both of us, the Chairman and myself, we have a real passion for education.

And we both realize that without your support, without the professionals here today giving us the proper insights to make the right decisions, we're not going to be able to make a difference. So today's really critical as is your testimony.

But I guess on a more formal side, as we continue to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court's landmark Brown versus Board of Education decision, it's important to reflect on how far we have come in ensuring educational access for every child.

But we must also remind ourselves, the task will not be finished until every child not only has a seat in the classroom, and I can

appreciate being a member, as both of us are, from the southwest and the challenges of having a seat is as much as having the teacher. But until every child has a seat but also is guaranteed a quality education, our job's not done.

50 years later after the 50th anniversary has begun, an alarming achievement gap still exists in our country.

Nationally, African American 4th graders are 28 percentage points behind their white counterparts in reading, and Hispanic 4th graders are 29 percent points behind.

President Bush's No Child Left Behind Act has given us the blueprint we need as a nation to complete the mission. Starting with the Brown decision, Brown versus Board of Education and No Child Left Behind are partners in history.

The No Child Left Behind Act is the bipartisan landmark education reform law designed to change the culture of America's schools by closing the achievement gap, offering more flexibility, giving parents more options, and teaching students based on what works.

In exchange for literally billions of dollars in Federal aid, states now must describe how they will close the achievement gap and make sure all students, including those who are disadvantaged, achieve academic proficiency.

It's interesting, as I listen to debate across the country and even at home in Nevada, when we talk about No Child Left Behind, it literally has become the whipping post for education.

If local government has chosen not to increase financial support, it's the No Child Left Behind's fault. If there's a cut in transportation, it's No Child Left Behind's fault.

Anything that's gone wrong with education, and we certainly we have a lot of professionals trying to prevent that, No Child Left Behind is blamed.

And I'll be honest with you. I think that it truly has been a milestone and it will be history in the making. Although not perfect, it's come a long ways and will continue to improve.

As we try to create this highly educated workforce that's critical to America's future and competitiveness, not only nationally but internationally, the quality of education in America's schools is directly related to the quality of teachers entrusted with the vital task of educating the nation's students.

Today's students are tomorrow's workforce, and for that reason, education is directly linked to America's future competitiveness in the changing economy.

Every child deserves to learn from a highly qualified teacher. And it's a privilege for me to be here today.

And as I mentioned earlier, as a Member of Congress from the southwest, we do have similar challenges to Arizona.

We need 2,500 new teachers a year in Nevada, 2000 alone in southern Nevada. We need to build two and a half plus new schools a month to stay ahead of our growth. We're growing 6-, 7,000 people a month into the Nevada community, and we have very serious challenges from seats, building enough schools, to having enough teachers.

By having said that, an issue that I'm also working on, I'd like to just enter for the record, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if you're

aware of this, but 29 states don't do background checks on teachers.

And I have introduced legislation to make sure that every state does background checks.

And as we're out recruiting every day to find new teachers, we're finding that a lot of states don't have the information that's necessary to make sure that our students are safe and that we're hiring the right teachers.

So separate and apart from educating and making sure that we raise the standards of the professionalism of the teachers, we need to get the message out to these other states that they also need to do some background checks.

It's not happening.

We found in Clark County School District, which is the sixth largest in the country, that we were recruiting teachers and their background checks were coming up clear.

And we're finding out later it was clear because it wasn't reported, the problems that they were having.

Legal problems, from pedophilia to other sexual crimes to other major crimes, were not being reported into the system.

I would hope we wouldn't have to pass legislation to mandate the background checks, although that's where the bill is right now.

But I know, as a Member of Congress and a prior member of the State Legislature, I was shocked to realize that there is not background checks being done in 29 of the 50 states.

So as the Secretary's here today, I'd like to send that message. We have to educate our own professionals. So when we would check a background through the FBI, which we require on every new teacher, literally, their records were coming up clear.

And there's something wrong with that when we're entrusted not only with hiring not only the best and brightest and highly trained professionals.

We have to make sure that as parents entrust their children with us that these teachers also haven't had other problems. So I add that for the record and share that with my friends and colleagues here in Arizona.

Anyway, with that, I'm excited to be here.

And I'll tell you, I have heard education compared to the medical profession in that, if you were to look at an emergency room hospital in the late 1800's and look at the emergency room today, you'd see a remarkable difference.

Technology, training, skills, everything has changed from the safety of the patient to the safety of the doctors and nurses.

But if you looked at the classroom, it's basically the same way it's been for over 100 years. And there certainly is a time and a place for that.

But I think we need to continue fostering meetings like this so we can learn how to improve education across the country and make sure that our classroom doesn't look like it did 100 years ago because the world doesn't look like it did 100 years ago.

And that's another reason why where we're here today.

So thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Appreciate it.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Porter follows:]

Statement of Hon. Jon Porter, a Representative in Congress from the State of Nevada

As we continue to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court's landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, it's important to reflect on how far we've come in ensuring educational access for every child. But we must also remind ourselves the task will not be finished until every child not only has a seat in the classroom, but is guaranteed a quality education as well.

Fifty years later, an alarming achievement gap still exists in our country. Nationally, African American fourth graders are 28 percentage points behind their white counterparts in reading, and Hispanic fourth graders are 29 percentage points behind.

President Bush's No Child Left Behind Act has given us the blueprint we need as a nation to complete the mission started with the *Brown* decision. *Brown v. Board of Education* and No Child Left Behind are partners in history.

The No Child Left Behind Act is the bipartisan landmark education reform law designed to change the culture of America's schools by closing the achievement gap, offering more flexibility, giving parents more options and teaching students based on what works. In exchange for billions of dollars in federal aid, states now must describe how they will close the achievement gap and make sure all students, including those who are disadvantaged, achieve academic proficiency.

A highly-educated workforce is critical to America's future competitiveness. And the quality of education in America's schools is directly related to the quality of the teachers entrusted with the vital task of educating the nation's students. Today's students are tomorrow's workforce, and for that reason education is directly linked to America's future competitiveness in a changing economy.

Every child deserves to learn from a highly qualified teacher and it is a privilege for me to be here today to learn about the steps Arizona is taking to ensure their children receive a world-class education.

I look forward to your testimony.

Chairman MCKEON. Thank you. I'm especially happy to be here in Arizona because I have four grandchildren in public schools here. They live in Mesa. And we have 26 grandchildren. So school education is very, very important in our family.

Let me introduce our witnesses.

We will begin first by hearing from Mr. Raymond Simon.

Mr. Simon currently serves as the Assistant Secretary in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education at the U.S. Department of Education in Washington.

Mr. Simon has served in numerous capacities since beginning his career as a mathematics teacher at North Little Rock High School. Mr. Simon has served as Superintendent for Conway Public Schools in Conway and also as Director of the Arkansas Department of Education.

So he knows what it's like in the classroom; he knows what it's like in the superintendent's office; and now he sees what it's like in Washington, D.C..

And he's still smiling. That's great.

Dr. Karen Butterfield currently serves as the Deputy Associate Superintendent in the Innovative and Exemplary Programs for the Arizona Department of Education in Phoenix, Arizona. Previously Dr. Butterfield served as Program Manager for the National Charter Schools Institute.

I was here years ago. We did a hearing here on charter schools. You're setting a great pace for the rest of the country. But that was in Mount Pleasant, Michigan.

In 2003, Dr. Butterfield was recognized by the Arizona North Central Association for her work, receiving the Circle of Excellence Award.

Then we will hear from Dr. Laura Palmer Noone.

Dr. Noone currently serves as President of the University of Phoenix, which is where we are, and has served in this capacity since September of 2000.

Previously Dr. Noone served as Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and as Director of Academic Affairs at the University of Phoenix.

Before joining the University of Phoenix system, Dr. Noone served as Judge Pro Tem at the city of Chandler and also as an attorney at law in general civil practice emphasizing business representation in civil litigation.

And finally, Dr. Lewis C. Solmon.

Dr. Solmon currently serves as the Executive Vice President and Director of Teacher Advancement Programs for the Milken Family Foundation in Santa Monica, California.

Before founding the Milken Institute in 1991, Dr. Solmon served as Dean of UCLA's Graduate School of Education.

Dr. Solmon has also advised several Governors and state superintendents in the area of teacher quality—wonderful job—funding school technology and school finance.

Did the Governors always listen to you?

Dr. SOLMON. Most of them actually did.

Chairman MCKEON. That's great. Before the panel begins, I'd like to ask each of our witnesses today to please limit your statements to 5 minutes.

We can be flexible on that. We don't have, like in Washington where we have that seat that falls out from under you, we don't have that here.

But your full record, your full comments will be included in the record.

We'll hear now from Mr. Simon.

**STATEMENT OF RAYMOND SIMON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

Mr. SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One reason I'm smiling is that you gave, between you and Mr. Porter, you gave about 90 percent of my prepared remarks. And we agreed.

Chairman MCKEON. I have heard that somebody that hears something six times and learns it is a genius, so maybe we need to hear it several times.

Mr. SIMON. Well, I think I'm in the presence of genius. So I'll try to only pick out the parts that will elaborate on what you and Mr. Porter have already said.

I think this component, the highly qualified teacher component of No Child Left Behind will prove to be the most challenging of all the aspects of the law to implement.

In addition, too, we're at a time when, as you've mentioned, there is a growing need for new teachers to join the profession.

We're seeing teachers of my generation retiring in record numbers at a time when we're demanding more, rightfully so, in terms of qualifications of teachers in our classrooms.

The research that you referenced also says that teacher success is enhanced by a combination of teaching experience and a strong

content knowledge, something we must continue to insist on in helping our teachers not only with how to teach but in the content area that they are teaching.

Last fall, as we began to receive from the states their reports on the numbers and percentages of highly qualified teachers, we found rather startling information.

As is often the case with something new, the data had a few holes. Some states had made a good-faith effort and had submitted reasonably accurate information.

Some were still working on their definitions of highly qualified teachers and their data reflected that uncertainty.

Some states simply did not submit any information because of limitations in their data collection system.

Nevertheless, on the whole, the 2003 state data on highly qualified teachers suggests how far we have to go to comply with No Child Left Behind.

Some states appear to be in good shape with 90 percent or more of their teachers already highly qualified.

Others face a much bigger challenge, reporting less than half of their teachers meeting the same requirements.

Some states reporting high percentages of highly qualified teachers may not have been using a definition that meets statutory requirements.

Last September, in partial response to that and at the urging of Secretary Rod Paige, the Department formed its Teacher Assistance Corps which, on it, included teachers, principals, superintendents, higher education staff, State officials and national education experts that visited all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and conducted what we call conversation without consequences.

In Arkansas we refer to that as deer camp conversation. Whatever was said there stayed there.

After 300 hours of site visits, we found much confusion, inconsistency about what the law requires and what states need to do to comply.

Veteran teachers incorrectly had been convinced that they had to go back to school to get multiple degrees in order to be highly qualified or to take tests to prove their qualifications.

Highly honored professionals suddenly found themselves, as a result of either misinformation or lack of action on the part of states to develop proper guidelines, to find themselves not highly qualified.

As a result of our conversation without consequences, many states began to rethink how their teachers are assigned and what their definitions of highly qualified would be.

Since that time, we found that more states are getting serious about aligning certification standards with content standards for children.

More states are raising academic standards for teachers, realizing how important a well-prepared teacher is. And many are lowering barriers to alternate certification programs that encourage talented, qualified individuals in other careers to become teachers.

Beginning this summer, the department will begin formal monitoring of states and go back now in a formal way and continue with

the discussions we had last fall, and also to provide technical assistance to schools and states to make sure they are on the right track to meet the requirements.

Most importantly, we're going to look at how states are collecting data and how they are spending their Title II funds.

I'll close my remarks on a personal note.

You mentioned you had 26 grandchildren. I have one that's 2 years old. His name's Alex.

And when Alex begins kindergarten in 3 years, as a granddad, I don't want it to be the luck of the draw as to whether or not Alex gets a good teacher.

And I sure don't want it to be the luck of the draw that Alex gets three poor teachers 3 years in a row, because if he does, the chances of Alex graduating from high school are pretty slim.

He deserves better than that. So do his buddies.

No Child Left Behind, in my mind, and I have spent—I'll finish 38 years in public education. I have never known a time when the opportunities were as great on a national level to help as many children as we have now.

Now is not the time to provide excuses. It's not the time to abandon No Child Left Behind. It's a time to stay the course.

This summer, as you indicated, we're going to spotlight teachers all over this country that are doing what others say can't be done. We're going to give those teachers and principals an opportunity to say, here's how I'm doing it; you can do it.

That's all teachers want. We have heard from many, many teachers over the last few weeks and months.

And they say, you know, we want to do this. Some of us don't believe we can because we don't know how, but we want to do what's best for these children and we want the mission of No Child to be successful. So any help the Department of Education can give us, that's what we're looking for.

That's a pretty powerful statement.

We have to honor good teaching. There are millions of great teachers in this country. No Child Left Behind has an opportunity to take that individual greatness of those teachers and channel it in one direction and make the whole greatness bigger than the sum of the parts.

I'm very proud to be a part of that.

That concludes my remarks. And I'd be happy to answer questions at the appropriate time.

Chairman MCKEON. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Simon follows:]

Statement of Raymond Simon, Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify today on the importance of teaching. Improving the quality of instruction and, more specifically, putting a highly qualified teacher in every classroom, may well be the key to the success of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). That makes teaching a core concern for this Administration, as I know it is for the Chairman and members of this Committee.

The reason is simple. Research shows what most of us know from personal experience: a talented teacher has a tremendous impact on student achievement. In particular, we know that a combination of teaching experience and strong content knowledge are linked to gains in student achievement. Although we know it is im-

portant for teachers to have a solid grasp of the content they teach, out-of-field teaching remains a significant problem. Historically, qualified math and science teachers are more difficult to hire than English or social studies teachers, but out-of-field teaching is just as prevalent in English and social studies as it is in math and science classes. To illustrate this, one-fifth of 7th–12th graders in the United States will have an English teacher who does not have even a minor in the subject.

We also know that inexperienced or unqualified teachers tend to be concentrated in the high-poverty schools that face the greatest challenges in helping all students reach high State standards. And finally, we know that teaching is a tough job, because nearly one-quarter of all new teachers leave the profession during their first three years of service.

WHAT THE LAW REQUIRES

The requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act concerning highly qualified teachers were designed to address each of these issues in teaching. NCLB requires a highly qualified teacher in every classroom for core academic subjects, so that all kids have the opportunity to achieve at grade level. States must report on the percentage of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers, both overall and disaggregated by high-poverty and low-poverty schools, so that we know whether or not the students with the greatest needs are getting teachers who can meet those needs. And we believe that highly qualified teachers are likely to remain in the profession longer than those who are unprepared for the challenges of teaching.

No Child Left Behind requires that every public elementary and secondary school teacher of a core academic subject hold a minimum of a bachelor's degree, obtain full State certification or licensure, and demonstrate subject matter competency in each of the academic subjects taught; however, States are provided the flexibility to develop procedures that conform to these three criteria.

Additionally, all new teachers hired to teach core academic subjects in Title I programs must meet these requirements now, and all other teachers of core subjects must be highly qualified by the end of the 2005–2006 school year.

Arizona is striving to meet these requirements. Your State Department of Education recently gave districts and schools guidance on the qualifications teachers need to have. They also have developed a HOUSSE, which is short for “high objective uniform State standard of evaluation,” a procedure NCLB authorizes which allows veteran teachers to demonstrate that they know their subject matter without having to take a test or go back to school.

WHERE STATES CURRENTLY STAND

Last fall States submitted data for the first time on the numbers and percentages of their teachers who are highly qualified. As is often the case with something that is new, the data provided had a few holes. Some States made a good faith effort and submitted reasonably accurate information. Some States were still working on their definitions of highly qualified teachers, and their data reflected that uncertainty. And some States simply did not submit any data on highly qualified teachers, in part because of limitations in their current data-collection systems.

Nevertheless, on the whole the 2003 State data on highly qualified teachers suggest how far we have to go to comply with No Child Left Behind. Some States appear to be in good shape, with 90 percent or more of their teachers already highly qualified. Other States face a much bigger challenge, reporting less than half of their teachers meeting the highly qualified standard. Moreover, some of the States reporting high percentages of highly qualified teachers may not have been using a definition that meets statutory requirements.

I think it is important to recognize that last fall's data served as a “wake-up” call for everyone involved, both at the State and local levels and here in Washington as well. There is a lot of work to be done over the next two years.

THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S TEACHER ASSISTANCE CORPS

Secretary Rod Paige recognized the challenge every State would face in meeting these requirements. To assist States in their efforts, last summer he formed the Teacher Assistance Corps (TAC) to support State's hard work in meet the highly qualified teacher requirements.

The Teacher Assistance Corps includes 45 teachers, former teachers, principals, superintendents, leaders from higher education, State officials, and national experts from around the country. Following training and assignment to teams that included U.S. Department staff, the Corps began visiting States in September 2003. During these “conversations without consequences,” team members explained the highly qualified teacher requirements and answered policy questions. Just as important, the visits provided an opportunity to listen and learn with TAC teams hearing about

innovative State and local professional development initiatives as well as unique local conditions affecting the recruitment and training of highly qualified teachers.

Teacher Assistance Corps teams have visited all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. They met with the Arizona Department of Education last November, answering questions and learning about how your State is working toward meeting the requirements. The Corps is available to provide additional assistance to Arizona through follow-up visits, conference calls, and regional and national meetings, if your State so desires.

NEW FLEXIBILITY FOR STATES AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A common set of concerns emerged from the Teacher Assistance Corps visits. For example, many rural districts must employ teachers who are assigned to teach multiple subjects, and thus face the challenge of meeting the highly qualified teacher requirements for each subject. Many middle school teachers have elementary or secondary certification, but lack specific middle school qualifications. And States continue to face shortages teachers of special education and in key subject areas like science.

To help States and school districts meet these and other challenges in complying with the highly qualified teacher requirements of No Child Left Behind, on March 15 the Secretary issued new guidance that both clarified existing flexibility and provided additional flexibility to meet these requirements.

One key change affects 100 districts in Arizona that are defined as small and rural under Title VI of No Child Left Behind. These districts will be allowed to provisionally employ middle or secondary school teachers to teach multiple subjects even if they do not meet all the criteria for a highly qualified teacher in each of the subjects they teach. Districts are eligible for this flexibility as long as they are providing intensive supervision and professional development that will enable these teachers to become highly qualified in the additional subjects over a three-year period.

The new flexibility also changed current Department guidance regarding qualifications for science teachers. Arizona now has the option of having science teachers demonstrate subject matter competence either in specific fields of science or in general science, depending on State certification or licensure requirements.

The Department also clarified that since States have the authority to define grade spans, they may determine the highly qualified teacher requirements that teachers must meet at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Other areas covered by the new guidance include the use of a High, Objective, Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) for veteran teachers, requirements for special education teachers, and improved data collection and monitoring procedures.

MONITORING

This summer, the Department will follow up on the technical assistance provided through the Teacher Assistance Corps by monitoring State processes used to determine the highly qualified status of teachers. We also will look at how States are collecting data on teachers, how they are spending their Title II funds and provide technical assistance if needed. The 2005–2006 deadline is fast approaching, and the U.S. Department of Education is committed to monitoring every State prior to the deadline, to ensure States are meeting the highly qualified teacher requirements in the law.

TWO PRINCIPLES FOR MEETING HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHER REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the Teacher Assistance Corps and more flexible guidance, the Department is promoting two key principles to help States and school districts meet the highly qualified teacher requirements. First, we must raise academic standards for teachers. This is an explicit requirement of the law, which reflects research findings on the critical importance of subject matter knowledge for effective teaching. One way to raise standards is to improve traditional teacher preparation programs so that they serve as a more reliable source of highly qualified and well-prepared new teachers.

For example, the Arizona Department of Education is currently working with colleges and universities in the state to have uniform standards and increase the amount of time spent in the classroom by student teachers.

Second, we must lower the barriers that keep many talented people from entering the teaching profession. The law is silent on certification requirements, opening the door to new thinking at the State level about certification systems. In particular, Arizona can streamline the process and create alternative routes that will encourage talented, qualified individuals now in other careers or jobs to become teachers. Your State Board is currently considering adding a new route to certification that would

allow individuals with a bachelor's degree in a subject to bypass the education coursework, and participate in a three year induction/mentoring program.

Another example of innovative flexibility is the Adjunct Teacher Corps initiative included in the President's 2005 budget request. This \$40 million proposal would help create arrangements for utilizing well-qualified individuals from business, technology, industry, and other areas as teachers in secondary schools on an adjunct basis.

THE PRESIDENTS 2005 BUDGET REQUEST

The President's 2005 budget request, like his earlier budgets, would provide significant support for State and local efforts to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified by the end of the 2005–2006 school year.

The key Federal programs that provide flexible resources for teacher training are NCLB's Title II Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, along with the Higher Education Act's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement grants. Combined with smaller categorical programs that support professional development, along with benefits for individual teachers under Loan Forgiveness and tax provisions, the request would provide a total of more than \$5 billion to help States and school districts improve the quality of their teaching forces.

CONCLUSION

As I said at the outset of my testimony, meeting the highly qualified teacher requirements of No Child Left Behind will be central to the success of the new law. I believe the law has already accomplished a great deal simply by focusing so much attention on the importance of putting a highly qualified teacher in every classroom. As is the case with implementing the rest of No Child Left Behind, the Department is working in partnership with Arizona both through guidance and technical assistance and through significant financial support—to move from requirement to reality in ensuring that all teachers are highly qualified.

I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman MCKEON. Dr. Butterfield.

STATEMENT OF DR. KAREN BUTTERFIELD, DEPUTY ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT, INNOVATIVE & EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS, ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. Good morning, Chairman McKeon, Representative Porter.

It is a true pleasure and honor to be sitting next to the Assistant Secretary and with our other distinguished testifiers this morning on what Arizona is doing to ensure we have highly qualified teachers in our classrooms and the direction that we have headed in implementing the Title II, No Child Left Behind requirements.

I would like to open up my remarks with a quote from Superintendent Tom Horne in a recent Board of Regents meeting regarding teacher quality.

"We are determined that 100 percent of the students will become proficient in reading and mathematics and will reach their potential in all academic areas in our state.

"The most important factor to reaching these goals is highly qualified teachers."

Throughout this testimony I will interweave the important elements of conditions needed in order to truly have and support highly qualified teacher efforts.

I'm an art educator at heart. I began my career as an art teacher. So I'd like to use the metaphor of creating a weaving. The warp is the actual base of threads that become the foundation of the actual weaving itself.

We cannot implement or foster highly qualified teachers without certain things in place. And so I'll be addressing that warp, those elements, throughout my testimony.

I'll be including five major initiatives of the State of Arizona and particularly the Arizona Department of Education has embarked on in improving teacher quality.

These five include Arizona's highly qualified teacher requirements which I will not go into detail in this testimony. You have the rubric, the House rubric in your packet as well as the checklist that ensures we have highly qualified teachers in our classrooms.

Secondly, recommendations from the Arizona Department of Education Certification Task Force.

Three, possible implementation of a statewide teacher induction and mentoring program.

Four, Arizona's commitment to teacher professional growth and development. And I'd like to highlight the successes of our Arizona Professional Development Learning Academy and our Reading First Initiative.

And last, our commitment to develop data elements, just what Chairman McKeon, you have stated in your opening remarks, the need to tie teacher quality to student achievement.

In beginning with Arizona's highly qualified teacher requirements, I want you to know that I am representing the hard work of Deputy Associate Superintendent of Title II, Kathy Wiebke, regarding her work with developing that checklist and the House rubric with a task force of teachers and educators from across the state.

This rubric has been a true help to our teachers and having them check off, am I highly qualified or not?

If I'm not, what do I have to do to reach those qualifications?

Secondly, it's become a great tool for our rural teachers who are struggling in this state to become highly qualified.

And I want you to know, they are truly grateful for the extended grant that has been allocated to them to become highly qualified over the next couple of years.

And Ms. Wiebke's letter that is addressing these requirements is in your packet under Attachment C.

She highlights that teachers with an in-depth knowledge of content are better able to make critical instructional decisions that high quality teaching and learning demand.

And the Arizona Department of Education continues to work very closely with our three state's regent universities and colleges of education in the spirit of the aforementioned text.

As research conducted by Wilson, Floden and Ferrini-Mundy conclude, that in addition to subject matter knowledge and communication skills, enthusiasm, flexibility, perseverance and rapport with students create the overall formula for teacher effectiveness in addition to the vital combination of state licensure process, teachers' professional knowledge and experience.

Secondly, in terms of recommendations from the Arizona Department of Education Certification Task Force, I'd like to highlight two of approximately five that the task force is submitting currently to the State Board of Education.

In order to provide enhanced opportunities for our teachers, we are looking at or the task force is looking at, instead of requiring the 180 hours of the disparate and often unconnected activity of providing professional development, we, the task force, is looking at a more job-embedded staff development plan for our state's teachers.

It would still require the 180 hours, but that plan would focus on six critical elements: Professional areas for growth, professional growth goals, an action plan step, a time line, the resources these teachers would need to fulfill their job-embedded professional development plans, and the anticipated impact as well as the results of the plan.

And in order to remove barriers of highly qualified teachers who move here from out of state to teach—I don't know if they are going to Nevada, Representative Porter, but we have got an issue here where we need to retain our highly qualified teachers in Arizona.

Arizona is working very, very hard to improve teacher quality, and our teachers are very dedicated to their roles in their classrooms and to their profession.

And the State Department of Education is strongly committed to servicing them.

We have two major challenges I would like to highlight for the record.

One. We have a migration of teachers leaving this state to seek higher pay. That has got to change. That's a condition in the warp that we need to strengthen the color of the weaving.

Two, the reality of revolving doors unfortunately exists here, particularly in our rural schools and unfortunately in many of our under-performing schools.

By revolving door, I mean the administrators and teachers are just not staying long enough to provide consistency in the classroom, consistency in providing quality.

I would like to, third, highlight the development, in order to address these last two challenges, with a discussion we are seriously having with implementing a statewide teacher induction and mentor program.

The induction would be the process. The mentoring would be the action. And we all know that research states how important the role of the mentor is in enhancing teacher quality.

It is our desire to create a system that will support our state's teachers in both our urban, suburban as well as remote rural areas of the state.

Children can thrive and make significant gains if this warp, part of the warp is in place.

One condition needed for successful implementation of research-based practices in the classroom is providing high quality staff development.

And I'd like to share with you quickly two areas that Arizona has embarked on that are demonstrating results and focusing on our commitment to teacher professional growth and development.

One is the Arizona Professional Development Leadership Academy which now is recognized as one of the best staff development

programs in the state. The PDLA now consists of 24 teams representing over 300 educators and is growing at a fast rate.

And I have also included in your packets information on the PDLA as well as our upcoming June PDLA Summit.

With Federal funds, we are able to help increase our capacity at the state level to help schools develop their capacity for effective professional staff development. And the PDLA focuses on three major components.

One, implementing the National Staff Development Council Standards of staff development; two, demonstrating and teaching them about models of professional development; and third, showcasing how they can evaluate. It is so important to evaluate: Is it working or not?

And that, again, is in Attachment D for you.

Our Reading First Initiative is a highly successful program that is training teachers to teach reading with effective research-based strategies.

And again, part of the foundation of the warp is, we are providing the infrastructure for this to be successful in the schools that need it the most.

This consists of identifying highly qualified teachers of reading who are on loan from ADE to school districts.

These highly qualified reading specialists are housed at each of our 15 county superintendent offices providing outreach and technical assistance to our very large, diverse state.

This is helping us close the achievement gap between research and practice and provide professional development that is consistent in quality while, most importantly, helping make these rich opportunities locally accessible.

I would also like to add that recently we partnered with the U.S. Department of Education and hosted our first High School Reform Summit. I was the team leader for that summit. And to the table came some of our most outstanding teachers and principals.

And I want this on the record, that they begged, please do not let us go backwards. We are working hard at implementing No Child Left Behind. We have seen a difference in how our teachers are teaching, raising the bars of expectation with our curriculum, and we're seeing results.

So we want to see those high standards of accountability continue.

But second, tied to reading first, they are craving and are in great need of scientifically based secondary literacy strategies. And so our convening summit which we're going to hold this July will be focusing on that arena.

And in order to keep all children ahead versus behind, we must keep the continuum of improved student successes going.

So strong capacity-building staff development is greatly needed, and we ask Congress for its assistance in continuing those funds to our states.

And last, I would like to share with you that we are looking into value assessment, value tracked tied to teacher quality and student achievement.

Implementing a value-added system, as the research shows in Tennessee and other states, by establishing individual teacher

identifiers tied to student achievement, works and helps us see which teachers are doing what and what they are doing is working.

It also helps us to identify what types of professional staff development are the most effective as well as which training and professional learning opportunities help our teachers grow.

Teachers have the biggest impact on student achievement. We all know that.

Most of us, I'm assuming, are parents, grandparents. We all know which teachers we wanted our children to have. I've got a daughter still in high school. I know which teachers I want her to have and why.

Teacher quality is critical. And overall, the teachers, especially the teachers in Arizona, support these measures of No Child Left Behind and recognize the growth students make through their teaching. They want this accountability.

In closing, teachers are our fundamental resource in education, but we're not treating them that way.

We're putting so much focus on the student and student achievement. It's really, what is happening with the quality of teachers in our classroom.

We need to be taking a look at high quality teacher preparation, high quality teacher recruitment, high quality teacher retention by supporting them with high quality resources and staff development embedded in rich, evidenced-based practice. That's the warp.

Then we must celebrate our teachers' successes by honoring their achievements and disseminating their exemplary practices. That is an element that is missing in our school system.

I would like to close with a quote from Michael Fullan. And I believe this is the path that the Arizona Department of Education and art educators are on, the path in this state in meeting highly qualified teacher requirements.

"Sustained success is never just one special event, meeting or activity. Rather, it is a journey, a journey of recursive decisions and actions."

Thank you very much.

Chairman MCKEON. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Butterfield follows:]

**Statement of Karen Butterfield, Ed.D., Deputy Associate Superintendent,
Arizona Department of Education**

Good morning, Chairman Boehner and Education and The Workforce committee members. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on the need for NCLB highly qualified teacher requirements, and provide you with a "picture" as to how Arizona is ensuring teachers have adequate subject matter knowledge for the subjects they teach.

As a former teacher for 22 years, a charter founder and administrator for 5 years, and currently in a leadership role with the Arizona Department of Education overseeing innovative and exemplary programs, I can first testify on the imperativeness of the need to have highly qualified teachers in our classrooms. Throughout my professional career, as well as continuing to serve in the critical role as parent, the same theme keeps reoccurring: Teacher expertise is a determining factor in enhancing improved student achievement and overall school success. Arizona's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Horne, is a strong advocate regarding the need for quality teaching and learning in our classrooms through his new initiatives, which foster: "Better Teachers, Better Curriculum, Better Schools". In his presentation at a Board of Regents meeting, he is on record as stating,

"We are determined that 100% of the students will become proficient in reading and mathematics and will reach their potential in all of the aca-

demographic areas. The most important factor to reach these goals is highly qualified teachers". (August 14, 2003).

Throughout this testimony, the important element of "conditions needed" is interwoven, as implementing many of these goals involve the complexities and challenges of fostering systemic change in our schools.

I would like to highlight the accomplishments of our state in the highly qualified teacher arena, focusing on five major initiatives that are ensuring we have highly qualified teachers in our state's public schools.

- 1) Arizona's Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements, reflective of NCLB
- 2) Two Recommendations from the Arizona Department of Education's Certification Task Force
- 3) Possible Implementation of a State-wide Teacher Induction and Mentoring Program
- 4) Arizona's Commitment to Teacher Professional Growth and Development:
 - a. Arizona Professional Development Learning Academy (AZ PDLA)
 - b. Reading First Initiative
- 5) Arizona's Commitment to Develop Data Elements: tied to tracking teacher quality and student achievement

1) *Arizona's Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements, reflective of NCLB:*

Through the leadership of ADE's Deputy Associate Superintendent of Highly Qualified Teachers, Kathy Wiebke, Arizona teachers have been provided the checklist for Arizona Highly Qualified Teachers (Attachment A), as mandated by P.L.107-110(NCLB). This document outlines the requirements as of follows:

- 1) Hold a bachelor's degree
- AND
- 2) Hold a valid state certificate (charters are exempt from this requirement)
- 3) Currently teach, and have passed a rigorous content State academic subject matter test (AEPA Professional Knowledge Test and the Subject Knowledge Test in the content area currently teaching, OR hold an advanced degree in one's content area, OR hold National Board Certification in the area in which one is currently teaching, or for Middle/High School levels only: 24 hours in content area).

If a teacher checks 1,2, and 3, h/she is considered highly qualified. If items under "3" were not marked, then the HOUSSE rubric must be completed to verify that existing qualifications meet the NCLB requirements (Reference Attachment B).

This rubric was developed through a task force comprised of stakeholders from across the state, based upon Superintendent Horne's request: that this task force work with schools and districts to meet the federal guidelines, while simultaneously, making the process as inclusive as possible. The rubric has been instrumental in not only promoting teacher self-reflection, but also serving as a tool for our rural teachers, who are also grateful for having extended time to demonstrate competence in additional subjects they teach, through the new flexible policy recently established by the U.S. Department of Education. As referenced in Ms. Wiebke's 5/17/04 letter to LEAs (Attachment C):

"We want teachers who teach Arizona's children to have the necessary depth of knowledge to help children develop deep and meaningful understandings. Children are inspired to learn by teachers who are passionate about the content and who engage their students in active inquiry and exploration. Teachers with an in-depth knowledge of content are better able to make the critical instructional decisions that high quality teaching and learning demand".

The Arizona Department of Education continues to work closely with our state's regent universities and colleges of education in the spirit of the aforementioned text. Research conducted by Wilson, Floden and Ferrini-Mundy conclude, for example, that in addition to subject matter knowledge and communication skills—enthusiasm, flexibility, perseverance and rapport with students—create the overall formula for teacher effectiveness in addition to the vital combination of state licensure process, teachers' professional knowledge and experience.

2) *Two Recommendations of the Arizona Department of Education's Certification Task Force:*

The Arizona Department of Education's Certification Task Force, comprised of 71 members from across the state, has also been addressing a variety of issues tied to teacher quality and certification. It needs to be emphasized in today's testimony that these are strictly drafted recommendations, and have yet to be approved by our

state board of education. Two issues currently being reviewed include certificate renewal and reciprocity .

Enhanced opportunities for teachers and administrators to engage in reflection on their own professional development is one possible recommendation of this task force under certification renewal. Instead of requiring the current 180 hours of disparate and unconnected activity, one's professional development plan would be more "job-embedded", with the professional development plan possibly designated by the educator's LEA or ADE. This suggested plan, which would still include the 180 required hours, would focus on:

- Professional areas for growth
- Professional Growth goals
- Action plan steps
- Timeline
- Resources
- Anticipated impact/results plan review

In order to help remove barriers of highly qualified teachers who move here from out-of-state to teach, it is critical to address issues of reciprocity under the large certification process umbrella.

Reciprocity recommendations for certified out-of-state teacher applicants would vary, depending on candidates who have less than 3 years of teaching experience and those who have 3 or more years regarding whether or not the subject knowledge test would be waived. A bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, valid fingerprint clearance card and current out-of-state teaching certificate at the equivalent level would remain required, including passing the AZ/US Constitution tests.

Arizona is working very hard to improve teacher quality; our teachers are dedicated to their roles in our classrooms and to their profession, and the Arizona Department of Education is strongly committed to serving them. We are making great strides in Arizona regarding strengthening teacher quality, but, we still have much work to do in addressing challenges unique to our state. Two such challenges are as follows:

- 1) The migration of teachers leaving this state to seek higher pay: According to the AFT, Arizona ranks 33rd for average teacher salaries (\$38,510). This is one condition that must change if we are to recruit, reward and retain our most qualified and successful teachers.
- 2) The reality of "revolving doors", reflective of both administrators and teachers, in our most rural—and, in most cases, also in our underperforming schools. We are taking steps to address this specific challenge on several fronts. One example is researching the possibility of developing a teacher induction and mentor program.

3) *Development of a State-wide Teacher Induction and Mentor Program:*

In order to provide a support system for teachers as they begin their careers, a statewide mentoring and induction program is currently under consideration, recommended by the Certification Task Force, as we work to build capacity for a program of support for our new teachers. It is critical to first, recruit, and then retain, outstanding teachers. A recent Morrison report projects that Arizona can expect close to 7,130 new K–12 teachers to be trained to enter classrooms each year through 2005, and 6930 from 2006–2010. Therefore, we have much work to do!

Currently, a team of stakeholders is working together to establish induction standards that will provide the foundation for all induction programs. It is our desire to create a system that will support teachers in our urban schools, as well as those teaching in very remote, rural areas of the state.

Children cannot succeed and make gains without consistent, strong, visionary instructional leadership. Children CAN thrive and make significant gains with highly qualified teachers who are expertise in their content area, and who are effectively trained on how to implement best practices. These teachers also need the support and resources of strong school, district and governance leadership. We cannot ignore the conditions that need to be in place in order to provide them with the culture and climate conducive for both teacher and student success.

One condition needed for successful implementation of research best practices in the classroom is providing high quality staff development/training that is systematic, and systemic—fostering school change. This leads me to share with you, two examples that are fostering strong staff development implementation and strategies that are producing RESULTS. These are based upon the Arizona Department of Education's commitment to servicing our constituents with ongoing professional development, including training in effective teaching strategies that work.

4) *Our Commitment to Teacher Professional Growth and Development:*

In order to lay the foundation for implementation of quality staff development, the Arizona Department of Education established the Arizona Professional Development Leadership Academy (PDLA) in 1999. It is a true grassroots effort on behalf of district and charter schools, which are supported through the state's county superintendents' offices.

The PDLA provides support to both teachers and administrators in learning new professional strategic practices to ensure student success that is systematic and systemic. Funded through ADE's Academic Achievement Division, the AZ PDLA is recognized as one of the best staff development programs in the nation. 24 teams, representing over 300 educators, have become active participants in the AZ PDLA, and these numbers continue to increase each year.

One of the major goals of the Academy is to help our schools develop capacity for effective professional development by assisting teachers, principals, central office staff and superintendents in understanding three major components of effective professional development:

- 1) The NSDC (National Staff Development Council) Standards of Staff Development: the foundation of what is currently known about what constitutes effective professional development to increase student learning. These consist of context standards (learning communities, leadership, resources), process standards (data-driven, evaluation, research based, design, learning, collaboration) and content standards (equity, quality teaching, family involvement).
- 2) The Models of Professional Development: professional development is more than offering a workshop; the seven models of professional development provide a variety of ways to increase educator knowledge, aspirations, skills, behaviors and attitudes;
- 3) Evaluation of Professional Development: how to plan and gather evidence to determine whether professional development has attained its intended goal of increased student learning.

This academic year, the PDLA has provided extensive, rigorous training in the professional development standards, data analysis, models of professional development, accountability systems, effective evaluation, creating professional development, and more. Next month, PDLA teams from around the state will convene in Phoenix for a PDLA Summit, which will focus on understanding and implementing professional development and school improvement change: conditions necessary to be in place in order to strengthen highly qualified teaching in our state. (Attachment D)

Another example of providing service to teachers with staff development is the implementation of the Reading First Initiative, a highly successful program that trains existing teachers to teach reading through effective teaching strategies. Professional development is based upon scientific research and its implications for instructional practice.

Reading First training in Arizona has been designed in two tiers in order to promote school change: 1) through district and school leadership as a "train the trainers" model; and 2) through teachers of reading, utilizing "teachers teaching teachers" model, with a focus on instructional practice. These tiered levels initiative reflect a statewide, systematic and systemic infrastructure for quality staff development, by: identifying highly qualified teachers of reading, who are "on loan" from ADE to school districts. These highly qualified reading teachers are housed at each of the 15 county superintendents' offices, providing outreach and technical assistance throughout are large, diverse state. The infrastructure's design lays the foundation in assisting us in reaching three critical goals: 1) to close the gap between research and practice, 2) to provide professional development that is consistent in quality, while, 3) making these rich opportunities locally accessible.

Our initial first round of reading test results are very, very hopeful, as they reflect significant improvements at the kindergarten level, in some of the schools with the poorest achievement records. Last August, only 9 % of students entering full-day kindergarten were up to par with their peers nationally in pre-reading skills. After taking part in scientifically based reading programs this year, more than half of these same kindergartners have reached grade level and are ready for first grade.

In addition, as we further delve into public engagement following our first successful High School Reform Summit, co-hosted with the U.S. Department of Education (April, 2004), we will recommend strengthening technical assistance and support for literacy teaching and learning in our middle/secondary schools: a need that was expressed strongly from our outstanding principal and teacher leaders during the Summit. Therefore, it will be critical that the K-3 Reading First initiative ex-

pand, with the assistance of increased federal funding, to help us provide critical training and staff development in reading in the higher grade levels.

In order to keep all children ahead—vs. behind—we must keep the continuum of improved student successes going—which is founded on providing high quality staff development, embedded in scientifically researched practices that work in our classrooms. This is a HUGE investment in advancing highly qualified teachers, and a much-needed one in advancing student achievement and successes for ALL students.

5) Arizona's Commitment to Develop Data Elements: tied to tracking teacher quality and student achievement:

Within the process of updating Arizona's certification system, we are investigating implementing a value-added system, by establishing individual teacher identifiers, tied to student achievement.

According to Kati Haycock, Education Trust Director, "Teacher effectiveness data systems are an essential and powerful tool in the effort to raise achievement and close the achievement gap" (The Real Value of Teachers: Using New Information about Teacher Effectiveness to Close the Achievement Gap" report by Kevin Carey). Such systems help us find out which teachers are the most effective, by matching them with the most needy students. Such data also provides critical information as to what types of professional development are the most effective, as well as which trainings and professional learning opportunities help them grow. States that are currently implementing a value-added component, tied to student achievement results, clearly demonstrate what we already know: that teachers have the biggest impact on student achievement.

This is another condition needed if we are indeed going to promote and enhance truly highly qualified teachers in our classrooms. We have yet to close the achievement gap in this state with our minority student population and with those students living in poverty. It is imperative that we take a hard look at the research that has been done in Tennessee, where students that were assigned with the most effective teachers for three consecutive years, performed 50 percentile points higher on a 100-point scale—than comparable students assigned to the least effective teachers for three consecutive years.

Overall, many teachers support measures that recognize the growth students make through their teaching. They strongly desire accountability in this important arena. Yet, systematically shifting higher performing teachers to working with students who need them the most, is no easy task in our current, complex system, both state-wide and nationally. The bottom-line is, it's difficult to accurately measure and control the value of teachers. However, these challenges should not halt us from attempting to try implementing a value-added system. I can only imagine the quality of teachers we may "pool" because of such an effort.

Closing:

Teachers are the fundamental resource of education.

We need to treat our teachers as the answer to embracing excellence in teaching and in learning: because they ARE our resource. Therefore, maybe the focus needs to shift from that of only the STUDENT, to the important, critical role to that of the TEACHER. Once this shift occurs, then I predict that the conditions will fall into place regarding "the whole highly qualified picture", which consists of: highly qualified teacher preparation, highly qualified teacher recruitment, and highly qualified teacher retention, by supporting them with high quality resources and staff development, embedded in rich, evidenced-based practice.

Then, we must celebrate our teachers' successes by honoring their achievements and disseminating their exemplary practices. Student achievement will then soar with these conditions in place, as long as they are fostered by strong instructional/school/district and state-wide leadership.

[Attachments to Dr. Butterfield's statement have been retained in the Committee's official files.]

Chairman MCKEON. Dr. Noone.

**STATEMENT OF DR. LAURA PALMER NOONE, PRESIDENT,
UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX**

Dr. NOONE. Chairman McKeon, Congressman Porter, I would like to add my welcome to you to the Valley of the Sun and especially welcome you to the University of Phoenix.

It's a great honor to have the Committee here as it performs its noteworthy work on teacher quality.

As an institution of higher education, the University of Phoenix currently enrolls over 14,500 teachers or soon-to-be teachers in education-related degree programs.

These individuals are either seeking the credential to become licensed teaching professionals or are returning to college to complete masters and doctoral degrees.

This makes the University of Phoenix one of the largest programs of teacher preparation and professional development in the United States.

No one can argue with the concept that having the highest quality teachers in the classroom in America is a good thing.

Research findings show that the teacher and his or her professional qualifications has the greatest affect on the student's academic success.

This comes as no surprise. Determining what exactly constitutes a high quality teacher is a bit more difficult.

No Child Left Behind defines highly qualified teachers largely in terms of formal academic content preparation.

Certainly teachers must have a solid working knowledge of the content they will teach, but pedagogical knowledge or the skills, expertise, and experiences necessary to teach a class well cannot be minimized.

To say that a teacher's quality should be measured by one area of expertise alone, such as their knowledge of or degrees within a specific content area can trivialize the importance of producing an overall professional educator.

How one teaches a course in terms of understanding the various methods students use to learn, using accepted content standards on which to base instruction, and applying appropriate assessment methods to verify that standards have been met are all vital requirements of a high quality teacher.

The intent of No Child Left Behind is to ensure that every child has a highly qualified teacher.

It provides guidelines as to what constitutes a highly qualified teacher and, at the same time, mandates that states develop alternative certification programs.

Typically alternative certification programs require no prerequisite course work in education for admission. The candidate's professional knowledge is gained by placing him or her in the classroom as the responsible teacher of record.

The charge to create alternative routes to certification affects both approval of teacher education programs and the individuals who pursue those programs while establishing a less regulatory-laden, burdened route to those who don't.

This is very troublesome for the University of Phoenix and other teacher preparation institutions. We work very hard to meet state

requirements, but these efforts can easily be sidestepped by these alternative routes.

These alternative certification routes often ignore content and pedagogical preparation in favor of on-the-job training.

While we laud the goal of preparing more teachers for the classroom, the situation creates two systems of certification, one highly regulated and one with little regulatory and assessment requirements.

To address teacher quality at the University of Phoenix, we are designing programs that lead to state certification.

Currently we offer the Master of Arts in Education program with initial licensure for Elementary Teacher Education, Secondary Teacher Education, Special Education, and Administration Supervision.

These programs are approved to be offered in Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Michigan, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Wyoming and the commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

In addition to the local campus programs, the University of Phoenix offers education programs through our online delivery modality.

The online delivery allows students located outside the state of Arizona in all settings to access and complete the necessary course work to become a certified teacher.

The Master of Arts in Education/Teacher Education program is an Arizona-approved teacher preparation program which, upon successful completion of the program, qualifies a student to sit for an Arizona teaching certificate and obtain an Institutional Recommendation from the University of Phoenix.

Although this program provides a viable option to address the nationwide teacher shortage, the University has encountered many roadblocks in offering the program to students nationwide.

Some states require all schools who would propose to have a student teacher within their state to have state-specific program approval.

Therefore, although the University may have no contact with the state other than the presence of a prospective student teacher resident, we cannot secure a student teaching placement until we obtain the state's approval.

The University continues to seek those approvals in additional states to offer the teacher preparation programs, but honestly, the timeframe for obtaining these approvals is often extremely protracted.

Therefore, if a student enrolls from one of these states, the University must obtain a partnership with the state institution in that state that already has the requisite state approval.

Many states have adopted the requirement that students must attend an NCATE-accredited institution in order to become licensed in the state and will not allow non-NCATE institutions to partner with NCATE schools.

As a result of those states, the University of Phoenix has no option to form partnerships whatsoever.

Still, other states have unique teacher certification programs. This means that an Arizona teaching certificate is not at all comparable.

Consequently, students who obtain that Arizona certificate are not able to become certified in these states without an abundance of additional course work or, in some situations, a repeat of their student teaching experience within the state of certification.

In conclusion, the problems relating to producing the additional number of high quality teachers required are not insurmountable.

It is possible to mount a national effort that can make a significant difference in educating excellent teachers, and institutions like the University of Phoenix are well positioned for the task.

But the creation of standards for teacher preparation is currently a state-by-state endeavor, and the process of navigating the intricacies and nuances of every state's processes is daunting, expensive, and time consuming.

Very often the requirements are arcane, and the process is designed to discourage innovative approaches.

Assessment of individual teacher performance is itself a complex issue. We would urge you to consider a more holistic approach, such as what the State of Arizona has endorsed, to determine teaching qualifications.

A teacher should be judged on the whole of their performance, including pedagogical approach, classroom management, and content.

Merely adding up credit hours on their transcript does not guarantee a highly qualified teacher nor does the absence of a specific course on a transcript condemn a teacher to mediocrity or substandard performance.

Similarly, alternative certification programs must be held to the same set of standards of accountability to produce high qualified teachers both in terms of content and in terms of pedagogy.

Thank you for allowing me to present this testimony on behalf of the University of Phoenix.

And I would also like to thank the staff of the University's College of Education for assisting me in the preparation of these remarks.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Noone follows:]

Statement of Laura Palmer Noone, Ph.D., J.D., President, University of Phoenix

At the outset, I would like to welcome you all to the Valley of the Sun and especially welcome you to the University of Phoenix. It is a great honor to have the subcommittee here as it performs its noteworthy work on teacher quality.

As an institution of higher education, the University of Phoenix currently enrolls over 14,500 teachers or soon-to-be teachers in education-related degree programs. These individuals are either seeking the credential to become licensed teaching professionals or are returning to college to complete master's or doctoral degrees, many in response to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements of highly qualified teachers. Others are seeking pay grade advances, while others are hoping to move to administration or to a specialty area such as bilingual education or reading. All told, this makes the University of Phoenix one of the largest programs of teacher preparation and professional development in the United States. It is from this perspective that I offer my thoughts on the condition of teacher preparation today. I have been asked to address my remarks to three areas—the importance of teacher quality; the need for NCLB highly qualified teacher requirements; and the efforts of the University of Phoenix to help schools ensure teachers have at least acceptable, if not superior, subject matter knowledge for the subjects they teach.

THE NEED FOR HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS

Much like baseball and apple pie, no one can argue with the concept that having the highest quality teachers in the classroom in America is a good thing. Although we in the education field have long proclaimed the importance of having qualified and caring teachers within K-12 school settings, studies linking teacher quality to proved student performance are limited. Researchers such as William Sanders, Richard Ingersoll, and Linda-Darling Hammond have been able to put some form of quantitative measurement to the degree of importance that qualified teachers play in students' academic success. Their findings show that the teacher, and his or her professional qualifications, has the greatest effect on a student's academic success. This comes as no surprise.

While no one argues with this concept, determining exactly what constitutes a high-quality teacher is a bit more difficult to identify and define. Certainly teachers must have a solid working knowledge of the content they will teach. For the University of Phoenix this concept is paramount. Indeed, we insist that our faculty members be practitioners within their respective fields of expertise and licensed to teach in the public school systems. Pedagogical knowledge or the skills, expertise, and experiences necessary to teach a class well cannot be minimized. To say that a teacher's quality should be measured by one area of expertise alone, such as their knowledge of or degrees within a specific content area, can trivialize the importance of producing an overall professional educator. How one teaches a course in terms of understanding the various methods students use to learn, using accepted content standards on which to base instruction, and applying appropriate assessment methods to verify that standards have been met, are all vital requirements of a high-quality teacher. The University of Phoenix, as well as many other teacher preparation programs throughout the country, believes in producing a well-rounded teacher: one who knows his or her content area, understands and practices the methods of learning and instruction, and handles the daily rigors of a K-12 environment well.

THE NEED FOR NCLB HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

The Secondary and Elementary Education ACT or No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is an ambitious piece of legislation. Through forces not necessarily within their control, many states find themselves in the position of having a shortage of qualified, licensed teachers willing to instruct. This often results in non-certified teachers in the classroom, by means of emergency or temporary certification.

The intent of NCLB is to eliminate this problem and thereby ensure that every child has a highly qualified teacher. NCLB addresses qualification by placing a heavy emphasis on adequate content knowledge in order to ensure that persons entering the teaching profession have documented expertise in the area in which they wish to teach. The guidelines as put forth in NCLB for states to certify individuals as "highly qualified" are as follows:

- Having a bachelor's degree
- Having certification or licensure as defined by the state
- Being able to demonstrate competency (as defined by the state) in each core academic subject he or she teaches.

Various changes have been made to these guidelines in response to states concerns over being unable to meet the aforementioned requirements for individuals teaching in rural areas, teaching across multiple science areas, and teaching multiple core academic areas.

NCLB Teacher Quality Grants also mandate that states must follow certain variables in order to receive the federal grant monies. Variables in this mix include:

- Reconstruction of certification to verify content and pedagogical knowledge
- Institution of adequate support services and assessment of beginning teachers
- Creation of alternate routes to certification
- Recruitment and retention of teachers
- Reformation of tenure systems
- Establishment of sufficient professional development services
- Implementation/enhancement of a reciprocity system for teacher credentials across states

These variables appear to make assumptions about the quality of state certification systems and the quantity of individuals interested in teaching. Yet, there is substantial debate about whether these assumptions are adequately supported though either state certification or research-related data.

Many states have developed or are initiating programs that provide alternative routes to teacher certification, particularly for mid-career professionals. The goal of such programs is to draw a diverse pool of individuals with backgrounds in particular fields into the teaching profession. Requirements for an alternative teaching

license vary by state. Generally, applicants must hold a bachelor's degree in the subject to be taught, achieve a passing score on state-required examinations, complete some type of teacher preparation program (these are usually provided by school districts), and possibly fulfill a supervised teaching internship. After satisfactory completion of these requirements, the applicant will be issued a teaching credential.

There can be great differences from state-to-state as to what additional training and coursework is required and how much support is offered to the new teacher once he or she is in the classroom. Typically, alternative programs require no prerequisite course work in education for admission. College graduates from all accredited universities, including international ones, are admitted. The candidate's subject matter knowledge can be demonstrated by examination as well as by the major. The candidate's professional knowledge is gained by placing him or her in the classroom as the responsible teacher of record. The primary faculty members who instruct the teacher candidates are classroom teachers serving as on-site mentors.

Admission to an alternative certification program is usually predicated upon the teaching candidates going through the hiring process of a school district and then being placed as a beginning teacher of record, with no previous education coursework or experience. The evaluation of candidates is based on their demonstrated competencies with the students they teach and by their students' achievement, which of course varies greatly between school districts and states.

The charge to create alternative routes to certification is an indicator of the desire from NCLB authors to continue mandating rigorous regulatory procedures. These mandates affect both approval of teacher education programs and the individuals who pursue these programs, while establishing less regulatory-laden routes (and more circumspect in quality) for those who don't. This is very troublesome for the University of Phoenix and other teacher-preparation institutions. We work very hard to meet state requirements but these efforts can be easily sidestepped by state alternative routes. As evidenced above, these alternative certification routes often ignore content and pedagogical preparation in favor of "on the job training." While we laud the goal of preparing more teachers for the classroom, the situation creates two systems of certification; one highly regulated and one with little regulatory and assessment requirements.

NCLB has done many positive things for improving teacher quality. It puts states "feet to the fire" to provide the necessary proof and documentation of how teachers are tracked within their profession by schools/districts and makes state agencies responsible for verifying the quality of teachers. NCLB requirements do make teacher education programs more responsible for the content areas of their graduates and their ability to meet state certification/licensure examinations (also through Title II of the Higher Education Act).

However, there are some issues with implementation of NCLB. The statute requires states and school districts to comply with the provisions of the new law while ignoring the importance of the two key requirements related to teachers. States feel they have been pressured to implement NCLB provisions related to school choice, supplemental services, and academic testing immediately. The choice and supplemental service provisions uproot students and take money out of school district funds, which many feel could be used to train and retain more qualified teachers.

It is not enough to test students and label them and their schools as failing. We must help teachers work effectively as the professionals they are and encourage retention and growth as well as an increase in effectiveness. The federal government has not fulfilled its promise to the states to create the plans and definitions necessary to recruit, retain, and support quality teachers (Leaving Teachers Behind, 2003). By working with districts, the teachers unions, other community organizations, as well as state and local governments, the NCLB can assist in ensuring that the plans necessary to fulfill the promises of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 2001 may be realized. This includes working together to define what a highly qualified teacher is in each state, to determine what kinds of information should be presented on the school report cards, and to create the programs and plans necessary to create equity in the teaching force (Leaving Teachers Behind, 2003).

ADDRESSING TEACHER QUALITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX

Colleges of education are faced with difficult choices in the debate over teacher quality. The following section addresses some of the decisions made by the University of Phoenix in addressing teacher quality.

Seek national accreditation for teacher education programs

At the University of Phoenix the College of Education is seeking national accreditation from the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). Our application for the teacher education and administration programs will be submitted by September 1, 2004. The decision to seek programmatic accreditation is tied directly to benefits to our students. Many states are beginning to tie their state licensure standards to graduation from a programmatically-accredited course of study.

Align programs to national and state standards

All of the master's programs offered in the College of Education are aligned to the unit standards set forth by the National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE). The program curricula are aligned to applicable state standards and the program standards designed by the Specialty Areas Studies Board approved by NCATE. In this way, the University intends to prepare students to sit for state licensure exams and provide the competencies sought by each state in credentialing teachers.

Design programs to lead to state certification

The College of Education currently offers the following Master of Arts in Education initial licensure programs: Elementary Teacher Education, Secondary Teacher Education, Special Education, and Administration and Supervision. These programs are approved to be offered in Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Michigan, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Wyoming and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In addition, the College of Education is in the planning stages of offering two additional initial licensure programs: the Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education and the Master of Arts in Education in Early Childhood Education.

Develop additional courses in mathematics, English, and history content areas

To satisfy the highly qualified teacher mandate of the No Child Left Behind legislation, the University is developing 24 upper-division credit hours in each of the content areas of mathematics, English, and history. By offering these courses we will assist educators who are, for whatever reason, teaching out of their content areas to be in compliance and to remain in their current classroom.

Verify content-area proficiency

Teacher Education candidates must pass their state's professional knowledge exam prior to being issued an institutional recommendation for certification/licensure by the University. Performance on these exams is reported in the annual Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II report, produced each spring by each state. On average, our aggregate student scores on the professional knowledge exam meet or exceed a 98% pass rate.

Ensure high quality, authentic assessments

The College of Education has several mechanisms in place to assess candidate quality and progress. The progression requirements of each program determine whether the candidate is ready to move forward in the program and begin the student teaching or internship experience. Progression requirements include:

- Passing score on the University's Basic Skills Proficiency Assessment in Reading, Grammar, and Mathematics
- Achieving passing scores on the formal interview
- Submitting a two-page typewritten statement detailing reasons for wanting to become a teacher, including any past experiences in teaching
- Verifying fingerprint clearance
- Submitting two professional letters of recommendation completed in the past year
- Providing verification of immunization or TB test results (Not all schools/districts require this.)
- Verifying content knowledge mastery prior to enrolling in student teaching courses

Throughout the program, each candidate is required to develop his or her own Electronic Portfolio with specific artifacts included as evidence of knowledge and skills. These artifacts are evaluated against established rubrics and are aligned to our program standards. Candidates must maintain minimum competencies on the portfolio and receive a passing graded score on the overall product at the end of the program.

During student teaching, candidates complete a teacher work-sample project in which they must create a multiple-week, standards-based unit; create and implement pre- and post- assessments; make accommodations for diverse learners; and reflect on the unit once it is completed. As an added component of this assignment,

candidates must track the progress of two students and detail the students' progress during the unit. The teacher work sample is a graded assignment, the results of which affect whether the student passes or fails student teaching.

During the administrative internship, candidates compile the vast amounts of material they accumulate and performance evaluations into an Internship Notebook. Along with the materials and evaluations, candidates must provide reflections on the various stages of the internship experience. The notebook is a graded assignment with significant impact on passing or failing the internship experience.

Continue and improve extensive field experiences, student teaching, and internships

Throughout the Special Education, Elementary, and Secondary Teacher Education programs, candidates are required to complete a minimum of 100 hours of verified field experience, covering a variety of developmental levels. The focus of each observation is related to specific course content. Documentation is maintained in the candidate's professional portfolio.

Student teaching is an integral component of the Special Education, Elementary, and Secondary Teacher Education programs. It provides candidates with a field-based experience at the appropriate grade and content level. Student teachers work with a cooperating teacher from a school site as well as a University of Phoenix faculty advisor. The student teaching experience is designed to enhance practical experience in a controlled environment and to emphasize the achievement of state standards leading to certification. This experience presents individuals with growth opportunities that best prepare them to assume the duties of a certified classroom teacher.

Each candidate in the Master of Arts in Education, Administration and Supervision program is required to complete a practicum experience in an appropriate P-12 school. Candidates are under the direct supervision of a University faculty supervisor and a licensed school administrator who will act as the site supervisor. The practicum is divided into three sections (EDA 590 A/B/C) each of which coincides with the coursework completed in the master's program.

Survey graduates and their employers

Alumni of the College of Education are surveyed to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the programs in order to continually monitor and update the curriculum. Alumni are asked to evaluate texts, assignments, faculty knowledge, faculty preparedness, faculty facilitation, applicability of course content, curriculum, and academic rigor. The alumni survey provides valuable data about a graduate's experience with the Education programs.

Employers of alumni from the College of Education are asked to rate our graduates on the quality of teacher preparation, instructional design and planning skills, management of instruction and students, use of assessment measures, communication, collaboration, willingness to participate in professional development, demonstration of content and professional knowledge, and integration of technology. The University terms employers of our students "shadow consumers" of our programs and places high value on this feedback.

UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM STATE CHALLENGES

In addition to the local campus programs, the University of Phoenix offers Master of Arts in Education programs through the online delivery modality. These degree programs are Arizona-approved programs. As indicated in the NCLB, approximately one third of all school districts in the United States are classified as rural. The online delivery allows students located outside the state of Arizona in all settings access to complete the necessary coursework to become a certified teacher. In particular, the Master of Arts in Education/Teacher Education (MAED/TED) program is an Arizona-approved teacher preparation program, which upon successful completion of the program, qualifies a student to sit for an Arizona teaching certificate and/or obtain an Institutional Recommendation from the University of Phoenix. Although this program provides a viable option to address the nationwide teacher shortage, the University has encountered many roadblocks to offering the program to students nationwide.

We believe the University of Phoenix is in a position to assist America by providing more highly qualified teachers. Many times these efforts are stymied by roadblocks and challenges. The following outlines the main categories of challenges the University of Phoenix has encountered regarding student teacher placement and certification through our online program of study.

In some states, the higher education board expects all schools that have a "physical presence" established within the state, evidenced by student teaching in that state, have state-specific program approval. Therefore, although the University has

no contact with the state other than the presence of a student teacher/resident, we cannot secure a student teaching placement unless we obtain the said state approval. The University continues to seek approvals in additional states to offer the teacher preparation programs, but the timeframe for obtaining these approvals is often extremely protracted. Therefore, if a student enrolls from one of these states, the University must obtain a partnership with a state institution that has the requisite home state approval. While we have established partnerships with other institutions, most were partnerships developed with a "one time placement" in mind. The majority of these partnerships will not facilitate future student teachers.

As mentioned earlier, many states have adopted a requirement that students must attend NCATE-accredited institutions in order to become licensed. Institutions that are NCATE accredited will not partner with institutions that are not. As a result, in NCATE states, University of Phoenix is unable to form any partnerships.

A few states have unique teacher certification programs. This means that an Arizona teaching certificate is not at all comparable. Consequently, students who obtain an Arizona certificate are unable to become certified in these states without an abundance of additional coursework or other items, such as teaching experience in the state of certification.

Departments of education, higher education boards, and institutions of higher education are in a constant state of flux trying to ensure that the quality of teachers and educational personnel is at a premium. As a result, policies and procedures change frequently, as do the relationships between different educational agencies. The No Child Left Behind legislation may encourage yet more changes in many agencies with which the University of Phoenix deals on a regular basis. As a result of these changes, one of the most challenging aspects for any multi-state institution will be to maintain awareness and affiliation with the range of state licensing agencies.

It is not often that one gets the opportunity to advise a distinguished body like this on how to solve national issues. I do not believe that the problems related to producing the additional number of high quality teachers we require are insurmountable. Under the present system, however, we will be hard-pressed to solve them. There is a saying in the literature of continuing quality improvement that goes, "every process is perfectly designed to produce the results it is producing." And MIT's Peter Senge has maintained that for the most part "structure determines behavior." We believe that it is possible to mount a national effort that could make a significant difference in educating excellent teachers and that institutions like the University of Phoenix are perfectly suited to the task. The creation of standards for teacher preparation is currently a state-by-state endeavor and the process of navigating the intricacies and nuances of every state's process is daunting, expensive and time consuming. Very often the requirements are arcane and the process is designed to discourage innovative approaches. So long as the status quo largely remains, our efforts to produce significant numbers of teachers who are prepared to really make a difference will produce uneven and disappointing results.

CONCLUSION

Like any issue of national magnitude, creating a nation of highly qualified teachers will not be an easy task, especially when there is little-to-no consensus on the definition of the problem. There are many issues, including states' rights to oversee the process of licensure, funding availability, as well as the performance of colleges of teacher education and the performance of individual teachers in the classroom. Assessment of individual teacher performance is itself a complex issue. Some states have taken an approach of merely counting content area academic credits to determine highly qualified teachers, but other states have chosen to take a more holistic approach to determining professional qualifications. We would urge you to consider the latter approach as the better way to determine teaching qualifications.

A teacher should be judged on the whole of their performance, including pedagogical approach, classroom management, and content. Merely adding semester hours does not guarantee a highly qualified teacher. Nor does the absence of a specific course on a transcript condemn a teacher to mediocrity or substandard performance.

Thank you for allowing me to present this testimony on behalf of the University of Phoenix. I would also like to thank the staff of the University's College of Education for their assistance in the preparation of these remarks.

REFERENCE

Leaving teachers behind: How a key requirement of the No Child Left Behind Act (Putting a Highly Qualified Teacher in Every Class) has been abandoned. (2003). Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now. Washington, D.C.

Chairman MCKEON. Dr. Solmon.

STATEMENT OF DR. LEWIS C. SOLMON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, EDUCATION, DIRECTOR, TEACHER ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM, MILKEN FAMILY FOUNDATION

Dr. SOLMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Porter. It's an honor to be here today and to support Congress's and the Administration's good work in No Child Left Behind.

And before I get into my remarks, I would just want to urge you to keep fighting and keep pushing it ahead because some of the comments that we're hearing are frustrating on our side as well. So I encourage you to go on.

I was asked to talk about the Teacher Advancement Program which is a program that the foundation has set up.

And I would like to start by just giving you a little background rationale, quickly describe you the program and its outcomes.

I won't go into the importance of quality teachers. That's already been talked about.

Let me just say that one of the implications of not having people in the field is that in low SAS schools, 61 percent of science teachers, as an example, are not qualified in science. Some of them have not had a course since junior high school and are teaching science.

That's a very horrible thing to have. We have tremendous turnover among the teaching corps. A third leave in 3 years. And it's the best ones who leave.

We have a maldistribution of high quality teachers such that the best teachers are not in the schools that need them the most.

And the result is that 50 years after the Brown versus the Board of Education decision, which has been mentioned, 69 percent of all 4th graders are not proficient in reading. 60 percent of African American 4th graders cannot read. That means they're below basic.

Well, we have looked, at the Milken Family Foundation for the last 20 years, we have looked at a variety of reforms, early childhood education, standards and assessment, and particularly technology.

And our conclusion was that, no matter what reform you implement, without a quality teacher, nothing matters.

Would you rather have a class of 20—well, would you rather have a class of 40 with a stimulating, exciting, well-prepared, knowledgeable teacher? Or would you rather have a class of 20 with a dullard?

We looked at technology, and we concluded after about 5 years of work that you can put all the hardware and all the software and all the wiring in a classroom, but if a teacher does not have the motivation and ability to get the skills that they need to change what they are doing, no matter how much technology you have, nothing will work.

And, indeed, every school in the country's wired and test scores are not going up.

We became convinced, actually about 6 years ago, before No Child Left Behind, that a bold new strategy was required for the education profession that counters the drawbacks of low compensation, lack of career advancement, unsupported accountability demands, and ineffective professional development that has plagued the teaching profession.

And we believe the Teacher Advancement Program is that bold new strategy. It's comprised of five principles, the most discussed of which is performance pay. A dirty word in some circles. Hopefully not here.

However, unlike other new-pay plans, TAP supports its plan with a strong performance assessment system, a new type of professional development that deals with real issues teachers face in their classrooms and helps them prepare to be assessed and provides multiple career paths so that teachers can advance as in other professions.

Every teacher who leaves is a cost because you've got the cost of recruiting a new one and inducting them, but if we keep attracting people into the same old profession, they are bound to leave.

So let me just take a couple of minutes on the five principles of TAP. First of all is multiple career paths.

What other profession do you enter in day one with a title, teacher, and a set of tasks, and 30 years later you retire with the same title and the same set of tasks?

That's not very attractive to certain kinds of people.

So what we do is we have a whole stage or set of stages. You start out as an inductee. Then you become a career teacher, then a mentor teacher, and a master teacher.

Each of those steps has increasing levels of professional qualifications, responsibilities, authority, assessment rigor, and compensation.

Now, one might say, isn't that the same as those old failed career ladder programs of 10 to 20 years ago?

What happened 20 years ago is you took the best teachers and you made them a master teacher. You gave them a title, probably a plaque, and maybe a little bit of money, \$200 to \$500, and gave them a lot more work.

Is there any wonder it failed?

It's disrespectful to take good people and not reward them for extra effort. So that's multiple career paths.

The second thing is performance-based accountability.

Today teachers get evaluated once a year, if that, by a principal who goes in, does a checklist, everybody passes, no problems.

Our professional accountability system has performance standards with research based evaluation of performance based on what works, what makes kids learn.

Are they doing the things in their classroom that make kids learn?

There are five performance levels.

Nobody gets a five. We believe all teachers can do better. And our evaluation includes not only teacher performance but student performance. A little more on that in a minute.

People are afraid: We don't want to evaluate teachers because the principal could be biased or show favoritism or whatever.

We have trained, certified evaluators that the Milken Family Foundation trains and certifies.

Teachers are evaluated six or more times a year by multiple evaluators, mentor and master teachers, as well as the principal and, as I said, six or more times by multiple evaluators.

And when they are evaluated, these are not punitive. We look at what teachers are doing and say, you might need a little help here. And then we provide the help.

And performance is tied to accountability.

Then we change the schedule of the school to be able to provide during the day on an ongoing basis for at least 90 minutes a week what we call ongoing applied professional development.

Teachers meet in groups of five-nine teachers led by a master mentor teacher looking at the student data, student portfolios and the evaluations that they received in their classrooms.

And the question is asked, what do you need to do to become a better teacher?

Now, I was the Dean of the Education School of UCLA, and I don't mean to speak for the University of Phoenix or Gene Garcia who I think is in the room from Arizona State.

But I know that, really, at UCLA, in the time that I was Dean, much of our professional development was based on what interested the faculty.

If our faculty were doing research on something or if there was a new hot topic, they would offer it, and if the time was convenient, the teachers came and took the classes.

That had nothing to do necessarily with the fact that a particular teacher could not teach long division very well.

Our kind of professional development says, your kids are not scoring well in long division or in converting fractions, so let the master teacher go in and actually teach a lesson in your class, to demonstrate, to model the lesson, to show them how to do it, then watch you do it and to see if you're doing it well.

That is professional development, not taking courses in the latest fad that interests a University faculty.

Now, then there's performance pay.

Salary is determined by the responsibilities and effectiveness of performance. Higher pay is granted for excellent teacher performance as judged by experts. There are different functions and abilities as they move up the ranks, and student achievement in a value-added way.

Now, some people say—we talked about the nepotism already, but we don't want—it's not fair to look at student achievement because some people get smarter students than others. That's what value added solves.

We look at improvement. So if you've got a student at the 20th percentile and you can bring her up to the 50th, that may actually get you more of a compensation bonus than you would get for having students at the 80th and moving them to the 82nd percentile. So value added takes away the advantage of having smarter students.

But again, performance pay alone is not enough. It has to be supported by a strong transparent and fair teacher evaluation system, professional development to deal with deficiencies, et cetera.

So I said 50 percent of the bonus is on skills and knowledge. 50 percent is on the student achievement. Half of that, roughly, schoolwide and half of that for what the individual teacher's students learn.

What other profession doesn't look at what you're producing when they determine your compensation?

Now, it's an expensive program. It costs about \$400 a student. Money has been found in districts, the State Department of Education budgets, new state appropriations. There have been ballot initiatives in several states. Private foundations have helped, Federal funds from No Child Left Behind.

Our program is written in as an allowable use of Title II funds. Many states are using their Title II funds both at the state 5 percent holdback and the amount going to the districts to support this program.

And we were fortunate enough to get a fund for improvement of education, a grant from the Department of Education last year.

Just to conclude with some results.

We're now in eight states, moving to Ohio and Minnesota next year, and possibly Texas. We started out in 2002–2003 with 31 schools.

We now have over 70 and will have over 80 next year.

Now, what everybody wants is results.

I wrote something in Education Week a couple of months ago that said that policymakers want results too soon. You know, they pass a law in January and want to know if it's had any effect on student achievement in June.

That's OK. It's reasonable. But in any case, we have some early results. And I'll tell you two kinds of things.

Our main goal is to improve student achievement. Our first goal is to improve student achievement.

We were able to compare 25 TAP schools in different years, less than 25 schools, but looking at them year-to-year, growth in student achievement compared to controlled schools, similar schools not doing TAP.

Our schools beat the controlled schools 70 percent of the time. Now, my boss, Lowell Milken says, "Why only 70 percent?"

Well, the answer is, the closer you adhere to our model, the more likely you are to actually beat the controlled schools.

But the RAND Corporation did a study of comprehensive school reform schools which have been in business for 10, 15 years longer. We had been in business two to 3 years when we beat the controlled schools 70 percent of the time.

The RAND study found that comprehensive school-reform schools beat their controlled schools 47 percent of the time in math and 50 percent of the time in reading which is like flipping a coin. And they were in business for a lot longer time.

The other wonderful story, and I'm pleased say that Linda Califano, who's the principal of one of the schools that I'm going to talk about now, Rose Lane School in the Madison School District in Phoenix—We do four out of seven schools in the Madison School District, our TAP schools. Some of them said, we have high achieving students, we don't really need to do it.

They didn't ask about value added. They just said they had high achieving students. But the ones with the lowest SAS, the lowest achieving schools decided to do TAP.

And of those, we looked at the two lowest SAS schools, and over the last 2 years they hired 61 teachers. Over the last 3 years they hired 61 teachers.

21 percent of those hires at low SAS schools came from either the higher SAS schools in the Madison School District or high SAS schools in surrounding districts.

Now, as you know, the flow of teachers is—generally low SAS schools are generally the farm team for the rich suburbs or the rich schools. Kids can't get a job. They go into low SAS schools. As soon as an opening comes, they move into high SAS schools.

TAPS seems to have—yet it's early, it's a small sample at this point, but what we have seen here and anecdotes that we have heard from our schools in our 10 other states tell us that when you have a professional system, a systemic reform that provides career advancement, rewards for getting student achievement, collegiality by working together to get better, all of those things attract teachers even to low SAS schools.

So we're very excited. We're seeing good attitudes. We're seeing teachers feeling much stronger feelings of collegiality, higher teacher satisfaction. So we're very pleased.

We believe that in order to attract, retain, motivate, and develop high quality teachers, we need to change the environment of the schools; we need to have career advancement; we need to have performance pay; we need to have a good evaluation system; we have to change the way professional development is conducted.

I hope more schools in Arizona will use the model of the Madison School District. They are certainly doing it all over the country.

In South Carolina they have decided to use the Teacher Advancement Program as one of their programs for technological assistance for schools that need improvement.

In Florida they have legislated something called Better Education for Students and Teachers, the BEST program which funds districts, whole districts to take on TAP or TAP-like programs.

So it's going on around the country. And we're very excited and we are looking forward to working with the No Child Left Behind legislation in the future.

Chairman MCKEON. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Solmon follows:]

Statement of Dr. Lewis C. Solmon, Executive Vice President, Education and Director, Teacher Advancement Program, Milken Family Foundation, Santa Monica, California

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lewis C. Solmon will be representing the Milken Family Foundation. The Milken Family Foundation is a nonprofit public benefit organization, qualified under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code to undertake educational and other charitable activities. While the Milken Family Foundation does not advocate any specific legislation, the Foundation does engage in nonpartisan analysis, study and research on education policy issues and presents its views on legislative proposals when requested to do so by appropriate governmental officials.

Testimony by Lewis C. Solmon will provide the committee with an overview of the Milken Family Foundation's Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). TAP is a comprehensive, whole school reform that provides teachers with career path and ad-

vancement opportunities; compensates expert teachers for their skills and responsibilities; restructures school schedules to accommodate teacher-led professional development; introduces competitive hiring practices; and pays teachers based on how well they instruct and how much their students learn. These components make the teaching profession more appealing, the job conditions more manageable, and the pay for high quality teachers more generous. Currently, TAP is being implemented in eight states: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, and South Carolina, including the entire districts of Eagle County, Co.; and Sumter County, Fla.; and in schools in the Archdiocese of Indianapolis. TAP expects to start in Ohio, Minnesota, and possibly Texas next fall. Over 75 campuses are now involved—impacting more than 34,000 students and 2,100 teachers—and that number is expected to grow even more by the beginning of the 2004–05 school year. These schools are supported by a variety of funding sources, including private foundation grants, legislative appropriations, increases in property tax levies targeted for TAP-like programs, sales tax increases, general revenues from state budgets, district funds and federal dollars available through No Child Left Behind.

NEED FOR IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY

Quality teachers are central to assuring an excellent educational experience for every young person in America. That is why No Child Left Behind (NCLB) has made teacher quality a pivotal element of its school improvement program. In polls, the public consistently ranks strengthening teacher quality among the most important issues facing education (Rose & Gallup, 2002). Moreover, this view is supported by a large body of academic research demonstrating that the single most important school factor related to increased student achievement is having a high quality teacher in the classroom (Haycock, 1998; Marzano, 2003; Rivkin, Hanushek & Kain, 2000; Sanders & Horn, 1998).

Yet, despite the evidence that quality teachers are of utmost importance, until No Child Left Behind, ensuring a quality teacher for every student has not been a priority in the myriad attempts to improve public schools. In fact, of the over 360 unique school reform ideas proposed in the Phi Delta Kappan between 1987 and 1997, less than one percent focused directly on improving teacher quality (Carpenter, 2000). And, of the few reforms that have addressed the issue, none to date has proved equal to the challenge. None has had the scope, force and focus to attract high-caliber talent to the American teaching profession, then to motivate, develop, and retain it.

Unfortunately, the current academic quality of students pursuing careers in teaching is not very high. Students who express an interest in teaching tend to score at the bottom of college and graduate school entrance examinations such as the SAT and GRE (Educational Testing Service, 1999). And for those currently teaching, quality varies tremendously. Good teacher produce six times the learning gains when compared to ineffective teachers (Haycock, 1998).

It is ironic that this testimony is being written on the half century anniversary of the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* decision outlawing deliberately segregated schools. Yet today, more than 60 percent of black fourth-graders can't read. The achievement gaps between students with different ethnicities, languages, and residences persist. I have attached some charts to demonstrate the low levels of achievement in the U.S. today and some illustrative gaps¹.

Despite *Brown's* ending state-sanctioned segregation, many urban districts today are overwhelmingly comprised of minorities, leading to the charge that American public schools have been "re-segregated." This ignores the demography of many large cities where small shares of school-age children are white. It also implies that Black and Latino-dominated schools are unable to provide high quality education. That implication is contradicted by the many minority-majority schools that do achieve significant student learning gains.

The emphasis on segregation detracts from the fundamental fact that too many minority children are being denied a quality education—that there is not yet equality of educational opportunity. Research shows that schools can get substantial achievement gains even for students from the most deprived social, family and eco-

¹To help readers understand the charts at the end of this testimony, several points are offered; (a) the proficient level on the NAEP is the minimum desired goal, and those scoring below basic simply cannot read, (b) to give some perspective to NAEP scale scores, the data suggest that an increase of ten points on the NAEP scale is roughly equivalent to an increase of one grade level, (c) to be considered "college ready," a student must graduate from high school, must take certain courses in high school that colleges require for the acquisition of necessary skills, and must be able to demonstrate basic literacy skills.

conomic circumstances. And the most important school-related factor affecting student achievement is the quality of the teacher.

But we do not have enough high quality teachers, and there is a serious mal-distribution of the best. The best teachers usually want to teach where their job will be easiest, safest and most rewarding, that is, in schools with higher SES families. The most qualified teachers in the inner city are most likely to move when there is an opening in the suburbs. They rarely get any recognition, financial or otherwise, for staying with the more challenging situation. New teachers fill the vacancies in the in the poorest schools, spend their first few years trying to figure out what to do, and by the time they become effective teachers they move on, only to be replaced by other neophytes. Meanwhile, the most advantaged children are assured a constant flow of the best teachers.

So we must develop models that will attract more of our best and brightest into teaching, then help them develop as effective teachers, and keep them in the profession. More importantly in the spirit of Brown, we must keep many of our best teachers in schools where they can help our most needy students. Significant extra compensation for those teaching in the poorest schools will help. Equitable distribution of resources (e.g. textbooks, equipment) will help as well. It is crucial that we no longer think of teachers whose students end up with the highest test scores as the best teachers, because many high achievers get much out of school support, so they start from a higher position. Alternatively, we must recognize and reward those teachers that get the greatest learning gains from their students, regardless of where they start or end up. If the most effective teachers are incentivized (rewarded) for helping students learn rather than for what students may already know, many of the best teachers will seek to teach those who have the most to learn.

When the quality of teachers available to minority students is as high or higher than the quality of teachers available to whites, all children will have equal opportunities to learn, which was the real purpose of the Brown decision. And that is the goal of the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) as well.

TAP counters many of the traditional drawbacks that plague the teaching profession: low compensation, lack of career advancement, unsupported accountability demands, little collegiality, and ineffective professional development that plague the teaching profession. TAP provides an integrated solution to these challenges—changing the structure of the teaching profession within schools, while maintaining the essence of the profession.

In designing TAP in 1998, the Milken Family Foundation (MFF) staff surveyed the research, consulted extensively with academics and outstanding elementary and secondary school teachers and principals, and applied experiences from success in the private sector. From these sources, we created a five-principle approach. Today, we recognize the close alignment of TAP to No Child Left Behind, specifically Title II that deals with teacher quality.

THE FIVE PRINCIPLES OF TAP

1. Multiple Career Paths

In a traditional school, a single career path exists for all teachers. Teachers with one year of experience or 20 years generally hold the same position, are engaged in the same activities, and have similar authority and responsibilities. There is no potential for quality teachers to grow in their careers; so many simply leave (Elmore, 2000). TAP provides new opportunities for teachers who perform at high levels and have the desire and qualifications to move along a career continuum of as many as six ranks. TAP schools reconfigure their staff by creating master and mentor teachers who are selected through a rigorous performance-based selection process. As a result, these expert teachers now have influence over a much larger contingent of students because it is their responsibility to improve all the teachers under their care. Teachers take on increased responsibilities with commensurate compensation as they progress in the TAP career path. “Career ladder” programs have been tried in the past, most to no avail. Basically, they identified the best teachers, gave them more responsibility and some honor, but little if any extra compensation for their extra work. In this respect, TAP provides significant additional compensation to master and mentor teachers for their qualifications, responsibilities and performance. It makes these extras worthwhile.

2. Performance-based Accountability

In most schools, teacher evaluations are performed by an administrator once a year, and consist of classroom observation scored against criteria with minimal emphasis on content knowledge, effective instructional strategies, and what students

are learning. Teacher evaluation practices at the school level typically do not incorporate teaching and learning elements that have been identified through research as having a positive impact on student achievement. With this weak teacher accountability system, the vast majority of teachers (99.999%) are rated satisfactory or above (Loup, Garland, Ellett & Rugutt, 1996).

In TAP schools, each teacher is observed 6 times by multiple, trained and certified evaluators (e.g., the principal, master teachers and mentor teachers). Rather than a pass/fail system, TAP grades teacher performance on a five-point scale—ranging from unsatisfactory to exemplary on the 21 TAP Effective Teacher Performance Standards that are based on a large body of research from education and cognitive psychology. Since few teachers are rated as fives, our belief is that every teacher can improve, even the best ones.

While classroom observation is an essential component to measure teacher quality, so is student achievement. Part of each TAP teacher's evaluation includes the value-added classroom achievement gains the teacher produces, as well as the school achievement gains from one year to the next.

3. *Market-Driven Compensation*

In a traditional school, teachers are paid on a salary schedule where pay increases as years of experience and education credits accrue. All teachers with the same experience and credits, no matter what, where, or how well they teach, are paid the same. Teachers who excel, as demonstrated by their classroom practices and their students' achievement, receive the same salary as teachers with the same years of experience and credits who demonstrate little talent and produce little in the way of student achievement gains. This, despite research indicating that neither a teacher's years of experience, nor an advanced degree can predict increased student achievement (Greenwald, Hedges & Lane, 1996; Hanushek, 1989).

Research has also shown that performance award programs are successful when they are integrated with strong school leadership, professional development, reliable analyses of student performance, and strong feedback (Odden & Kelley, 1996; Odden, 2000).

The market-driven compensation principle in TAP provides school principals with the flexibility to compensate teachers differently based on their position (e.g., career, mentor or master), their performance, and the performance of their students. Furthermore, principals are encouraged to offer competitive salaries to attract teachers to hard-to-staff subjects like math and science, and hard-to-staff schools. Most TAP demonstration schools have permitted teachers to continue receiving increases in their salary according to their district's salary schedule, while paying master and mentor teachers a salary augmentation. Each school establishes a performance award pool to pay for bonuses based on an individual teacher's yearly performance.

Many former and current performance pay plans have not succeeded because performance bonuses are too small considering the extra work required. Further, the principal alone often determines "performance" in these plans, leading to charges of favoritism and bias. In TAP, performance is determined by multiple evaluators and multiple classroom observations, some announced and some unannounced. Part of the bonus is based on school-wide achievement gains and achievement gains of the students of individual teachers (value-added).

4. *Ongoing Applied Professional Growth*

In a traditional school, the principal often contracts professional development services that are half-day workshops led by outside consultants, or provides release time for teachers to attend classes or conferences held off-site. The assumption is that after this training, teachers will apply what they have learned in their classrooms. However, research on teacher professional development informs us otherwise. Studies of teacher learning tell us that learning is most likely to occur when teachers:

- Can concentrate on instruction and student outcomes in the specific content and context they teach;
- Have sustained opportunities to experiment with and receive feedback on specific innovations;
- Collaborate with professional peers, both within and outside their school; and
- Have influence over the substance and process of professional development (Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002; King & Newmann, 2000; Newmann, Bryk, & Nagoaka, 2001).

These optimal teacher-learning conditions can occur in schools that use the varied expertise of their own teaching staff. The TAP career path establishes a structure where master and mentor teachers provide ongoing professional development, conduct classroom demonstration lessons, give regular feedback on specific teaching

and learning innovations, and design professional development opportunities to meet their fellow teachers' content and grade-level needs. By providing time for weekly, site-based and teacher-led professional growth activities during the school day, TAP schools focus on issues that are current and relevant to classroom practice.

5. Expanding the Supply of High Quality Teachers

TAP schools expand their teacher recruitment and outreach efforts by advertising for positions outside their school, district or even their state. We encourage schools to seek mentor and master teachers from beyond their own current staffs. This ensures that the very best people available provide leadership and professional development to the staff.

IMPACT OF TAP

Over the next ten years, America will need roughly two million new teachers, and as many as possible should be of very high quality. While some may see the ensuing teacher quantity and quality shortages as a crisis, we see it as an opportunity to significantly reform the structure of K–12 education to focus on its most valuable assets—quality teachers. The implementation of TAP allows schools and districts to meet some of the challenges they face. TAP is a whole school reform intended to recruit, motivate, develop and retain high quality teachers in order to increase student achievement. Here are some of the highlights of the current year.

We now have three years of results from TAP schools in Arizona and two years from TAP schools in South Carolina. We compared 25 year-to year changes in student achievement in TAP schools to control schools. In 17 of these cases, or 68% of the time, the TAP schools outperformed their controls. The RAND study of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools concluded that 50% of the CSR schools outperformed their controls in math and 47% outperformed their controls in reading, although the CSR schools had been operating for a substantially longer period of time than TAP. One important anecdotal explanation for the success of TAP is that teaching in TAP schools is improving significantly.

Further, collegiality and teacher satisfaction has remained strong in the TAP schools, despite conflicting research that suggests that teachers who are part of a performance-pay system will experience increased competition and dissatisfaction. These attitudinal results reflect the holistic approach of TAP that combines an accountability system with clear rewards, and a professional development system to support all teachers in improving their classroom instruction.

Additionally, in Arizona, we are seeing some very talented teachers moving from high SES schools that are not doing TAP to low SES schools that are doing TAP. Over the past three years, 61 teachers have started working at the two lowest SES TAP schools in the Madison School District. Of these, thirteen (21%) have come from high SES schools and are considered to be among the very best teachers from the Madison schools or nearby districts. These early results from our TAP schools are very promising and coupled with the anecdotal evidence from teachers, parents, principals and students, we are optimistic about the student achievement gains that will be evident as the program becomes a part of each school's culture.

One year ago, TAP was being piloted in six states (Arizona, South Carolina, and Arkansas, which were subsequently supported in part by a Fund for the Improvement Education (FIE) grant; the Archdiocese of Indianapolis and Eagle County, Colorado, which are funded by other sources; and Florida, which had two schools at the time funded by a state appropriation for the Florida Mentor Teacher School Pilot Program). During the past year, we have added five more pilot schools in Florida, and five schools in Louisiana. In addition, as will be described below, all the schools in Sumter County, Florida have begun to implement TAP bringing Florida's total to 17 schools. Next fall Minnesota will begin TAP in at least six schools and Ohio will join the program. By the end of the current academic year, we will have at least 70 schools implementing TAP across the county, up from 31 in the previous year. We are serving over 34,000 students with over 2,100 teachers.

The Florida legislature has passed the BEST (Better Education for Students and Teachers) program, which provides \$25 million this year to support pilot programs, either TAP or TAP-like, to recruit, retain, develop and motivate highly qualified teachers. Under BEST, Florida has funded four districts from January to June, 2004, and one of these, Sumter County has decided to do a pure TAP model in all their 10 schools with the assistance and support of MFF.

The state of South Carolina has decided to include TAP as one of the options for the schools in that state that need to improve (referred to as their "technical assistance program"). Currently we have several new South Carolina districts inquiring about adopting TAP, and the numbers are expected to increase significantly.

Minnesota received a federal grant to pilot TAP in a large urban district, and a rural district, Waseca County. The evaluation will compare TAP to several ongoing performance pay plans.

Each year we hold a national TAP conference to enable participating TAP states, districts, and schools to share their experiences, and so states interested in joining the program can learn more about TAP. We received requests from eight new states to attend the most recent TAP conference, and this resulted in Texas and Ohio starting the process to participate in TAP.

Currently the TAP program operates primarily in elementary and middle schools. We have begun implementation of TAP in three high schools, and expect more to be added next year. We are working to develop a full high school model.

Our program is gaining substantial national visibility. TAP was highlighted by the Teaching Commission, whose recommendations look like a prospectus for TAP, by Connect for Kids, and by Secretary Paige himself, who in a speech at Dartmouth College said, "I am a big fan of the Teacher Advancement Program—" And recently, Undersecretary of Education Eugene Hickok visited a TAP school in urban Louisiana. He talked about is support for TAP because it emphasizes teachers. "In so many places teaching has become such a solitary enterprise, it's so sad," he said. "It should be collegial." TAP is collegial. We are pleased that TAP is reported on in a very positive manner in both the national and local press on almost a weekly basis. We would be happy to provide copies of the articles.

While TAP yields many positive results, the cost of TAP is roughly \$400 per student per year. These funds are required to pay supplements to master and mentor teachers, to provide performance awards, to hire replacements for master teachers, to hire specialists to free up regular teachers to attend professional development cluster groups, to cover costs of additional testing where necessary, and to pay teachers for extra training days. Too many reforms skimp on money and so become trivial programs that do not garner attention and support from teachers. TAP is significant in terms of compensation and professionalism, but that costs money.

TAP schools are being supported by a variety of local sources including legislative appropriations, increases in property tax levies targeted for TAP-like programs, sales tax increases, general revenues from state budgets, and district funds. We are working with all current and prospective states to develop additional funding sources so they can take over full funding of TAP. We believe that the long-term survival of TAP depends upon the states and districts identifying state and local sources of funds (including NCLB funds), as opposed to grants from private foundations or the federal government.

We are working to encourage participating schools to utilize their NCLB funds, especially their Title II funds to pay for TAP. Indeed, the Non-Regulatory Guidance for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants issued in January, 2004 says "Title II, Part A funds can [also], as part of an overall strategy to improve teacher quality, be used for teacher incentives (e.g., to recruit teachers for hard-to fill positions or retain teachers who have been effective in helping low-achieving students to succeed) or to pay the salaries of master teachers who provide or coordinate professional development services for other teachers." In essence, this is TAP. The following chart describes how NCLB funds are being used for TAP.

State Uses of NCLB Funds for TAP						
State/District	State Title II	District Title II	Title I	Title VI	Title V	CSR
Arizona			✓	✓		
South Carolina	✓	✓	✓			
Florida		✓	✓			✓
Arkansas		✓	✓			
Indianapolis	✓				✓	
Louisiana		✓	✓			

Although the situation has improved in the past year, our experience is that few states have been willing or able to utilize enough of their Title II funds to fully fund TAP. Much of that money was committed previously for class size reduction or for existing professional development programs. As TAP becomes a more proven program, more states are taking advantage of NCLB funds to embark on TAP. Also, as state budget outlooks are improving, more state money will be forthcoming. Nevertheless, the current situation is one where states that are participating in TAP or intend to do so have some money to support TAP, but are continually seeking

new sources of private and public support to enable the purest conformity to the model, and to expand the number of TAP schools. The Milken Family Foundation spends approximately \$3 million annually to support TAP schools. This support is provided through ongoing technical assistance to the schools; collection and analysis of data on teacher attitudes and performance, and student achievement; annual program reviews of TAP implementation; support for directors who work closely with MFF to oversee implementation of TAP at each school; and ongoing development of training modules and implementation processes to improve TAP nationwide.

CONCLUSION

By providing an effective strategy for reform, TAP is working to turn teaching from a revolving-door profession into a highly rewarding career choice. The real reward will be the outstanding education available to each and every student in the country.

In TAP schools, high quality teachers are recognized and promoted; they have access to focused ongoing professional development; they work in a collaborative environment; and they are compensated differently based on their skills, knowledge, responsibilities, how they teach, and how much their students learn. This structure is very different from traditional schools. We are already seeing that these structural changes, modeled on existing best practices in business and on research-based strategies in education and the social sciences, provide opportunities for teachers in the same way that opportunities are available to employees in many other industries (Schiff, 2001). This is resulting in improved student achievement as well.

Chairman MCKEON. You know, as I listen to each of you, I feel excitement and I feel frustration and lots of different emotions because I see such tremendous potential, and yet we have also had lots of criticism.

Years ago I had a friend that was a principal in a high school in the LA city school system, and he told me that they had just done a study.

And they found that from the time somebody conceived an idea in that school district until it became fully implemented throughout the district, it took 25 years.

And the problem is, how many children go through that system in those 25 years? And I think that's why the concept of No Child Left Behind came.

We can't afford to leave children behind, whether it's your grandchildren, my grandchildren, our children.

You know, every one of these children is precious and every one of these teachers. I don't think anybody goes into teaching that doesn't want to be successful.

And yet some of them are not successful. Some of them start out being successful and fade away or go into something else.

I remember when we were holding hearings a few years ago on teacher preparedness, I would ask each of the witnesses what you've kind of all referred to is, and I asked it specifically the way you doctor did, Dr. Solmon.

If you had the opportunity as a mother, you know that some of the teachers are better than others and you want to make sure—you know, my wife was PTA president so she could be close to the school because that had an impact on which class our children got into.

But I would ask the question, if you had a choice because, I mean, there was a lot of emphasis on smaller class size, like that was the end of all problems.

And every mother that I talked to, if she had the choice of taking, as you put it, the best, most exciting teacher, even for a large

class, versus a teacher that was not excited, whether it happened to be a brand new teacher or one that was burned out on the subject with a small class, which would you choose?

And they'd always pick the larger class size because, to me, the most important person in education is the parent and then the teacher. The parent has to get them started and then the teacher has to create the excitement and teach.

And each of us can think back to great teachers we had in elementary school, high school, college. Wherever we were, we can think of good teachers and what an impact they had on our lives.

I have a letter in my desk in Washington. I should just carry it with me all the time, but it was from my third grade teacher a few years ago. And I'm not sure if she's living now, but I received a notice from someone she had moved out of the area. I mean, I didn't live in the area.

But somebody knew that I had been in her class. And she was turning 100 and asked if I could do something to honor her. And we sent her a flag and a commendation.

And she sent me back this letter telling me how—I was the oldest of five sons. I think all of us had her for the third grade. And I remember her saying what a good job my parents had done and how they raised good boys and she was happy that she had been my teacher.

She says, now, I want you and President Bush to do this and this and this. Still working, still excited at age 100, still giving directions to a student.

And I have seen teachers. I have gone in classrooms. And you just get a feeling, you know. You look at what they have on the wall and you can just feel excitement.

I have seen great principals that have taken me around their schools, and I have seen, you know, in this classroom on the door it says "A great teacher is teaching in this classroom."

And you walk in and you feel it and you can feel excitement generating from the teacher, from the principal, and it makes you feel really good.

And then I have been in the classrooms where teachers probably should be doing something else. And it's hard to make a change. I visited a class and this was a magnet school where they brought good kids from all over the city into this area. And I went to the student government class.

And this is a guy, the teacher, that should have been one of the best because these were 8th graders that were, I mean, just 8th graders going on Ph.D.s, you know.

And I walked in. I had already visited some of the classrooms, then I walked into his classroom, greeted him at the door. Nothing against beards and long hair, but they kind of maybe indicate something sometimes.

And I said, how's it going?

He says, great. It's almost 3 o'clock.

And I thought, well, that's a good start. I started visiting with the kids and I started—I could feel what he was putting into them coming back. Why can't we get more money for more supplies? Why don't we have this and that?

At 3 o'clock he left. I mean, we were in a nice visit. He left. And I thought, what a shame, you know. What a golden opportunity.

And he was an attorney. Nothing against attorneys.

But I think he probably had not been successful as an attorney and thought, well, I'll be a teacher. And he's probably not teaching any more, I hope, because he was certainly not helping those young people.

And after a while I listened to all these complaints about, we don't have this and we don't have that. And I said, have any of you heard of Abraham Lincoln?

Yeah.

I said, you know, it seems to me that Abraham Lincoln learned by candle light from his mother reading to him out of the Bible and a few good books. And she instilled in him a desire to learn. And, you know, what did we get from Abraham Lincoln?

So that teacher could have taken that golden opportunity. And then I have seen countless examples of great teachers.

When I was on the school board we instituted a program to—I went to a seminar and they brought back this idea. And so I told the superintendent, I want to have, in one of our meetings each month, of what's good in education.

He's saying, you know, we have tried that in the past, and we would go in and the teacher would start making a presentation and some of the school board members took out a paper and were reading papers.

And I said, well, let's try it. We get in and I remember some outstanding things. We had a teacher in—this was a high school district. And I remember at the start of our meeting we started with what's good in education?

This teacher walked in in Cardinal's robes speaking French. You know, we all sat back. I thought, what an impact that has on children. I mean, do you think that wouldn't make them want to learn French?

And we had another teacher that taught a positive attitude course, and those sections filled up immediately. He was also the baseball coach.

And I remember he started out, he had took a potato and he took a straw and he stuck that straw through the potato. I don't know how many times I have tried that, but I never could do that. But he just motivated and excited those kids.

What is a teacher worth?

I tell teachers the story of, you know, you can count the number of seeds in an apple but you can't count the number of apples in a seed.

And teachers and mothers do not get immediately compensated for their work. Many times they don't see the benefits of their work for 20 years.

I would love to go back and talk to Mr. Vernon who was my physics teacher in high school or Mr. Waldo who was my chemistry teacher and thank them for what they did.

You know, they were never paid enough but they put in the time. They excited students.

Some of you referred to compensation for teachers and how we have performance-based compensation.

How do we do that?

That's a question you can all respond to.

Dr. SOLMON. Well, the way we do it is, we do it as a bonus because we didn't want to initially attack the salary schedule which is, as you know, depends on years of experience and post-baccalaureate credits for increases.

Those things do not seem to be related much at all to what students learn. The first 5 years of experience seems to make a difference with that. After that, not much.

So we try to add on to that a bonus based on how they perform, how teachers perform in class, based on scientifically studied behaviors, and how their students achieve.

But what I would want to say is that I agree that a lot of teachers are paid too little but probably some are paid too much. The one—

Chairman MCKEON. I agree with you totally. And I come from a background of retail business. And we had incentives for our employees. I mean, everything was built around sales and how you increase sales and how you increase through pay and motivation. I understand how to do that.

What I mean is, how do you do it in today's world with unions and their opposition? I mean, has the world changed? When I was on the school board, nobody was going to be paid more than somebody else. I mean, that was taboo.

Dr. SOLMON. We made a presentation actually on Tuesday to the American Federation of Teachers at their policy meeting in New York, and they were quite receptive, not all unions. But the American Federation of Teachers who apparently worked on some of the No Child Left Behind legislation as well, they keep saying as long as its fair.

And when the evaluation system is transparent, when there's opportunities for teachers to get better, where no teachers are hurt by performance pay, they're willing to think about it.

Chairman MCKEON. How are you finding it?

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. Well, in the State of Arizona, the districts are using Prop 301 monies in that arena in terms of rewarding teachers, but that can be viewed as very shallow. I mean, every teacher, for example, might be getting a stipend.

Going back to my comments and Lewis mentioned it also, I think that's why our state is investing incorporating a value-added system and look at truly linking teacher accomplishments with students achievement.

Chairman MCKEON. And how does the union feel about that.

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. I can't speak for the union regarding that.

Chairman MCKEON. But are you running into opposition.

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. I would guess that might be the case.

Dr. SOLMON. But actually they work very closely in the Madison School District with the program there.

I mean, as long as they are involved and the teachers like it—you might ask the principal to talk after the testimony and see what it is.

But my impression is that the unions, when they are involved from the beginning, when they are consulted, when it's not imposed

top down, they are willing to consider it more than if somebody were to come in and say, this is going to happen.

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. And I want to reiterate that I feel, personally, and having been in the classroom, teachers want to be accountable.

Chairman MCKEON. Mr. Secretary.

Mr. SIMON. I'll give you a first cousin to what you're talking about. You said, what works in today's world.

What many schools are doing and what we did in Arkansas to try to at least get the foot in the door to performance pay was to reward school-wide teachers where the school had met or exceeded the State's expectation on student achievement. That did two things.

One, it promoted collegiality among the staff because it wasn't the 4th graders teacher's job to make sure the students passed the 4th grade test. It was everybody's job.

And when the school succeeded, then the money went to that school with the expectation, if the school chose, to share that in the form of a bonus with all of the staff. That got away from any given teacher being singled out.

We also, when I left Arkansas, were looking at the possibility of—this is not exactly performance pay but it was more of an objective measure on where we needed teachers. We needed math teachers.

The statistic I gave over 5 years, our teacher training institutions had graduated 1,193 PE majors and one physics major. Come to find out, the physics major left Arkansas and went to North Carolina. So we really had none.

Shortage areas where we needed teachers, pay a teacher more to go into that field. Pay a teacher more to get a degree in a shortage area. Pay a teacher more that was actually teaching in an area where that teacher had a major, things that we know are successful.

Chairman MCKEON. This is your suggestion or what they actually did.

Mr. SIMON. That was my suggestion at the time. If I'd have stayed around we would have done it. They're making moves to do that.

Chairman MCKEON. Do the unions go along with that.

Mr. SIMON. Yes, pretty much.

Chairman MCKEON. OK. Because if we're not all on the same page and if we're not all working together—like you say, it has to be collaborative and you have to—but not just in education, but many times unions will fight to protect their weakest person, not the strongest.

And people that are working—a good teacher that's doing an outstanding job next to a teacher that's just putting in the time causes real problems.

Now, you say, if you gave the whole school and you tried to get everybody working together, it would increase the productivity, it improves collegiality. Also if it's not done properly it can destroy collegiality. So that's an important thing.

Mr. Secretary, in No Child Left Behind, we're hearing praise, we're hearing criticism.

What do you see thus far?

And, you know, I appreciate, you pass a law in January, you want the results in June. The regs aren't written yet. It takes a long time to get that.

But what do you see are the real shining points that thus far are coming from this law?

Mr. SIMON. I think the shining points, No. 1, and this results from direct conversation we have had with teachers, is that just the attention that's being paid to student achievement is causing student achievement to rise. It's causing schools to pay attention to every child.

While they are arguing whether they really believe every child can learn or whether they believe it's fair that subgroup size is what it is in a given state, whether they believe there's enough money being set aside to do it, what I call the form issues, teaching is still going on.

And this has focused attention on the absolute necessity of believing in children and teaching the standards.

So that alone is causing some improvement.

No. 2, I think there's a very positive in the fact that we're, at the present time, considering 40-plus state accountability system amendment requests which tells us that states are looking at what other states are doing and looking within their own accountability plans and deciding, hey, we can do this a little better.

I don't see it as gaming the system as some people put it. I think states are really paying attention to this, really want what's best for kids.

I know that's true in schools. They want what's best. They are struggling to find a structure to make that happen and they are changing, and I think that's good. They are not satisfied with the status quo.

Our orders from Secretary Page are to wring every ounce of flexibility out of the law. I think we have done a good job of doing that over the past few months.

Yesterday I was occasioned to be in Missouri and we heard from some superintendents over there making the same comment. We think we're headed in the right direction. We appreciate it. The dialog is open and I think that's good.

Chairman MCKEON. Thank you. Mr. Porter.

Mr. PORTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate all your testimony. Let's talk about, Dr. Butterfield, some of the Arizona challenges. When it has to do with, not necessarily teacher recruitment, but what's the term that we use to keep them?

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. Retaining.

Mr. PORTER. Thank you. Unscientifically, from my perspective, is that as we're living in these fast-growing states and we're recruiting from around the world and we're hiring a lot of new teachers fresh out of college because of the shortage, it seems like many of them may teach in Nevada or Arizona for a couple of years but then they end up going home.

Maybe it's Iowa or Illinois or New York—no, probably not New York. People are not going east that far.

But are you finding that to be the same in Arizona, that, a lot of it is they get a couple years under their belt and then they want to move back to their home state?

Is that a challenge?

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. I would say that's a challenge.

As I mentioned in my testimony, you know, we're not at the top in being ranked for teacher salary. That certainly is an impact.

But I think, in general, having been in the trenches, teachers need to be highly valued and provided that infrastructure to support them to help them grow to be the best that they can no matter whether they are in year one or in their 25th or 30th year of teaching.

I have been in my own situation in a lot of schools. I'm a charter school founder. When I founded that charter I implemented things with my staff that were very different from traditional district schools.

So I think we need to foster, again, the foundation of support for teachers to want them to stay.

I don't know why their specific reasons are for not staying for more than one or 2 years, but I know that our transition to teacher program, for example, is doing some neat work here in this state in fostering the rolls of Paraprofessionals by providing them with the tools and resources that they need to be highly qualified.

And I was talking a contact in Yuma who was stating, you know, we were hoping to promote retaining and keeping our teachers with this program, but we're finding that if we're utilizing the funds to help train our Paraprofessionals, they are the ones that want to keep on going.

They are getting hooked on about life-long learning and being provided the structure, infrastructure and support where they are now moving on to get their teaching degrees, and they are recruiting and retaining simultaneously.

So I think we need to be looking at the promising and best practices that are out there in terms of retaining teachers and recruiting them.

Mr. PORTER. On that same line, I see a lot of teachers, to elevate themselves financially, decide to go into administration because then that takes it to another plateau or different levels. That's both good and bad—

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. Correct.

Mr. PORTER.—because a good teacher doesn't necessarily make a good administrator or vice versa.

There is a lot of administrators that I would probably suggest they not go to the classroom, but there are a lot of talented folks from both ends. But it seems to me we're seeing a transition to increase their income into administration; is that correct?

Is that happening in Arizona?

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. Well, I think that's been the traditional way that teachers have seen as the only way to move up the ranks, so to speak.

Mr. PORTER. But when I talk to teachers, and pay is always important, especially with rising gas costs or whatever, is a challenge. But I'll be honest with you. The teachers that I talk to, that is not No. 1.

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. I agree with you.

Mr. PORTER. Now, it is, certainly, from a union's perspective. And that's their job. I appreciate that.

But I see teachers leaving because of either the lack of parental involvement in the classroom or in some cases too much because the teacher is not able to discipline the child today for fear of lawsuits and other challenges.

I see teachers leaving because of something you've said now three or four times, and that's just elevating the position, feeling like they can go someplace else and feel like they're getting a little more appreciation.

But I see a lot of teachers that are leaving early not because of pay—

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. Correct.

Mr. PORTER.—but because of these other areas, paperwork—and I know we're trying to streamline it, Secretary, some of the paperwork.

But I'm very concerned that not only is that happening in the classrooms. It's happening in our school boards.

There is not a more important elected official in the community, in my mind, than the board of trustees for a school district.

And in many cases like Nevada, Las Vegas, it's probably the largest business in Nevada.

But what I see happening nationwide is we have a lot of wonderful, caring people that run for office for school boards, but many of them probably shouldn't because, again, their expertise may be in the classroom or they may be a wonderful parent.

But I think we also need to elevate the school board of trustees around the country to the position of prominence that they deserve and give them the tools they need.

And I think that would help also all the way down to the teachers as we elevate the importance nationwide of being in the profession.

Now, from a Federal perspective, Secretary, I hear constantly that we're underfunding education as a whole.

And if my understanding's correct, under the Bush Administration, it's up about 43 percent.

And then what I hear on the other side of that, those that are—and it's a Presidential election year so people will complain no matter what, but I what I hear is, we have increased funding by 43 percent, we have put all these extra mandates on all these districts, so the 43 percent increase means absolutely nothing.

How do you respond to that, Mr. Secretary? How best to explain to the community how the dollars are being spent and if it's an adequate amount?

Mr. SIMON. A couple of ways. And we're seeing this as we view studies that are being done around the country on how schools are spending money.

And by the way, there have been at least three independent studies on No Child Left Behind that have said it's not an unfunded mandate, two by the GAO and one from Massachusetts and another think tank, and I can't recall exactly the name of that right now. Anyway, three or four studies have indicated it's not.

What we are hearing, and it's the same concern that teachers have told us and principals have told us, that, incorrectly, No Child Left Behind is seen as something in addition that has to be done in addition to what's going in the states right now.

And if you look at it as in addition to, then I could see where people would have the misunderstanding that it's a mandate without money attached to it.

But, in fact, it's not meant to be in addition to. It's meant to be in place of. It's meant to be an opportunity to work smarter, to abandon the failed practices of the past and do things that work for kids.

We know what a good teacher's qualities are. We know good teaching practices. We know good accountability measures. Those don't have to be done in addition to. They can be done in place of. But we don't want to abandon some things that we're comfortable in doing.

There's been unprecedented levels of funding specifically put in place for No Child Left Behind to deal with—states have been given money to develop tests. They have been given money to use to attract, retain and pay highly qualified teachers.

They have been given money to provide professional development for teachers. Yet we're hearing from teachers that schools are doing away with professional development.

So the reaction doesn't appear to be in tune with the spirit of No Child. I think a lot of that just has to do with: We don't want to abandon our comfort zone.

Mr. PORTER. Am I correct, is it about a 43 percent increase.

Mr. SIMON. Yes, sir. There's several percentages. It depends on which one you look at, but yes.

Mr. PORTER. Also from the Federal perspective, I hear a lot about class size from those teachers that are in the classroom, schools that have 40, 50 kids maybe in the classroom, and that also is causing some frustration for a teacher trying to do the best they can and, literally, limited time and resources and the physical ability.

Is classroom size a problem nationwide or is it just a southwestern phenomenon?

Mr. SIMON. I think class size is a problem everywhere, but the problem is not necessarily in the number of children you have, although there can be extremes.

Research shows that until you—most of the research is at the elementary level. And most of the research that I've seen says you have to get down to a pretty substantially low number, and that's somewhere around 12 to 15 kids, to where class size really makes a difference.

Going from 25 kids in a class to 22, and 22 to 18, it's not going to make a difference.

Teachers. It's not necessarily how many children you have. Does the teacher know how to deal with the variety of students he or she finds in a classroom?

That's professional development again.

You can't treat—all children are not the same. Many times a child's behavior problem or a child's interest in school, how the child feels when he or she comes to school will impact the teacher's ability to teach the rest of the kids. There may be a distraction.

That doesn't mean the class size is too big. It just means the teacher needs some help in how to deal with those children. There are a number of ways of doing that that don't take a lot of money.

It's strategies of teaching. It's common-sense approaches that some teachers don't know how to do. That's why professional development on how to deal with that is so important.

As a number of people have said today, I'd rather have a high quality teacher that knows the content that has a feel for kids in a classroom of 40 than I would an incompetent teacher that doesn't want to be there in a class of 20. 40 kids are going to come out far better.

So in my mind, putting money on highly qualified teachers, professional development, preparing the teacher both in content and pedagogy is a far better use of funds than trying to reduce class size unless you have plenty of money to get that class size down.

Chairman MCKEON. Dr. Solmon, you had a comment.

Dr. SOLMON. Yes. When they talk about underfunding education, I mean, my question always is, what's enough.

We have a PowerPoint slide that we often show where, over the last 30 or 40 years you see funding going like this and test scores going like this.

So in a very macro way, despite the tremendous increases in funding over the last several decades, we have seen no increase in student achievement. So, therefore, just throwing more money at the problem is not going to solve it.

Another comment I would make, as I'm sure you know, I mean, the Federal Government provides 8 percent of spending on schools. So I mean, to say that schools can't function because the Federal Government isn't providing enough, if they, you know, provided, you know, 20 percent more or whatever, it would still only get it to 9.6 percent. So it doesn't really matter.

The comment I wanted to make about teachers leaving, although it's hard to imagine that people would leave Nevada or Arizona for Iowa, as you hypothesized, is that if they moved from Nevada or Arizona to teach in Iowa, it's my understanding they would have to go back to school.

And so, in other words, we don't have interstate portability of—

Mr. PORTER. It's a problem coming east to west also.

Dr. SOLMON. Right. So the point is that I think that a lot of those people that are going back to Iowa are leaving the teaching profession.

We've got, I think, almost as many people who could teach not teaching as we do have people teaching in this country.

And the other comment I wanted to make, you say that pay is not important to teachers. And I agree with that because that's why they are teachers. I mean, if the pay was important, they wouldn't be teachers.

But I do have to say that we conducted focus groups of very bright young college graduates who had considered teaching but decided not to do it.

And to them, not only was the level of compensation important, but the distribution.

A lot of the kids that—I went into an interview in a district and asked them how much I would make if I was the most successful teacher 20 years from now because they had always been successful in academics and extracurricular.

And the district recruiting person pulled out the salary scale and said, this is what you'll make in 20 years. And he said, how about if I'm good? No. This is what you'll make in 20 years. There may be a new contract, but this is what you'll make in 20 years.

Those people decided to go into law or medicine or business or something because they said, if I'm good, I want to be rewarded for it.

So it's not the people in teaching who care about money. It's the people who didn't come into teaching.

Mr. PORTER. And I want to make it clear that pay is very important. It's just that when I talked to those that are leaving, it isn't on the top of the list. It's in the four or five. But it is very important.

But you're right. I think you summarized it well, that a lot of it is those that didn't go into the profession, absolutely.

And I'll be honest with you. I don't know how a main bread winner could survive on a teacher's salary and raise a family and not have another job or have a spouse.

I mean, I don't know how you can do it. You can't. And that is a challenge nationwide.

Dr. BUTTERFIELD. I would also like to add, in regards to recruiting teachers and especially those who are the brightest ones, whether they are in another profession or recent college graduates, the needed area in breaking down the barriers of teacher certification, whether it be through reciprocity, state to state, maybe taking a look at tiered certification, new ways to recognize outstanding teacher accomplishments and their achievements.

Arizona's Certification Task Force is also looking into those areas. So it's important to break down barriers.

Mr. PORTER. I'd just like to conclude with one comment that I don't think we've addressed today nor will it be answered today.

You know, I mentioned earlier comparing it to the operating room of 100 years ago. But if you look at what's required of a teacher today as compared to 100 years ago, we're expecting teachers to be doctors, lawyers, priests, rabbis, you name it, in the classroom.

The whole system has changed so much. And we expect all that out of teachers that are making \$40,000 a year.

But also a lot of parents don't give the teachers the support. But then at times maybe that's correct.

But the child's in a classroom 9 percent of his life or 10 percent of his life.

But we're expecting teachers, in 10 percent of that time, to be everything to these children. Many of them don't have parents or don't have anyone at home.

And I am convinced that we have to find a way to compensate and to encourage, to help this structure as it's changed in the last 100 years because it's not just about educating or learning.

It's life skills. It's everything. And we have to find a better way to do it together. And I believe we can do it. But with a teacher that's expected to do all this in a few hour's time, we have to look at the whole system.

And I appreciate No Child Left Behind. I think it's taken major strides in helping set some standards.

But I think we need to take it to another level.

And that is, our teachers are counselors and psychologists and they are having to be everything to everybody. And I think we have to realize that, that the system has changed.

So thank you all very much for your testimony and for your being here.

Chairman MCKEON. Thank you, Mr. Porter.

And I want to thank all of you today, the witnesses, for being here. And if there's something that you wanted to add that you didn't get that you would like to have in the testimony, we will keep the testimony open and you can get it to us.

This is not, you do something one time and then that takes care of it for the rest of eternity. This is a process that will continue.

And so I think it'll take 12 years to fully implement No Child Left Behind.

In the meantime, that kindergarten student will graduate from high school but a lot of other children will be coming along behind. And we need to do all we can to motivate and excite those teachers to every day realize that they have an opportunity to change and improve lives.

And our country depends on it.

You know, there are other countries around the world now that are starting to do a better job of education, and we're finding that in some areas we're falling behind. And we need to redouble our efforts.

And I want to thank you, Mr. Secretary, for what you're doing to do the implementation.

You know, this is a very big country. And when I told the story about the school district that took 25 years to get something through, you can imagine how, as you travel around the country, I'm sure you hear people that say, "well, that's not what I heard," because there is a lot of misinformation out there.

And if we can do whatever we can to get the correct information out there and wherever we find ourselves in the role where the water's trying to get down to the end of the row, if we can get it past us and help others to get it past them because the ultimate person is your grandchild, your grandchild, you know, these children out there that maybe don't have a grandparent or a parent because we don't know which one of them will be the next Einstein or the next person that's going to—the next Lincoln, change the world.

And we can't afford to lose what any of them can give back to us. So thank you for your participation here today.

Mr. Porter.

Mr. PORTER. Thank you. You know, I have to tell you about this cartoon before we go. The cartoon was in a Las Vegas newspaper probably 7 years ago, and I have kept it. And it was an editorial cartoon.

And it showed a child standing in a circle of people. And the child's standing there kind of looking like this. And there's a teacher pointing the finger at an administrator pointing the finger at a board of trustee pointing the finger at a legislator pointing a finger at a Governor pointing a finger at a congressman pointing a finger at a senator.

And the kid's standing in the middle like this.

We just can't allow that to happen any more because we have allowed a lot of the blame game to happen in education. And that visualizes for me every day—I keep it in my desk. I see it every day—of how we can't allow that to continue. And that happens a lot.

And the second thing I want to leave with you, please take a look at background checks on teachers in your states, and as you cross the country. Make sure that we, from a security standpoint, are doing everything we can also.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McKEON. Thank you. If there is no further business, then, this Committee stands adjourned. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional material provided for the record follows:]

Additional Statement of Karen Butterfield, Ed.D., Deputy Associate Superintendent, Innovative & Exemplary Programs, Arizona Department of Education, 1993 Arizona Teacher of the Year

Dear Chairman McKeon and Congressman Porter:

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to testify in Phoenix on 4/27/04 on issues surrounding highly qualified teachers. I also appreciate that additional testimony can be included.

When the question came up regarding, "Why are teachers leaving (Arizona)?" which included thoughtful discussion regarding quality pay—I and my fellow colleagues at the Arizona Department of Education felt strongly that LEADERSHIP is critical at the school, district and governance levels, if we are to recruit and retain our best teachers. Therefore, it is this element of which I would like to include as additional testimony.

I think we can all agree that highly performing schools are those often led by visionary, passionate leaders, who support their teachers and staff tremendously. They are highly visible within the school/community, foster innovation and risk taking, and ensure the right tools and resources are allocated for successful teaching and student learning. Systematic and systemic "thinking and doing", along with implementing shared leadership, are imperative elements to embrace if schools are truly to change in order to foster highly qualified teachers, high quality schooling.

The Arizona Department of Education has embarked on Arizona LEADS3: Leaders in Education for the Advancement and Development of Student and School Success. Utilizing three major state partners (City of Phoenix as a municipality, a tribal nation and Pima County), we will be offering leadership institutes to support and advance student achievement through coaching, mentoring and providing resources to help school administrators and their teams with disaggregating of data, including data analysis. Successful Arizona school leaders will mentor and coach those who are struggling with school performance, many of which, are dealing with the conditions I mentioned in my testimony ("revolving door" of leadership with administrators/teachers/governing board members). AZ LEADS3 will focus on recruitment, leadership preparation, induction and continuous improvement.

In this month's Phi Delta Kappan, the article, "Leading Small: Eight Lessons for Leaders in Transforming Large Comprehensive High Schools" (Copland and Boartright), states the imperativeness of systemic change in leadership, especially in restructuring our schools. Leaders who nurture a different culture of shared, distributed leadership, involve the critical stakeholders, and who are willing to battle the status quo—provide the necessary conditions for long-term, systemic and positive change.

Although pay and good teaching conditions are important to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, we cannot leave out the most important factor in the recruiting/retaining equation—that of sustained quality school, district and governance leadership.