Lee Hysan Lecture Series in Education
Faculty of Education
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

High Performance Schools: School is Everybody's House

Jane C. Conoley

Faculty of Education   Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

About the Author

Jane C. Conoley is Edith S. Greer Distinguished Professor of Educational Psychology, and Dean of Education at Texas A & M University.

[Currently (2010), the author is Dean of Education at the University of California, Santa Barbara.]

Educational Policy Studies Series

Education embraces aspirations of the individual and society. It is a means to strengthen human resources, sustain competitiveness of societies, enhance mobility of the underprivileged, and assimilate newcomers to the mainstream of the society. It is also a means to create for the populace an environment that is free, prosperous, and harmonious.

Education is an endeavor that has far-reaching influence, for it embodies development and justness. Its development needs enormous support from society as well as the guidance of policies that serve the imperatives of economic development and social justice. Policy-makers in education, as those in other public sectors, can neither rely on their own visions nor depend on the simple tabulation of financial cost and benefit to arrive at decisions that will affect the pursuit of the common good. Democratization warrants the emergence of a public discourse on vital matters that affect all of us. Democratization also dictates transparency in the policy-making process. Administrative orders disguised as policies have a very small audience indeed. The public expects well-informed policy decisions – those that are based on in-depth analyses and careful deliberation. Like the policy-makers, the public and professionals in education require a wealth of easily accessible facts and views so that they can contribute constructively to the public discourse.

The Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research of The Chinese University of Hong Kong provides the space for rational discourse on important educational matters. From time to time, the Institute organizes "Education Policy Seminars" to address critical issues in educational development of Hong Kong and other Chinese societies. These academic gatherings have been attended by stake-holders, practitioners, researchers and parents. The bulk of this series of occasional papers are the fruit of labor of some of the speakers at the seminars. Others are written specifically as contributions to the series.

The aim of this Education Policy Studies Series is to present the views of selected persons who have new ideas to share and to engage all stake-holders in education in an on-going discussion on educational matter that will shape the future of our society.

HIGH PERFORMANCE SCHOOLS: SCHOOL IS EVERYBODY'S HOUSE

Abstract

Combining universal access to school with excellence has been a historic dilemma in U.S. schools. This dynamic tension is appearing in other nations as well as information age occupations demand highly literate workforces.

Schools have adopted multilevel reform efforts to meet the challenges of educating today's children. These efforts include: changes in teacher preparation; high expectations for teacher behaviors in the classroom; curriculum standards; state accountability measures; development of alternative public school models; pilot tests of alternative funding mechanisms for private schools; differential staffing in schools; and the use of high technology to individualize learning.

The goal of providing all children with successful learning experiences is critical from both political and economic necessities. This paper explores the vital ingredients of high performance schools that are, in fact, inclusive. The final argument is that student welfare must be considered holistically with special attention to happiness, relatedness, and self-efficacy.

From the emperor down to the common people, all must consider the cultivation of a person as the root of all. It cannot be that, when the root is neglected, what springs from it will be well-ordered.

The Great Learning I (Confucius, trans. 1928)

The United States has been in the midst of a relentless analysis of educational achievement since the appearance of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The outcomes or goals of this scrutiny are often described in simplistic terms. For example, "every child reading at grade level," "every child connected to the information superhighway," "no social promotion," "back to basics," "phonics instruction for all."

The predominance of slogans represents the intense politicization of primary and secondary education. Governors and presidential candidates vie to be known as the education candidates. Their concerns about U. S. public education are based on rather controversial evidence (Berliner & Biddle, 1995) but the outcome is a nationwide movement toward standards-based education. The meaning of standards-based education is not identical across the U. S. and the relative weights given to various reform strategies differ dramatically (Darling-Hammond, 1996; Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1999; Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, & Watson, 1998; Symonds, Palmer, Lindorff, & McCann, 2000).

This paper describes a model of high performance schools which emphasizes the pivotal role played by teachers and the need for equitable access to success. The rather narrow focus the current discourse on standards creates is critiqued. It aims to show the dynamic links that exist among children's home situations, the qualifications of their teachers, the quality of the instruction they are offered, and their attainment of high level cognitive skills.

I write this paper with great humility, as I am not a philosopher nor historian of education, but a person who is recently intimately involved in education policy in the United States. My humility is also based on my limited understanding of educational endeavors across the globe. I offer this model, however, as a counterpoint for policy analysts in Hong Kong who are taking educational reform into their consideration. Much can be learned by the progress and the missteps of others.

The ecological model presented is composed of influences on student learning. Such influences are quite numerous, so this paper will focus on educative communities, standards for teacher preparation, satisfying and expert careers in education, a rich curriculum, and the system of accountability. The most proximal influence on a child's success is clearly his or her first and lifelong teachers, their parents. As much has already been written about parental influences on children and these may be particularly influenced by culture, it will not be elaborated in this paper.

Educative Communities

Over 25 years ago, Goodlad (1984) published the important critique of public education in the United States, "*A Place Called School*." In this still very relevant volume, Goodlad argued the 21st century would have increasing demands for highly educated people, but certain conditions were in place which have negative effect on schools in producing such people. Goodlad described the conditions as follows:

- A young culture very preoccupied with self and less shaped by home, school, church or temple than in previous generations. Current school organization is a poor fit to their needs.
- The slow response of schools to the technological revolution.
- The poor fit between schools and the workplace. As families became less able to prepare children for the new jobs of the 20th century, schools may not be able to prepare children for the vocations of the 21st century.

It is clear that Goodlad's 1984 predictions have been well-supported. He proposed the need to use and relate more effectively all parts of society: home, school, church, temple, media, museums, workplaces, cultural agencies, and so on. The development of education as a community-wide function would complement the school's special role to provide excellent general education. The impact of an "educative community" is astounding to consider. This concept includes but far surpasses community education practices

in the United States. Rather, it suggests a societal commitment to educate the young in liberal arts, civic participation, and vocational training.

Standards for Teacher Preparation

> I've come to the frightening conclusion that I am the decisive element in the classroom. It's my personal approach that creates the climate. It's my daily mood that makes the weather. As a teacher, I possess a tremendous power to make a child's life miserable or joyous. I can be a tool of torture or an instrument of inspiration. I can humiliate or humor, hurt or heal. In all situations it is my response that decides whether a crisis will be escalated or de-escalated and a child humanized or dehumanized.
>
> (Ginott, 1972, pp. 15-16)

Strong and effective teacher education programs share common characteristics (American Council on Education, 1999; Major & Pines, 1999; Valli & Rennert-Ariev, 2000). The programs are located in universities in which teacher education is a central mission and the arts and science faculties and education faculty are linked around important educational objectives. The programs have received external validation of quality through national accreditation. The contents of excellent teacher education programs reflect important national standards; prepare young teachers to use technology, illustrate adequate invest-

ments in research on teaching and learning; have extensive field-based/case-based/problem-based educational activities, and are followed by effective induction programs.

New Teacher Standards

Of some special interest are the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards. These are being adopted by a number of states in the U. S. as the basis for the first year review of teachers and the basis for initial licensure.

Table 1   Ten Dimensions of Teacher Evaluation

Content Pedagogy	Communication and Technology
Student Development	Planning
Diverse Learners	Assessment
Multiple Instructional Strategies	Reflective Practice/Professional Growth
Motivation and Management	School and Community Involvement

The ten dimensions are quite comprehensive and can be a guide to improvement program for teachers at universities. The standards are well-known to most educators, but some deserve to be discussed. (See Appendix A for brief definitions.)

For example, the standards associated with *content pedagogy* and *diverse learners* have caused some controversy in the States. University teacher preparation programs differ fairly dramatically in the amount of discipline specific coursework that teacher candidates complete. More discipline knowledge and intense pedagogical preparation

are key ingredients for success. Turf and academic status issues have made forging model programs difficult.

Poverty, racism, ethnic and linguistic diversity among children in the U. S. confront even very inexperienced teachers with overwhelming heterogeneity. Many children exhibit low academic performance. Some lessons have been learned, however, about the differential effectiveness of strategies with low performing students. For example, preschool and parent education, supplemental instruction, structured focus on reading, writing and mathematics, extensive teacher development in implementing curricula have all been found to increase children's learning success.

A publication by Jere Brophy (1999) from the International Academy of Education provides excellent specification for the *multiple strategies* standard. Although Brophy makes no certain claim for a set of universally effective teaching strategies, he presents 12 strategies which, in his mind, will have widespread application.

Table 2 Research-based Strategies for High Achievement

Supportive Classroom Environment	Strategy Teaching
Opportunity to Learn	Practice and Application Activities
Curricular Alignment	Scaffolding Students' Tasks
Establishing Learning Orientations	Cooperative Learning
Coherent Content	Goal-oriented Assessment
Thoughtful Discourse	Achievement Expectations

Brief definitions of each of Brophy's strategies are given in Appendix B.

Nothing concerns new teachers more than classroom discipline or the *motivation and management standard*. In addition, recent examples of shocking school violence have frightened many teachers. Although all these incidents were extremely tragic, the actual level of violence in American schools is quite low. Most teachers' complaints are about verbal insubordination rather than physical confrontations. Quick and effective reactions to low levels of aggression are vital, however, in preventing escalations (Goldstein, 2001).

Technology skills have received close scrutiny in recent federal studies. In general, as Goodlad predicted 26 years ago, teachers report only moderate confidence in their technology skills. The availability of hardware and software has greatly outstripped teacher preparation in this area.

Formal and informal assessment skills should be at the heart of effective instructional planning. Formative and summative descriptions of children's learning are key to instructional planning and evaluation. The focus on standardized testing in the U. S. has, however, become increasingly controversial.

Critics, such as Cook, Cunningham, and Tashlik (2000) target the low standards that are actually at the basis of much of the high stakes, and very lucrative testing programs (Katzman & Hodas,

1995). Educational psychologist, Robert Linn (2000), has also sounded a call of concern regarding the programs of high stakes tests that are sweeping the States. He identifies several weaknesses of the programs and warns that, "having high standards is not the same as having common standards. Common standards necessarily narrow the curriculum."

Advanced Teacher Characteristics

University programs can be guided in their graduate programming by consulting the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The focus on preparing and developing teachers of high accomplishment is of the utmost importance in improving student learning. The five propositions of accomplished teaching are deceptively simple. See Appendix C for further elaboration.

Table 3   Attributes of Accomplished Teachers

Accomplished teachers:
· are committed to students and their learning.
· know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.
· are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.
· think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.
· are members of learning communities.

Satisfying Careers in Education

No matter how vital teacher preparation is, educational agencies must be committed to facilitating satisfying careers. Unlike many other industrialized countries, teacher drop out rates in the U.S. are very high. As many

as 50% of new teachers leave the profession after only five years' teaching. This will affect children's performance as teacher experience tends to be correlated with improved student performance (Greenwald, Hedges, & Laine, 1996). There are many reasons why teachers leave the profession. In Texas a majority cite paperwork, administrative hassles, and difficult community relationships as the key concerns (Henderson & Henderson, 1998). The Carnegie Foundation listed ten areas of decision making where teacher involvement is essential to the health of the schools (Barth, 1999). If teachers were seen as leaders within their schools and, in fact, had authority in the following activities, job satisfaction would certainly increase (see table 4).

It is interesting to notice that many of these leadership functions are within a university professor's purview, but almost none of them become regular activities for primary or secondary teachers. Some teachers, of course, when offered the opportunity to engage in school leadership, defer. Many cite already full plates, time pressures from work, family, and community obligations, or unsupportive school administrators. By far, however, the negative influence of peers seems to loom as the biggest roadblock (Barth, 1999). Some rather primitive adult relationships, inertia, risk aversion, and lack of confidence characterize certain schools that do not take to heart the truism from Pogo, "None of us is as smart as all of us."

Table 4   Activities of Teacher Leaders

Teacher Leaders will:
1. Design staff development and in-service programs.
2. Decide on school budgets.
3. Choose textbooks and instructional materials.
4. Shape the curriculum.
5. Set standards for student behavior.
6. Set promotion and retention standards.
7. Evaluate teacher performance.
8. Decide whether students are tracked into special classes.
9. Select new teachers.
10. Select new administrators.

Rich Curriculum

An important support to satisfying work lives for teachers is access to and shared development of rich curricular offerings for young people. Many are more expert than I in curriculum theory, per se, but some obvious elements of successful learning communities have been related to high performance among students in primary, secondary and higher education settings (Astin, 1993b; Carlson, Shagle-Shah, & Ramirez, 1999).

Learning Communities

Many opportunities for student-to-student and student-to-faculty interactions are key. Using highly relevant and controversial topics for students to explore and critically examine is an important basis for knowledge construction rather than mere reproduction. Students are held to high expectations regarding their learning, and exposed to both disciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches that illustrate the multiple ways of constructing meaning.

The best learning communities focus on collaborative and active learning activities (e.g., problem-centered and service-based learning) that explore knowledge from a values base. Civic and service components are used to further the educational agenda. Faculties jointly create programs and team-teach an integrated curriculum. See Appendix D for the full treatment of learning communities.

Accountability

The standards movement in the U. S. has focused accountability on students, teachers, school districts and buildings, and more recently higher education. In Texas, the recent policy that mandates grade retention if children fail grade level competency tests is meant to hold parents accountable for student learning.

Students

In addition to measures of student achievement in reading and mathematics (the primary focus of most testing programs), schools in Texas are ranked according to average attendance, drop-out rates, end of course examination rates, high school completion rates, percentage of students completing an advanced course, and several other variables. Students take periodic tests throughout primary and secondary school studies. Nineteen states require a final test as the criterias for graduation. Texas is unique, I think, in the use of disaggregated data. That is, for a school to meet criterion, all groups within the school must be at mastery levels – Anglo, African, Hispanic, Native, and Other – Americans. This single feature of the Texas

accountability system may be its most powerful feature. The historic acceptance of low performance among poor children of color is now challenged. The demand for universal improvement has, in fact, resulted in some dramatic gains among these groups (Skrla, Scheurich, Johnson, Koschoreck, 2000). The gaps between their achievement and those of the Anglo children have narrowed, but do still remain (Grissmer & Flanagan, 1998).

High performing and exemplary schools receive financial rewards and very high status. Low performing schools are often provided with new leadership (if the low performance continues for three years) and additional resources. Many Texas districts allow parents to transfer students out of low performing schools, adding to the stigma of failure. Report cards for schools based on student achievement (on other variables) are published in 36 states.

Teachers

Accountability for teachers has rested primarily with additional testing programs and mandates for continuing education. Although the performance of their students on state tests is available, as yet classroom data are not made available to the public.

Ironically, however, as teacher certification tests become more common, the pathways to becoming a teacher have grown more numerous. Many loopholes now exist in some states to allow individuals with no formal education in pedagogy to sit for licensure examinations.

Hailed by many legislators as a successful challenge to the university or education school monopoly on the production of teachers, the policies disregard well-established research findings on what adds to student performance.

For example, Ferguson (1991) illustrated the influence of teacher qualifications on student achievement by examining the proportions of explained variance of factors affecting math test score gains in grades 3-6. He was able to show that home and family factors such as parent education, income, language, background, race, and location accounted for 49% of student achievement. Teacher qualifications such as licensing examination scores, education, and experience accounted for 43%. Small classes and small schools accounted for 8%.

Supportive research from Greenwald, Hedges, and Laine (1996) examined achievement gains as units of standard deviation across 60 studies. Notice the following hierarchy that represents the unit gain for every $500 spent on improving one of the variables:

- Lowering pupil teacher ratio   .04
- Increasing teachers' salaries   .16
- Increasing teacher experience   .18
- Increasing teacher education   .22

Clearly, the negative political reactions to university-based programs and the growing shortage of teachers has fueled practices that are highly unlikely to promote high performance schools. (See for example, the 1992 NAEP trial assessment data reported in Darling-Hammond, 1996.)

Universities

In a few U. S. states, universities are now given a "report card" for teacher preparation. This process is most highly developed in Texas but has been legislated nationally. The grade on the report card is based on teacher candidates' scores on state licensing tests. A pilot of the national system this spring, 2000 illustrated the difficulties inherent in ranking universities across the nation and even within the states. In Texas, failure to have at least 80% of teacher candidates pass all their content area and pedagogy tests results in mandatory technical assistance after three years with the threat of eventual closure of a university's teacher preparation programs in failing certification areas. The data on candidates' scores are disaggregated as they are for the primary and secondary schools. All groups must reach criteria for the university to remain accredited.

It is of some concern that most of these accountability pressures have come with no additional resources for teachers nor for universities. For example, teachers are responsible for paying for their own continuing education and universities are not mandated to disperse funds more equitably to schools and colleges of education to upgrade the experiences offered to teachers.

Effects of Accountability Systems

The focus on accountability characterizes educational reform systems in many of the Western countries such as the U.K., Canada, Sweden, Australia, and New Zealand

(Skrla, Scheurich, Johnson, Koschoreck, 2000). It is a controversial emphasis that has produced positive and negative effects for students, teachers, and university programs (Duggan & Holmes, 2000).

Of key importance, of course, are the effects on student performance (The College Board, 1999). Several U.S. states report dramatic improvements in the performance of all groups of children. The results in Connecticut, Kentucky, New York, and Texas suggest that the accountability systems for public schools have improved student performance. In Texas the passing rates in math for white children in 1994 was 73%. For African Americans, the passing rate was only 38%. In 1999, however, the passing rate for whites was 93% and 73% for African Americans (Skrla, Scheurich, Johnson, Koschoreck, 2000).

The combined effects of critical teacher shortage and increased accountability have resulted in several positive trends for teachers including:

- Increased starting salaries.
- Loan forgiveness programs.
- More attention to first year induction programs.
- Attention to improving veteran teacher pay and implementing other teacher retention programs.

University programs benefit from the high stakes accountability by being forced to change some of their traditional ways of educating teachers. For example,

many have experienced:

- Closer partnership between universities and school districts to improve teacher preparation.
- Improved links between colleges of education and colleges of arts and sciences.

The concerns with accountability systems based on standardized tests rest with:

- the validity of the licensure or achievement tests;
- access of minority candidates to the teaching profession and adverse effect on minority children;
- narrowing of the teacher preparation and public school curriculum to reflect the tests;
- failure to mandate associated improvements in workplace and classroom contexts and in teacher development; and
- the paradoxical effect that less qualified people can now enter the classroom.

Despite these concerns, few would predict that the focus on student or teacher testing will fade.

Critique

As with most sweeping movements, intended and unintended, positive and negative outcomes emerge. Standards-based education illustrates exactly this array of outcomes. A balanced critique is somewhat difficult given the movement's different manifestations across the States.

One, perhaps unintended, revelation was that poor children have been systematically disadvantaged by having the greatest proportion of teachers who are either teaching out of field and/or who lack appropriate teaching credentials at all (e.g., The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, 2000). Knowing about this process may not stop it, of course. Awareness that poor children of color have gotten the least prepared teachers does, however, explain some of these children's chronic underperformance.

Increasing pressures for K-16 alignments are another outcome of the political and social attention galvanized through the standards movement. These pressures might be useful mechanisms to improve the educational experiences of young people in higher education.

The current national attention to shortages of educational professionals has certainly alerted university presidents to the huge financial possibilities associated with educating teachers. Schools of education can carefully craft professional development programs for practicing teachers using the standards presented earlier while clearly articulating the humanitarian narrative for the profession of educator. The financial opportunity can be leveraged to influence a projected 2.2 million new teachers over the next decade.

Of all the negative outcomes associated with the standards-based movement, three of them worry me the most.

1. An unquestioning reliance on the results of standardized tests.
2. A potential unraveling of public support for public education.
3. A failure to focus on the improvement of the quality of teachers available for initial and long-term employment in public education.

Because most of the media coverage of the standards movement reports primarily on the positive effects, I will spend more time on issues of concern.

Standardized Tests

As a psychologist and one who edited the Buros Institute's *Mental Measurements Yearbook* (Conoley & Impara, 1995; Conoley & Kramer, 1989; Kramer & Conoley, 1992) for almost 12 years, I look at testing with a fairly favorable and knowledgeable eye. Standardized testing fills an important and positive place in both the standards movement and in evaluating educational programming overall. Authors and publishers of these tests may not, however, be as forthcoming as possible in publicizing the best use of tests and the meaning of results.

Robert Linn, an eminent educational psychologist, has built a career on the development and use of psychometric approaches vital to test construction. In a recent article (2000), he sounds a call for concern regarding the use of testing and the communication of testing results in the States. The pervasive superficial understanding of psychometrics that characterizes most policy makers and some educators also receives his attention.

For example, the widely touted success stories being disseminated in some U. S. states fail to reveal how many children are excused from participating in the tests. Further, the repetitive use of identical tests over time inevitably leads to improvement through practice (by teachers who understand the demands of the test). Another telling issue is the failure of student gains on all state tests to be apparent on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). While not dismissing the positive use of measurement as a cornerstone for educational reform, Linn (2000) offers several guidelines for consideration.

- Include all students in the assessments.
- Require new high quality assessments each year that are equated to those of previous years.
- Seek multiple indicators not a single test. The choice of construct matters and multiple indicators increase the validity of inferences.
- Place more emphasis on comparisons of performance from year to year rather than from school to school. Consider both value added and status in the system as outcomes of the testing.
- Recognize, evaluate, and report the degree of uncertainty in the reported results.
- Evaluate both the intended positive effects and the unintended negative effects of the evaluation system.

As mentioned above, Linn (2000) draws the clear, but apparently not obvious, conclusion that having high standards is not the same as having common standards. Common standards necessarily narrow the curriculum. There is a price associated with a narrow curriculum in this cen-

tury when basic skills are no longer sufficient for living
with high quality.

Of some special interest and perhaps reflecting a
typically U.S. twist are the recent student protests that
have occurred in several states. In a *New York Times*
(April 13, 2000) article entitled, "Blue Books Closed,
Students Protest State Tests" Jacques Steinberg reported
that students refused to take pilot versions of standard-
ized graduation exit tests. One 15-year-old sophomore
from Great Barrington, Massachusetts closed his test
booklet and wrote a six-page essay about how a stan-
dardized exam could never measure the breadth of his
abilities. This action was repeated by several hundred
10th graders in Massachusetts and mirrored a February
protest by 200 students from Illinois.

Public Support for Public Education
Ironically, one pernicious effect of the standards
movement has been to contribute to a loss of confidence in
public education. When all indicators suggest that public
schools are improving dramatically or at least holding their
own in the midst of declining social support (Berliner &
Biddle, 1995), most Americans report that public schooling
is in trouble. Their report, by the way, is most often about
schools outside of their direct knowledge. Overwhelmingly,
Americans rate their local schools as very good to excellent.

This loss of confidence has gathered momen-
tum for a political agenda to use free market logic

in education. Many alternatives to traditional public education are now being discussed and piloted in the States. Some examples are vouchers for parents to choose where to spend public money on their children's education and the privatization of pubic schools through administration by for-profit entities (Symonds, Palmer, Lindorff, & McCann, 2000, February 7).

Most U. S. states have approved public charter schools. There are about 185 charters granted in Texas alone despite the lack of evaluative information on any of the schools. These schools are public schools which can operate free of typical state standards and many regulations. Charters have been granted to school districts, individuals, universities, and to agencies. It is too early to gauge the effectiveness of these schools, but their public, non-religious, and open door policies make them attractive alternatives to the public funding of private schools.

Teachers at the Center

The standards movement has the potential to rally the U.S. public in support of teaching. This would be historic. Although now making headlines, there have been chronic teacher shortages in the U. S. for the past 50 years. Primary teaching has never been a high status occupation in the U. S. – secondary teaching only a bit better on the prestige and salary yardsticks. Colleges of Education across the nation have been under-funded and exist usually at the bottom of the academic hierarchies. Suffice it to say that teachers and those who educate them have never

received a serious level of respect in U.S. culture (Goodlad, 1999).

Current rhetoric touts the central importance of teachers to the success of students. This positive perspective is in danger of being overwhelmed, however, in the face of staggering teacher shortages. Although quality teaching is spoken about, many U. S. states have now created quick entry paths into the profession. These teachers might be successful eventually if their uncredentialed beginnings were followed up with serious professional development, improved working conditions, and a reconfigured school organization – especially a reorganization of teacher career ladders and a serious rethinking of secondary (grades 9-12) education.

Programs such as Teach for America, Troops to Teachers, alternative certifications, and emergency certifications bring more people into the schools but they tend to leave quite quickly. Their lack of coursework in areas known to be related to high achievement in reading, for example, suggest that children are not well served merely by the presence of an adult in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 1996). See also Appendix E for a summary of teacher qualifications and teaching practices correlated with high achievement in reading.

Work in New York (Armour-Thomas, Clay, Domanico, Bruno, & Allen, 1989) and in Tennessee (Sanders & Rivers, 1996) found that differences in teacher

qualifications accounted for significant percentages of variation in student achievement in reading and mathematics. Children with similar standard assigned to highly qualified versus unqualified teachers over a period of three years showed performance differences of between the 29th and 44th percentile for children with three years of poor teaching and between the 83rd and 96th percentile for children with three years of highly qualified teaching. The conservative difference between achievement at the 83rd percentile and the 29th percentile is astounding.

The same powerful forces that would prefer privatized/free market schooling are in favor of an unregulated teacher workforce. Assuming that good teachers will stay and bad teachers will be fired, they rally against higher credentialing standards arguing that having a baccalaureate in a content area is sufficient preparation for teaching. Because these advocates appear to be winning, there will be ample opportunities to judge the effects of that position.

Beyond Standards to High Performance Settings

Watch well over your seed-things and your children! Speak wisely to these our new children! Henceforth they shall be your first speakers, And the peace-making shield of your people.
                                        Zuni creation myth

Many of greatest figures in history were teachers. Buddhist, Taoist, and Zen teachings suggest that care of

the young is not a discrete focus on academic achievement but an organic responsibility of an entire people on entire young persons. The well-being of the young safeguards the health of the entire society.

Levin (1998) previously in this lecture series noted the importance of nurturing analytic, creative, and practical intelligences. He warned against a narrow focus on mere academic achievement (especially I would add as defined by a dominant group) as the benchmark for social progress. His admonitions are well supported in the literature about school grades and adult success. Although there is certainly a positive effect to having higher levels of education on quality of life, there is little correlation between high levels of adult success and particular grade point averages. Very little is actually known about how schooling relates to knowledge and to knowing across the life span (Alexander, 2000).

The goals for young people worthy of our attention go far beyond mere mastery of basic skills. We clearly want to develop children who are capable of:

- High involvement in important tasks that challenge them
- Deep concentration
- Intrinsic motivation

These are characteristics of the psychological state of "flow" (Massimini & Delle Fave, 2000). They represent a commitment to optimal, healthy functioning.

Educative communities (Goodlad, 1984) are

needed to support our young of every color and socio-economic status in achieving the capacity for optimal functioning. Whole communities must focus on nurturing high ability, perseverance, enterprise, courage, and a dissatisfaction with the status quo (Winner, 2000). These are characteristics needed for satisfying lives and for success in the ambiguous future before us. Many case studies of eminent people reveal that their success was a result of their ability, their belief in themselves, and dogged determination to complete a life's work. For example, Newton took 20 years to develop *Principia Mathematica.*

What do young people require to achieve these levels of psychological wellness and health? No simple recipes exist, but recent analysis by Ryan and Deci (2000) suggest meeting individuals' needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness lead to enhanced self-motivation and mental health. When these needs are thwarted, diminished motivation and well-being result.

If standards-based schooling can deliver on its promises to offer all children quality schooling using curriculum that stimulates creative and analytic thought, competence can be achieved. If standards-based schooling is part of a transformation of schools to be nurturing centers for learning that promote individual achievement and collaborative/cooperative learning, young people can learn the important balances between autonomy and relatedness.

Narrow notions of education occurring only within

the school room – whatever the expertise of a teacher, validity of the test, or richness of a curriculum – are unlikely to offer young people tools for the 21st century. With expert guidance from parents, teachers, and community members, however, all children can learn. They can be taught in situations that develop their skills in independent and group work. Their curriculum can be organized around important issues so they understand the mandate for civic participation. Children must be helped to avoid the tyranny of materialism that threatens their sense of responsibility to the whole community. In fact, it may be that in China, the rapid capital globalization will confront cultural values of community, family and social order. Education must be viewed as a communal and holistic process both for the well-being of the community and as a way to establish healthy balances between autonomy and relatedness. Building academic competence without concurrent attention to these other issues is a meager education at best and a threat to the future well-being of society at worst.

When people across the globe are asked if they are happy, it becomes apparent that age, gender, and income are very poor predictors of happiness (Meyers, 2000). In fact, having enough money to meet daily needs is necessary. Of greater importance, however, is a life characterized by close relationships and a belief system that promotes social support, a sense of purpose, and a conviction of hope. High performance schools must have these as important learning objectives. To plan for less is wrong because we know what is needed. Stagnation and

indifference are fundamental enemies of change. Failure to guarantee time, tolerance, perseverance, and sustained support imperils any reform (Barber & Phillips, 2000). Personal, political and economic will is needed. There is no short slogan to capture the goals of creating schools that are, in fact, supportive and challenging learning homes for every child. When this goal is reached, however, the fortunes of the globe will be enhanced.

> Thing being investigated, knowledge [was extended]. Their knowledge being [extended], their thoughts were sincere. Their thoughts being sincere, their hearts were then rectified. Their hearts being rectified, their persons were cultivated. Their persons being cultivated, their families were regulated. Their families being regulated, their States were rightly governed. Their States being rightly governed, the whole world was made peaceful and happy.
>
> *The Great Learning* (Confucius, trans., 1928)

References

Alexander, P. A. (2000). Toward a model of academic development: Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge. *Educational Researcher, 29*(2), 28-44.

American Council on Education. (1999). *To touch the future: Transforming the way teachers are taught*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Armour-Thomas, E., Clay, C., Domanico, R., Bruno, K., & Allen, B. (1989). *An outlier study of elementary and middle schools in New York City: Final Report*. New York: New York Board of Education.

Astin, A. W. (1993a). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Astin, A. W. (1993b). What matters in college? *Liberal Education*, *79*(4), 4-15.

Barber, M., & Phillips, V. (2000). *Fusion: How to unleash irreversible change. Lessons for the future of system-wide school reform*. Education Policy Studies Series No. 32. (Lee Hysan Lecture Series in Education). Hong Kong: Faculty of Education & Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Barth, R. S. (1999). *The teacher leader*. Providence, RI: The Rhode Island Foundation.

Berliner, D. C., & Biddle, B. J. (1995). *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.

Brophy, J. (1999). *Teaching*. Education Practices Series

30

(1). Geneva, Switzerland: International Academy of Education (is available in French and English at http://www.ibe.unesco.org).

Carlson, K. G., Shagle-Shah, S., & Ramirez, M. D. (1999). *Leave no child behind: An examination of Chicago's most improved schools and the leadership strategies behind them.* Chicago, IL: The Chicago School Academic Accountability Council.

Confucius. (1928). *Ta hio: The great learning*. (E. Pound, Trans.). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Conoley, J. C., & Impara, J. (1995). *The twelfth mental measurements yearbook.* Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Conoley, J. C., & Kramer, J. J. (1989). *The tenth mental measurements yearbook.* Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Cook, A., Cunningham, C., & Tashlik, P. (2000, March 8). Unmasking the low standards of high-stakes tests. *Education Week*. www.edweek.org

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future.* Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ball, D. L. (1999). *Teaching for high standards: What policymakers need to know and be able to do*. Consortium for Policy Research in Education Joint Report Series and National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, JRE-04.

Duggan, T., & Holmes, M. (2000). *Closing the gap: Be-

yond the standards horse race: Implementation, assessment, and accountability – The keys to improving student achievement. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.

Ferguson, R. F. (1991). Paying for public education: New evidence of how and why money matters. *Harvard Journal on Legislation, 28*, 465-498.

Fullan, M., Galluzzo, G., Morris, P., & Watson, N. (1998). *The rise & stall of teacher education reform.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Ginott, H. G. (1972). *Teacher and child* (pp. 15-16). New York: The Macmillan Company.

Goldstein, A. P. (2001). Zero tolerance for low level aggression. In J. Hughes, A. LaGreca, & J. C. Conoley (Eds.), *A handbook of psychological interventions.* New York: Guilford.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Goodlad, J. I. (1999). Whither schools of education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 50*, 325-338.

Greenwald, R., Hedges, L. V., & Laine, R. D. (1996). The effect of school resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research 66,* 361-396.

Grissmer, D., & Flanagan, A. (1998). *Exploring rapid achievement gains in North Carolina and Texas*. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.

Henderson, D. L., & Henderson, T. W. (1998). *Texas*

teachers, moonlighting, and morale: 1980-1998.
Huntsville, TX: Sam Houston State University.

Katzman, J., & Hodas, S. (1995). *Class action: How to create accountability, innovation and excellence in American schools.* New York: Villard Books.

Kramer, J. J., & Conoley, J. C. (1992). *The eleventh mental measurements yearbook.* Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Levin, H. M. (1998). *Education and the ability to deal with change*. Education Policy Studies Series No. 15. (Lee Hysan Lecture Series in Education). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Linn, R. L. (2000). Assessments and accountability. *Educational Researcher, 29*(2), 4-16.

Major, C., & Pines, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Teaching to teach*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Massimini, F., & Delle Fave, A. (2000). Individual development in a bio-cultural perspective. *American Psychologist, 55*, 24-33.

Meyers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends, and faith of happy people. *American Psychologist, 55*, 56-67.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperatives for education reform.* Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well being. *American*

Psychologist, 55, 68-78.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Value Added Research and Assessment Center.

Skrla, L., Scheurich, J. J., Johnson, J. F. Jr., & Koschoreck, J. W. (2000). *Accountability for equity: Can state policy leverage social justice?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Steinberg, J. (2000, April 13). Blue book closed. Students protest state tests. *New York Times*.

Symonds, W. C., Palmer, A. T., Lindorff, D., & McCann, J. (2000, Feb 7). For-profit schools. *Business Week*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.

The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. (2000). *Teaching and California's future: The status of the teaching profession*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Author. (www.cftl.org)

The College Board. (1999). *Reaching the top: A report of the national task force on minority high achievement*. New York: The Author.

Valli, L., & Rennert-Ariev, P. L. (2000). Identifying consensus in the teacher education reform documents: A proposed framework and action implications. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*, 5-17.

Winner, E. (2000). The origins and ends of giftedness. *American Psychologist, 55,* 159-169.

Appendix A

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards

Content Pedagogy: the teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Student Development: the teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

Diverse Learners: the teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Multiple Instructional Strategies: the teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Motivation and Management: the teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Communication and Technology: the teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Planning: the teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Assessment: the teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Reflective Practice/Professional Growth: the teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

School and Community Involvement: the teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Appendix B

Research Based Teaching Strategies

Supportive classroom environment

Students learn best within cohesive and caring learning communities.

Opportunity to learn

Students learn more when most of the available time is allocated to curriculum-related activities and the classroom management system emphasizes maintaining their engagement in those activities. This is not just time on task. Teachers promote opportunities to learn by active instruction, by elaborating content for students and by helping them to interpret and respond to it.

Curricular alignment

All components of the curriculum are aligned to create a cohesive program for accomplishing instructional purposes and goals.

Establishing learning orientations

Teachers can prepare students for learning by providing an initial structure to clarify intended outcomes and cue desired learning strategies; using advance organizers - what and why it is important; and by using pretests.

Coherent content

To facilitate meaningful learning and retention, content is explained clearly and developed with emphasis on its structure and connections. Students may not be able to integrate and use

skills that are learned only by rote and practiced only in isolation from the rest of the curriculum. Connect with what is already known. Use authentic learning activities and assessment measures.

Thoughtful discourse

Questions are planned to engage students in sustained discourse structured around powerful ideas. Students are required to think critically, solve problems, make decisions and illustrate other higher order applications. These include debate, discussion, explanation and elaboration of answers.

Strategy teaching

Teachers model and instruct students in learning and self-regulation strategies. They explicitly share what to do; how to do it, when and why to do it. Teachers use modeling and explicit instruction. The teacher thinks out loud making problem solving an overt process. Teachers show how to use rehearsal, elaboration, organization, and affect monitoring to improve learning and performance.

Practice and application activities

Students need sufficient opportunities to practice and apply what they are learning and to receive improvement-oriented feedback. There are three main ways teachers help students learn. First, they present information, explain concepts and model skills. Second they ask questions and lead their students in discussion and other forms of discourse surrounding the content. Third, they engage students in activities or assignments that provide students with opportunities to practice or apply what they are

learning. These activities include reasonable homework at a success level.

Scaffolding students' tasks

Teachers provide whatever assistance students need to enable them to engage in learning activities productively. These include varied, interesting assignments that are sufficiently new and challenging but within the child's zone of proximal development. Teachers prepare students in advance by providing guidance and feedback and reinforce learning by leading the class in post activity reflections.

Cooperative learning

Students often benefit from working in pairs or small groups to construct understandings or to help one with skill mastery.

Goal oriented assessment

Teachers use a variety of formal and informal assessment methods to monitor progress towards learning goals.

Achievement expectations

Teachers establish and follow through on appropriate expectations for learning outcomes. They set high and realistic goals. Teachers set floors not ceilings and realize there is no need to protect students from failure.

Source: Brophy, J. (1999). *Teaching.* Educational Practices Series (1). Geneva, Switzerland: International Academy of Education (is available in French and English at http://www.ibe.unesco.org)

Appendix C

The Five Propositions of Accomplished Teaching

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards seeks to identify and recognize teachers who effectively enhance student learning and demonstrate the high level of knowledge, skills, abilities and commitments reflected in the following five core propositions.

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.

2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.

3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.

4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.

5. Teachers are members of learning communities.

A full description of each of these core competencies can be found on the National Board's website http://www.nbpts.org/nbpts/standards/conclusion.html

Accomplished teaching involves making difficult and principled choices, exercising careful judgment and honoring the complex nature of the educational mission. Teachers employ technical knowledge and skill, yet must be ever mindful of teaching's ethical dimensions. The primary mission is to foster the development of skills, dispositions and understanding, while responding thoughtfully to a wide range of human needs and conditions.

Teachers owe joint allegiance to the forms and standards of knowledge within and across disciplines and to the students they serve.

They must acquire and employ a repertoire of instructional methods and strategies, yet remain critical and reflective about their practice and draw lessons from experience. Teachers' professional responsibilities focus on instructing the students in their immediate care, while they also participate in wider activities within the school and in partnership with parents and the community.

Teaching is often portrayed as an activity that conserves valued knowledge and skills by transmitting them to succeeding generations. It is that and more. Teachers also have the responsibility to question settled structures, practices, and definitions of knowledge; to invent and test new approaches; and, where necessary, to pursue change of organizational arrangements that support instruction. As agents of the public interest in a democracy, teachers through their work contribute to the dialogue about preserving and improving society, and they initiate future citizens into this ongoing public discourse. In the development of its assessment procedures and certification standards, the National Board has sought to represent these ideals faithfully and comprehensively.

Assertions about what teachers should know sometimes conceal inadequacies in the current state of knowledge. In this respect, teaching is not unlike other

professions where practitioners confront unavoidable un-
certainty in their work. However, the knowledge base
for teaching is growing steadily. Professional consensus
and research findings have begun to provide authorita-
tive support for knowledge related to many of the tasks,
responsibilities and results of teaching. But much remains
to be learned.

Source: National Board of Professional Teacher Standards
http://www.nbpts.org/nbpts/standards/conclusion.html

Appendix D

Correlates of Learning Communities

Enhancing Outcomes
- Student-student interaction
- Student-faculty interaction
- Student-oriented faculty
- Discussing highly controversial issues with other students

Negative Associations
- Hours spent watching TV
- Institutional size
- Use of untrained/uncertified teachers
- Full time employment
- Strong orientation toward materialism

Trends
- From student-centered to learning-centered
- Disciplinary and multidisciplinary
- Multiple ways of constructing meaning
- Collaborative learning environments
- Active and collaborative learning
- Values-based knowledge
- Civic and service components in educational agenda
- Programs of coursework that faculty members team teach.
  Course work is embedded in an integrated program of study.

Pedagogical Approaches
- Collaborative/cooperative learning
- Peer teaching

- Discussion groups and seminars
- Experiential learning
- Labs and field trips
- Problem-centered learning
- Lectures and demonstrations
- Writing and speaking across the curriculum
- Ongoing reflection, such as, metacognitive activities and self-evaluation

Faculty Development
- Teaching skills
- Understanding students
- Interpersonal relationships with students
- On-going learning
- Communicating with colleagues
- Writing/critical thinking in context

Faculty Development Needs
- Planning and organizing
- Use of instructional technology
- Evaluation of student learning
- Classroom assessment and research
- Problem solving and learning strategies

Critical Elements of Change Process
- Impetus for change
- Administrative support
- Leadership teams
- Comprehensive view/shared vision
- Strategic plan

- Inclusive planning
- Student-focused goals
- Faculty involvement
- Project director
- Information
- Networks
- Resources
- Incentives and rewards

Source: Astin, A. W. (1993a). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Reading Achievement:
Key Correlates of High Achievement

Teacher Qualifications
- Level of certification
- Level of education
- Coursework in literature-based instruction
- Coursework in whole language
- Coursework in study strategies
- Coursework in motivational strategies

Teaching Practices
- Combination use of trade and basal books
- Integrative language programs
- Integrated reading and writing
- Emphasis on literature-based reading
- Frequency with which students write about what they have read
- Frequent silent reading
- Focus on comprehension and interpretation
- Frequent use of a variety of books and use of the library
- Students write paragraphs about what they have read to assess their reading
- Use of individual or group projects or presentation to assess reading

Source: 1992 NAEP Trial State Assessment; L. Darling-Hammond (1996).

Notes on the Author

Jane C. Conoley is Edith S. Greer Distinguished Professor of Educational Psychology, and Dean of Education at Texas A & M University. Professor Conoley was trained as a school psychologist, and has written about psychological services in schools, such as school consultation, psychological interventions for children and families, psychological assessment, and violence in schools. She has authored numerous scholarly books, book chapters, and journal articles, and has edited many books, including the prestigious *Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook* (1987-1995). She has served in many professional organizations, including as President of Division 16 (School Psychology) of the American Psychological Association. Currently, she is actively involved in the school reform movement in Texas (U.S.A.) through her administrative role as Dean of Education at Texas A & M University.