

NCATE

The Standard of Excellence in Teacher Preparation

Volume 20 Issue 1

QUALITY

teaching



James G. Cibulka
President

Educator Effectiveness We're Poised for a Quantum Leap

This issue of *Quality Teaching* includes articles describing two related new directions in the field—one oriented to improving educator preparation programs through redesign; the other,

building state longitudinal data bases that will yield useful information for teacher educators that provide feedback on which programs are effective and which may need change.

The description of program change in California is a direct result of the recommendations of NCATE's Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning. It is an exciting system-wide change. Both Charles Reed and Chris Steinhauer are members of the Blue Ribbon Panel, and both gave their commitment to move to a clinical model in educator preparation. California is the first of nine states that have offered to serve as initial pilots for implementing the Blue Ribbon Panel recommendations to launch a statewide Alliance to move the agenda forward.

Thus we have a new model of educator preparation to be pilot tested in nine states through a State Alliance in each of those states. Other states are welcome to join.

At the same time, Louisiana is in the forefront in its development of a longitudinal database to link P–12 student achievement to teacher preparation programs. This is a quantum leap for the field. Heretofore, educators could only presume that the programs had a positive impact, but had limited outcome data (such as self-report surveys) to validate claims. Louisiana's model is built on value-added assessment, in which the degree to which new teachers influence the achievement of their students is compared to the growth of achievement in students taught by experienced teachers. Other states are developing multiple-indicator performance approaches.

This is truly an exciting time in the history of educator preparation; new strides are being made which will help educators improve programs to better meet P–12 needs, with the overall goal of improving student learning. We are at the advent of great strides in educator preparation and practice.

continued on page 2

contents

James G. Cibulka
*Educator Effectiveness:
We're Poised for a
Quantum Leap*
cover story

**Charles B. Reed &
Beverly Young**
*The Launch of
the California
Alliance for Clinical
Teacher Preparation
Partnerships*
page 2

**Jeanne M. Burns &
Vickie S. Gentry**
*Louisiana's Value
Added Assessment*
page 4

**Gollnick, Sr. Vice
President, to Retire**
page 9

**Eldridge to Move
into Senior Vice
Presidency at
NCATE**
page 10

Finally, we announce a change in leadership of the accreditation process. Donna Gollnick is retiring after 25 years of service to NCATE. Her knowledge of accreditation has been invaluable as NCATE now transitions to CAEP, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation.

She will remain a Senior Consultant. Likewise, we welcome Deborah Eldridge, dean of the division of education at Lehman College in New York, who becomes the Senior Vice President for NCATE on July 1, 2011, and who will continue in that role as we move to CAEP. ★

The Launch of the California Alliance for Clinical Teacher Preparation Partnerships



Charles B. Reed
Chancellor, California
State University

The California State University system is engaged in a groundbreaking initiative to advance educator preparation in the state through clinical preparation and partnerships. The California Alliance for Clinical Preparation Partnerships and Improving Student Learning was launched through the *California State University (CSU) Summit on Transformative Change in the Preparation of Teachers*. The Summit was co-hosted with the National Academy of Sciences and involved 270 top education leaders from across California and the nation (see www.cal-state.edu/teachered/summit).



Christopher Steinhauser
Superintendent,
Long Beach Unified
School District

The CSU Summit examined best practices in the central aspects of teacher education and focused on partnerships and clinical designs. In addition to advancing clinical preparation practices, the Summit laid the foundation for planning the California Alliance. This state Alliance will be aimed at achieving transfor-

mative changes that build on the recent report of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Blue Ribbon Panel and its blueprint for reform of teacher preparation across the nation. Its work will be based on a clinical training model that is much like prep-

aration in the field of medicine. The California Alliance will select exemplary demonstration sites, pilot clinical preparation, promote rigorous measures of teacher candidate and program performance, and foster scale-up through state policies eliminating barriers to reform.

CSU Chancellor Charles Reed was asked by NCATE to lead the California Alliance along with Long Beach Unified School District Superintendent Christopher Steinhauser. California is one of eight states that offered to serve as initial pilots for implementing the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel recommendations and is the first that has launched its state Alliance through a statewide Summit. The California Alliance will be phased in across the state after an initial period of planning and piloting.

A significant challenge for State Alliances is how to engage school districts deeply in the process of preparing future teachers. This ordinarily is not part of the core mission of school districts, and that raises the question: How can helping to prepare teachers be formally integrated into the mission in a way that serves the needs of the districts? Schools and districts have been informally engaged in preparing new teachers for years—through various induction activities. A priority of the California Alliance will therefore be creating exemplary clinical partnerships and sites *that meet district needs*. A related and second priority will be developing the co-teaching model between candidates and mentor teachers at demonstration sites *to enhance schools' instructional capacity*.

A third priority will be development of a unique collaborative induction model that retains non-employed recent graduates in the profession. It will address a high priority for districts that must lay off beginning teachers due to the state's budget crisis but wish to retain them in the pipeline toward teaching positions in the district—to be hired when positions become available. The induction

design will be similar to the medical preparation model, in which a training fellowship is provided. It will be distinctive in teacher preparation in California because it will combine an induction program with professional development in which participants may receive additional certification in the high demand fields of science or math.

A fourth priority that will be addressed is rigorous admission of candidates. The range of approaches and criteria now being used will be explored. The partnership role of school districts in recommending candidates will also be explored, as will be innovative approaches aligning assessments used in admissions and school district hiring.

A fifth initial priority will be program outcomes assessment. All demonstration sites will utilize teacher performance assessment (TPA), based on California's statewide licensing requirements that include a comprehensive performance assessment for all graduates. Some demonstration sites in the California Alliance will also pilot a highly promising design for assessing program outcomes based on P-12 student performance, building on the pioneering work of the CSU Center for Teacher Quality in value-added assessment.

The California Alliance will select exemplary demonstration sites, pilot clinical preparation practices, promote rigorous measures of teacher candidate and program performance, and foster scale-up through state policies eliminating barriers to reform.

The California Alliance will build on the long-standing track record in California, particularly within CSU, of exemplary clinical teacher preparation partnerships. One such example is the partnership between the Long Beach Unified School District, CSU Long Beach, and Long Beach City College. The partnership has contributed to outstanding preparation among teacher candidate graduates and high levels of employment by the school district. A centerpiece of the partnership is the Urban Teaching and Education Academy in a Clinical Home (UTEACH) program, a site-based residency teacher preparation program. UTEACH educates and prepares teachers while fostering positive change in Long Beach's urban schools through a deeply collaborative clinical model. It uses a medical-residency design, and candidate learning takes place primarily in complex urban school environments where the candidates teach.

Additional models that will be built upon within the California Alliance are the five model CSU projects that were funded through the U.S. Department of Education Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) Program. These include three urban residency models with Los Angeles Unified School District—one at CSU Dominguez Hills, one at CSU Los Angeles, and one at CSU Northridge. Areas of focus include preparation of math, science, and special education teachers.

Another TQP project is a partnership led by CSU Chico, a distinctive northern California rural residency program. The CSU Chico project includes a second component focused on undergraduate preparation that includes significant attention to clinical experience. This is the design of the fifth TQP project, a collaboration among CSU Bakersfield, CSU Monterey Bay, and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo that emphasizes early and rich clinical experiences, has a math and science focus, and includes partnerships with school districts across the central region of California. Descriptions of the Teacher Quality Partnership projects are available on the U.S. Department of Education web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/index.html>.

Partnerships with P-12 schools have been a distinguishing feature across CSU teacher preparation for many years, with most campuses having outstanding Professional Development Schools. Examples of these partnerships, which link coursework with clinical work through systematic bridging of theory and practice, are described in the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) report, *Reforming Teacher Preparation: The Critical Component*, available on the AACTE web site <http://aacte.org>. Additional campus programs that are distinctive in their strong clinical partnerships and described in the report include those at CSU Fullerton, CSU San Marcos, Cal Poly Pomona, San Diego State University, San Jose State University, and Sonoma State University. Another example is the highly effective systemwide site-based online teacher preparation program for elementary candidates, CalStateTEACH.

These proven CSU models provide a uniquely strong underpinning for implementing the California Alliance for Clinical Preparation Partnerships. Alliance partners will include school districts, schools, teacher preparation programs in other state systems, state agencies, and a range of key stakeholders. ★

Louisiana's Value-Added Assessment: Linking Achievement and Teacher Preparation Programs



Jeanne M. Burns
Louisiana Board of
Regents



Vickie S. Gentry
Northwestern State
University

Universities and private providers in Louisiana are now using value-added assessment that is linked to student achievement as one of multiple measures to demonstrate that “*teacher preparation matters.*” This evidence is also supporting efforts to improve teacher preparation programs in specific content areas or specific grade spans.

Louisiana is the first state in the nation where the Board of Regents, Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Department of Education have worked collaboratively to share State data for the purpose of creating a longitudinal data system to support value-added analysis of first and second year teachers. Specifically, the analysis includes those first and second year teachers *who have completed* undergraduate teacher preparation programs in public and private universities in Louisiana and/or

completed alternate teacher preparation programs offered by public universities, private universities, and private providers in the state.

As a result of this collaborative relationship, the Louisiana Board of Regents provided funding for Dr. George Noell (Department of Psychology, Louisiana State University and A&M College) to create a Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model. The model was piloted for three years (i.e., 2003-04, 2004-

05, 2005-06) before the names and value-added results of three teacher preparation programs were released to the public in 2006-07. Since the initial release, the results for a growing number of redesigned teacher preparation programs have been released to the public annually for institutions with 25 or more first- and second-year teachers who are teaching in their areas of certification. Dr. Kristin Gansle (College of Education, Louisiana State University and A&M College) is now co-leading the analysis with Dr. Noell and effect estimates have been calculated for 57% of teacher preparation programs in the state.

Louisiana is the first state in the nation where all responsible agencies have worked collaboratively to share State data for the purpose of creating a longitudinal data system to support value-added analysis of first and second year teachers.

Louisiana's Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment predicts growth of achievement of individual students based on prior achievement, demographics, and attendance; assesses actual achievement of the individual students; and calculates effect estimates for teacher preparation programs. Stated another way, the degree to which new teachers influence the achievement of their students is compared to the growth of achievement in students taught by experienced teachers. Louisiana's state achievement tests for students in grades 4-9 for the content areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies are used for the analysis. Once effect estimates are calculated for each content area within each teacher preparation program, they are placed within five performance bands, which range from 1 (highest) to 5 (lowest) that compare growth in achievement of students taught by new teachers in redesigned programs to growth in achievement of students taught by experienced teachers and other new teachers.

During August 2010, value-added results were released for 12 of the 21 teacher preparation programs in Louisiana. The results indicated that there was as much

variance across content areas within teacher preparation programs as there was variance between teacher preparation programs across the state. Prior to calculating initial results, it was anticipated that few teacher preparation programs would attain effect estimates at Performance Levels 1 or 2. However, seven out of nine redesigned teacher preparation programs with results in all five content areas attained scores at Performance Levels 1 or 2 in one or more content areas. This indicated that first- and second-year teachers taught students who demonstrated growth in achievement that was comparable or greater than growth in achievement of students taught by experienced teachers in Louisiana in one or more content areas.

Five of the nine redesigned programs cited above also had content areas in which students taught by new teachers in redesigned programs demonstrated growth in achievement at a Performance Level 3 (comparable to other new teachers). Thus, programs did not perform uniformly well in all content areas. As an example, Northwestern State University attained effect estimates at a Performance Level 1 for Science, Performance Level 2 for Language Arts and Reading, and Performance Level 3 for Mathematics and Social Studies when provided the 2009-10 results for their alternate certification program.

2009-2010 Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Results

Three of the 12 redesigned teacher preparation programs received value-added scores at Performance Levels 4 or 5 in one or two content areas for their undergraduate or alternate programs, which indicate that growth in achievement of students taught by first-and second-year

teachers in specific content areas is below or significantly below the achievement of students taught by other new teachers. All three redesigned programs also have value-added scores at Performance Level 3 in other content areas where growth in achievement of students taught by completers was comparable to growth of achievement of students taught by other new teachers. Thus, the weaknesses in these programs did not exist in all content areas, and varied within and across institutions depending upon the specific content areas being taught.

Multiple Measures to Examine Teacher Preparation Effectiveness

Louisiana did not start with the use of a value-added model to examine effectiveness of teacher preparation programs – Louisiana started with redesign. In 1999–2000, a Blue Ribbon Commission for Teacher Quality identified 60 recommendations to improve teacher quality. The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and Louisiana Department of Education developed and approved new policies to support the recommendations and raised expectations for what undergraduate/alternate program completers would be required to do to become certified in Louisiana. They also raised requirements for entry into undergraduate and alternate programs to ensure that candidates would be academically prepared to teach the content areas.

The Board of Regents approved new policies that required all universities to create redesign teams composed of College of Arts/Sciences/Humanities faculty, College of Education faculty, school/district partners, and other partners to redesign teacher preparation pro-

NORTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

Performance Levels	Content Areas				
Amount of Growth in Achievement of Grades 4–9 Students Taught by New Teachers	Science	Language Arts	Reading	Math	Social Studies
Level 1: Growth in achievement GREATER than students taught by EXPERIENCED teachers.					
Level 2: Growth in achievement COMPARABLE to students taught by EXPERIENCED teachers.					
Level 3: Growth in achievement COMPARABLE to students taught by NEW teachers.					
Level 4: Growth in achievement BELOW students taught by other NEW teachers.					
Level 5: Growth in student achievement SIGNIFICANTLY BELOW students taught by other NEW teachers.					

[In the value-added model] the degree to which new teachers influence the achievement of their students is compared to the growth of achievement in students taught by experienced teachers.

grams, improve content and pedagogy within programs, and increase the quantity and quality of clinical experiences in schools. The redesign teams prepared written proposals to address the more rigorous certification requirements and all proposals addressed common sets of indicators that were based upon state and national teacher and content standards.

All proposals underwent review by national and state experts, and university/district teams involved in the development of the proposals were interviewed by the experts. Institutions were required to address the stipulations of the national and state experts and be approved by the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education by July 1, 2003 to continue to admit candidates into their programs. Failure to address the new expectations resulted in the termination of pre-redesign programs. This was a very important first step in creating multiple measures to assess and improve the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs in Louisiana.

In addition to the redesign, Louisiana requires all public and private universities to be NCATE or TEAC accredited. All universities now have nationally accredited programs with the exception of one new university program that is undergoing TEAC accreditation. Also, Louisiana implemented a Teacher Preparation Accountability System from 2002 to 2005. When Hurricane Katrina hit in 2005, a need developed to revise the system due to changing demographics in the state and the ongoing development of the value-added model. The system originally examined such indicators as passage rate on the Praxis, survey data from new teachers, quantity of program completers, and quantity of program completers in teacher shortage areas. Once fully revised, the value-added assessment will be integrated into the accountability system.

Value-Added Assessment: Teacher Preparation Benefits and Challenges

The most important benefit of the value-added assessment is having authentic data to determine if teacher

preparation programs are having a positive impact upon growth in student achievement once completers have been teaching for one or two years. Programs assume that they are having a positive impact, but they rarely have output data to validate their theory. Louisiana's results have indicated that none of the teacher preparation programs have value-added scores that are consistently very high (e.g., Performance Level 1) or consistently very low (e.g., Performance Level 5) in all five content areas. Instead, all 12 programs have results that indicate that their programs have higher or lower levels of effectiveness in one or more of the five content areas.

Another benefit is that programs can now examine their results over time. Because several universities in Louisiana have value-added results for three or four years, they can determine if they have attained the same performance levels each year, if their performance levels have dropped, or if their performance levels have increased as a result of new strategies that have been implemented to improve the effectiveness of their new teachers. As an example, Northwestern State University has consistently attained effect estimates for four consistent years at a Performance Level 1 (e.g., greater than experienced teachers) in the area of Science and Performance Level 2 (e.g., comparable to experienced teachers) in the areas of Reading and Language Arts. However, in the area of Mathematics, they scored a Performance Level 2 (i.e., comparable to experienced teachers) during 2006–07 and 2007–08 and dropped to a Performance Level 3 (i.e., comparable to new teachers) during 2008–09 and 2009–10. This data analysis has prompted program faculty and administrators to ask more in-depth questions about the potential cause of the drop.

Institutions first receiving these results faced an unexpected challenge in determining if the effect estimates were based upon new teachers who had completed preparation programs in elementary education (Grades

The results indicated that there was as much variance across content areas within teacher preparation programs as there was variance between teacher preparation programs across the state.

NORTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY
ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM
MATHEMATICS (LONGITUDINAL RESULTS)

Performance Levels	Content Areas			
Amount of Growth in Achievement of Grades 4–9 Students Taught by New Teachers	2006–07 Results	2007–08 Results	2008–09 Results	2009–10 Results
Level 1: Growth in achievement GREATER than students taught by EXPERIENCED teachers.				
Level 2: Growth in achievement COMPARABLE to students taught by EXPERIENCED teachers.				
Level 3: Growth in achievement COMPARABLE to students taught by NEW teachers.				
Level 4: Growth in achievement BELOW students taught by other NEW teachers.				
Level 5: Growth in student achievement SIGNIFICANTLY BELOW students taught by other NEW teachers.				

1–5), middle school education (Grades 4–8), secondary education (Grades 6–12), or special education (Grades 1–12). To respond to this need, additional analysis has recently been conducted to provide programs with new results that are broken down by the separate grade spans. As an example, Northwestern State University now has access to data that indicate that effect estimates for Mathematics for elementary education teachers are very high, while effect estimates for secondary education teachers and special education teachers are low. Thus, the breakdown by grade span has prompted more probing questions about the selection and preparation of teachers to teach Mathematics in the secondary education and special education programs. The inclusion of grade span results will be included for all future value-added analysis. However, institutions have been warned to use the results with caution when the numbers of teachers are fewer than 25.

A second challenge is that only 12 of the 22 teacher preparation programs in Louisiana currently have value-added results for their programs. Due to the termination of pre-redesign programs on June 30, 2003, and the implementation of redesigned programs on July 1, 2003, it has taken time for teacher preparation programs to implement the redesigned programs, have candidates complete the redesigned programs, and have completers teach for two years to be included in the value-added analysis. More universities are expected to have a sufficient number of new teachers for the results to be released to the public during fall 2011 and in future years. Unfortunately, universities without results are at a disadvantage for they must collect additional independent data from teachers in the field and analyze the data to determine if their new teachers are demonstrating more or less effectiveness in specific content areas and specific grade spans.

NORTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY
ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM
MATHEMATICS (GRADE SPANS)

Grade Span	N	Effect Estimates
Elementary (Grades 1–5)	17	5.9
Middle School (Grades 4–8)	7	0.4
Secondary (Grades 6–12)	11	-6.4
Special Education	27	-6.1
Mean Effect Estimate for Northwestern State University for Mathematics (Level 3 Performance Level)		-1.5

Mean Effect Estimate for All New Teachers for Mathematics = -3.1

A third challenge is that the value-added results do not tell a teacher preparation program “why” their teachers are demonstrating greater levels of effectiveness in specific content areas and specific grade spans. It helps to identify where a weakness may exist but it does not tell why it exists, and it does not identify the strategies to implement to address the need. Teacher preparation programs must collect additional data to answer those questions. To

address this challenge, the Louisiana Board of Regents has created a State Research Team that is composed of a researcher from each teacher preparation program in the state. The researchers have received sub-grant funds to meet as a team and conduct research independently to improve their teacher preparation programs. As a team, they are asking probing questions, identifying new types of data that need to be collected at a state level, and sharing ideas and tools. As independent researchers, they are gathering existing and new data about their programs/completers, analyzing the data, identifying specific needs, identifying appropriate strategies to address the needs, and developing a plan to implement a research study. During 2011–12, they will be implementing their research plans, collecting data to determine if the strategies impacted their programs, analyzing the data, reporting results, and sharing what they have learned with institutions across the state.

The most important benefit of the value-added assessment is having authentic data to determine if teacher preparation programs are having a positive impact upon growth in student achievement once completers have been teaching for one or two years.

A final challenge has been the conclusion by some that the value-added score is a reflection of the overall teacher preparation program when it is actually a measure of growth in achievement of students in grades 4–9 in five content areas (i.e., mathematics, science, social stud-

ies, reading, and language arts). It is not a measure of students in grades PK–3, grades 10–12, or all other content areas in which teachers are prepared. It only reflects grades in which achievement tests are administered to students in public schools in Louisiana. It is an important measure. However, it is only one of multiple measures being used to judge the effectiveness of teacher preparation in Louisiana.

In closing, it is very important to ensure the accuracy of the data being used to conduct the value-added analysis and the accuracy of the results that are being disseminated to the public. Louisiana's teacher preparation programs validate the names of their completers before the value-added analysis occurs and efforts are made to ensure that university and state leaders understand the meaning of the results before they are disseminated to the public. Value-added assessment provides results that can be very valuable in isolating specific grade spans and content areas where needs for improvement exist. It also provides results that help to identify content areas and grade spans where highly effective new teachers are being prepared. As Louisiana moves forward, it needs to integrate other measures of achievement into the Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment, and it needs to adopt other measures of teacher effectiveness that address the many other areas of teaching that are not currently being measured. ★

Note: Copies of all technical reports that have been prepared by Dr. George Noell and Dr. Kristin Gansle and other documents pertaining to the development and implementation of the Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment can be found at the following URL:
<http://regents.louisiana.gov/index.cfm?md=pagebuilder&tmp=home&pid=113>.

Gollnick, Senior Vice President, to Retire: Led Accreditation Process for 25 Years



Donna M. Gollnick
Sr. Vice President

Donna M. Gollnick, Senior Vice President at NCATE, is retiring as of June 30, 2011 after leading the accreditation process for 25 years. She will continue as a Senior Consultant for NCATE as the organization transitions to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the new unified accrediting body.

process is invaluable as we transition to a new unified accrediting body,” says Jim Cibulka, President, NCATE. Prior to 1990, Gollnick served as NCATE’s Interim Executive Director and Deputy Executive Director.

In her ‘spare’ time, Gollnick writes articles and handbooks. She is well known as an expert on multicultural education. She is the co-author with Philip Chinn of the textbook, *Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society* (6th edition, 2002). She was a contributor to the 1995 *Handbook on Research in Multicultural Education* and the 1992 AACTE publication on cultural diversity and teacher education.

She is a member of the writing team for *Introduction to the Foundations of American Education*, published by Allyn and Bacon, which is now in its 13th edition. In addition, she has written and made numerous presentations on teacher education and accreditation.

Gollnick has worked in Washington, D.C. for nearly 30 years, the first 11 years at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) where her last position was as Director of Professional Development. For seven years Donna taught in secondary schools in Carmel and South Bend, Indiana.

Gollnick received her first two degrees in home economics education from Purdue University. Her doctorate in intercultural education is from the University of Southern California. In 1996, The School of Family and Consumer Sciences at Purdue University presented her the Distinguished Alumni Award. AACTE honored her as an “Advocate for Justice” in 1998. ★

ization. She leads the entire NCATE accreditation process, which includes unit accreditation and program review. With her staff, she helps institutions prepare for accreditation visits, answering innumerable questions from institutions over the years. She has been a leader in using technology to communicate with NCATE’s 733 institutions via hundreds of webinars on the pro-

Gollnick has been a leader in using technology to communicate with NCATE’s 733 institutions via hundreds of webinars on the process.

cess. She has designed and led training for thousands of Board of Examiner members who conduct on site reviews. She also staffs the Unit Accreditation Board, which determines the accreditation status of professional education units. In that role, she has prepared papers and memorandums which have led to policy and procedural changes in the accreditation process. Gollnick has been a familiar presence at AACTE for the past 25 years as she leads the popular ‘NCATE Update’ at its annual meeting. For the past two years, Gollnick has served on the Joint Design Team that has formed CAEP. “Her extensive knowledge and expertise in the accreditation

Eldridge to Move into Senior Vice Presidency at NCATE



Deborah Eldridge

Deborah Eldridge will assume the role of Senior Vice-President at the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) July 1, 2011. Dr. Eldridge currently serves as Dean of the Division of Education at Lehman College of the City University of New York. In addition to her current role, Dr. Eldridge

will bring experience as a former teacher, professor, and department chair to her new responsibilities. She previously served as department chair and professor, curriculum and teaching, at Montclair State University. Prior to her service at Montclair, she served as assistant dean and also department chair of curriculum and teaching at Hunter College in New York.

“I look forward to bringing my varied experiences as a Dean and a faculty member, as a program reviewer for IRA, and as a former NCATE coordinator to the work of transforming the process and procedures of accreditation.”

Eldridge received her Ed.D. from Boston University in Language, Literacy, and Cultural Studies. She has been active in efforts to strengthen and reform teacher preparation, including being a principal investigator of a Teacher Quality Partnership Grant to strengthen educator preparation in mathematics at the elementary school level from the U.S. Department of Education. Eldridge has been active in professional, public, and university service in many capacities. She has authored and co-authored books and numerous professional articles and book chapters and delivered many scholarly presentations at professional conferences. She is a

member of the International Reading Association, the American Educational Research Association, the National Network for Educational Renewal, the Council of Great City Schools, and the American Association of College of Teacher Education.

In accepting the offer to join NCATE and CAEP, Dr. Eldridge comments, “My time as Dean of Lehman College’s Division of Education has been illuminating and rewarding on many levels. However, I look forward to bringing my varied experiences as a Dean and a faculty member (which includes writing specialized professional association and institutional reports), as a program reviewer for IRA, and as a former NCATE coordinator to the work of transforming the process and procedures of accreditation.”

She continues, “It is an exciting time to be in teacher education and to be working closely with NCATE toward the emergence of the new accreditation body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). I believe accreditation can be a powerful tool to address one of our most pressing national challenges and opportunities--the need to have an effective teacher in every classroom.” ★

A coalition of over 30 organizations of teachers, teacher educators, policymakers and school specialists committed to quality teaching

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

2010 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036-1023
Voice: 202.466.7496
Fax: 202.296.6620

www.ncate.org

Quality Teaching

Volume 20, Issue 1
Spring 2011

a publication of the

**NATIONAL
COUNCIL
FOR
ACCREDITATION
OF TEACHER
EDUCATION**

James G. Cibulka
President

Donna M. Gollnick
Senior Vice President

Jane Leibbrand
*Vice President for
Communications
and Editor*

Justin Codd
*Webmaster and
Guest Designer*