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Chapter One

Introduction

American public schools are diverse institutions, not just in terms of race but in all aspects of socio-cultural diversity: race, gender, sexual orientation, social class, etc. (Abell Foundation, 2001; Aldridge & Goldman, 2007). With this diversity comes a critical need to address the achievement gap. Historically marginalized children are under-represented at the higher end of academic achievement scales while over-represented at the low end of these scales (Abell Foundation; Collins, 2008; Rousseau & Tate, 2003). Furthermore, these marginalized populations are largely underrepresented in the demographic makeup of teachers in the United States, consisting of only 17.5% of the teaching force while making up 45% of the student population (AACTE, 2013).

To effectively teach in these diverse environments, there are two main cultural understandings that educators must develop. First, educators need to understand the culture transmitted through the educational institution in which they teach. Second, educators must understand the cultures of the educational institution’s stakeholders. Using this knowledge of the various cultures involved, educators can gain a deeper understanding of the diversity that exists within the community and any dichotomies that may exist between the culture transmitted and the cultures of the stakeholders, especially as they relate to the marginalization of sub-groups of the community. With these understandings, educators can develop a multicultural pedagogical framework that takes into account the various cultural beliefs and practices that exist within the educational institution in order to provide an instructional environment that is both sensitive to and addresses the unique needs of a diverse student body (Andrews & Schwab, 1993).
In order to do so educators must receive adequate training on social and pedagogical issues related to diversity and social justice in their educator preparation programs (EPPs) (Andrews & Schwab, 1993). However, in many cases the curriculum employed by EPPs is largely a combination of state regulatory requirements and national accreditation standards. Heads of EPPs are resigned to submitting their programmatic curriculum to these external requirements in a reactive, conforming nature (Goodlad, 1990).

As 29 states require EPPs to hold national accreditation and approximately 55%¹ of EPPs currently hold national accreditation, the history of national accreditation, especially its emphasis on issues of diversity and social justice, bears examination (NCATE, 2014a; TEAC, 2014b). This work seeks to answer the following research questions:

- In what ways have diversity and social justice been conceptualized, and to what degree have they been emphasized from 1995 to 2013 in the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education accreditation standards for educator preparation?
- What influences have shaped the conceptualization of diversity and social justice and have determined the degree of emphasis over that period of time?

The Importance of Diversity and Social Justice in Educator Preparation

Teachers that actively confront the realities affecting differences in students’ cultural knowledge enhance the learning environment and provide alternative learning

---

¹ Based on the estimated number of educator preparation programs found in the AACTE (2010) report An Emerging Picture of the Teacher Preparation Pipeline.
experiences that guide students in their understanding of how to excel in both traditional and non-traditional educational settings (Helsing, Howell, Kegan, & Lahey, 2008; Jeffries, Powers-Costello & Dean, 2011). This, along with the fact that many educators argue that the raison d’être of their practice is a concern for the children’s’ future and the maintenance of our democracy and national prosperity, shows a need for training in best practices that support autonomous professional judgment in diverse educational settings. The goal of such training should support professional judgment that maximizes the public good, i.e. a high quality education for all students (Abell Foundation, 2001; Tamir & Wilson, 2005).

Working with marginalized populations is not the only concern for modern educators. They must also prepare their students for a global economic system in of corporate and commercial power, which has led to a decrease in the autonomy of national economies (Hargreaves, 2000; Helsing, Howell, Kegan, & Lahey, 2008; Reich, 1992; Sayers, 2007; Spence, 2011). This, paired with the electronic and digital revolutions has led to an economic climate that emphasizes profit and competivity over the common national good, and the movement of companies to more underdeveloped regions. With this corporate migration and increased availability of international communication and information there is now an increase in contact between diverse cultural and belief systems (Hargreaves; Reich; Spence). As part of the growing global economy from the mid-1990s, the multicultural nature of family structures in American communities has also begun to increase. Therefore, educators must be prepared to relate to the communities beyond the schools in new and different ways and understand how the changing family structure can impact education (Hargreaves).
Research shows that the development of culturally responsive teacher attitudes and expectations has a positive impact on student learning as well as teacher perceptions of at-risk youth, leading to the skill to positively serve all children well (Brophy, 1983; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2009; Good, 1987; Hamel, 2003; Kumar & Hamer, 2013; Powers-Costello & Swick, 2008). Even though this form of training may not close the achievement gap itself, it can certainly aid in its reduction. Moreover, there is a great need for teachers to have received training on the issues and strategies that improve the education of marginalized groups (Abell Foundation, 2001; Jeffries, Powers-Costello & Dean, 2011). With the growing diversity of schools in the United States, it is important to face these concerns and work to support the difficult task that teachers will confront. Teaching, and the preparation of teachers, needs to become more sophisticated (Cochran-Smith, 2001; Hargreaves, 2000).

It is important that EPPs lead educators to understand the tremendous responsibility they carry in developing perceptions of students that can be empowering during the educational process, especially those that work with youth from historically marginalized populations. Therefore, students in a teacher education program must have experiences that will provide multiple opportunities to challenge their understandings of justice and equality (Abell Foundation, 2001; Cochran-Smith, 2001; Hamel, 2003; Powers-Costello & Swick, 2008). This, in turn, could help them to develop an appropriate empathic attitude so that they respond to student needs in a supportive and nurturing way. It is necessary to understand that a professional is one who has a specialized knowledge base and uses shared standards of practice and service ethic that emphasizes a commitment to student needs.
Due to the individualistic nature of the profession, it is important that preservice teachers in teacher education programs receive proper, sophisticated training. Otherwise, teachers may develop a limited sense of efficacy because of their individualism (Hargreaves, 2000; Helsing, Howell, Kegan, & Lahey, 2008; Tamir & Wilson, 2005). Schools are a potential focal point for the retention and regeneration of a sense of community. As such, this research has the potential to help future educators and teacher educators understand their professional role in developing an open and interactive relationship with students, their parents, and the larger community (Cochran-Smith, 2001; Hargreaves, 2000). Hopefully, such research will help them avoid the development of assumptions and expectations of parental and community support that are socially and culturally biased (Helsing, Howell, Kegan, & Lahey, 2008).

**National Organizations**

The outcry for high teacher quality is not a lonely one. Many researchers, policy makers and education organizations continually call for reform in teacher preparation. The following section is a list of organizations concerned with the quality of teacher education programs and highlights how each organization calls for reform in teacher education as related to the research questions.

**American Council on Education.** In 1998, the American Council on Education (ACE) collaborated with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) to appoint a task force on teacher education. The charge given to the task force was the equipping of college and university presidents to have a positive outcome on the effective preparation of educators. This charge stemmed from the premise that the quality of American schooling was declining and the only way to improve this quality
was the strengthening of EPPs. Their findings emphasized the content and skill development of educators, including their connection to high needs areas such as high-poverty schools and minority groups.

**Abell Foundation.** The Abell Foundation is an organization whose mission is the enhancement of the quality of life in Maryland with an active interest in public education. The Abell Foundation published a report in 2001 in which they called into question the then current teacher certification processes, claiming that these processes did not provide true insight into all facets of effective teaching. Rather, their report argued, certification served to ensure all educators have taken a prescribed set of coursework and barred those who have not done so. The report further stated that by doing so the certification process reinforces teacher shortages, especially shortages of high quality teachers in low-income and high minority districts (Abell Foundation, 2001). Their report also calls into question research supporting the curriculum used in EPPs, the need for certification, and stated that EPPs are not preparing educators that are any more effective than non-certified educators.

**National Council for Teacher Quality.** More recently, the National Council for Teacher Quality (NCTQ) has continued the Abell Foundation’s (2001) argument on a national level. Kate Walsh, who was the senior policy analyst for the Abell Foundation at the time of their 2001 report, has served as the president of NCTQ since 2002. NCTQ states that they are an advocacy group for educational policy that emphasizes educator effectiveness (NCTQ, 2014a). Since 2012, NCTQ has had a central focus on evaluating educator preparation programs against a set of standards developed by the organization
because they, like the Abell Foundation, believe that the current certification process is ineffective (NCTQ, 2014b).

**Accreditors of Educator Preparation**

In recent years, state and national policy debates centered on teacher education and licensure emphasized the topics of outcomes, consequences and results. These debates are the driving force behind educational reform in relation to policy and practice as well as the national accreditation of EPPs. In the early history of teacher education accreditation, there were three key areas of consideration: attributes, effectiveness and knowledge. However, in the 21st century, teacher candidate and K-12 student outcomes are the emphasis for teacher education accreditation (Cochran-Smith, 2001).

For faculty and administrators directly involved with nationally accredited EPPs, there are two commonly recognized names: the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). Each of these two organizations has a slightly varied emphasis in their standards for the accreditation of EPPs. However, as of July 1, 2013, these two accrediting bodies merged to form a single, new national teacher education accreditor, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). A discussion of EPP accreditation is further complicated in that the processes employed by these national accreditors undergoes continual change because of external criticism despite their relatively young age (Tamir & Wilson, 2005).

**NCATE.** The first and most widely recognized national accreditor to set formal accreditation standards for educator preparation was NCATE. NCATE emerged in 1954 as an independent accreditor of undergraduate and graduate EPPs. Five organizations
representing the teaching profession collaborated in NCATE’s creation: the Council of the Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the National Education Association (NEA), the National School Boards Association (NSBA), the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. After extensive efforts to improve the quality of teaching and teacher education from the turn of the twentieth century, the aforementioned organizations pushed for the formation of NCATE in an effort to promote professionalism, accountability and to improve the field of teacher education. Currently, NCATE has 33 national partner organizations with goals tied to the creation of high quality EPPs. NCATE’s extensive history, wide recognition, and its high level of external influence is the reason it is the emphasis of this work.

Since 1990, NCATE has pursued becoming an essential component in the development of EPP reform efforts. Prior to the merger of NCATE and TEAC, NCATE had partnerships in all 50 states to serve as a resource and partner, 29 of which require EPPs to hold national accreditation (NCATE, 2004, 2014c).

**TEAC.** The second national accreditor for educator preparation, TEAC, is far younger. TEAC, founded in 1997, was an organization intent on improving degree programs aimed at preparing qualified professional educators, but wanted to take a more scientific approach to the process. Much like NCATE, TEACs work emphasizes the accreditation of undergraduate and graduate EPPs (TEAC 2014c). However, wherein NCATE promoted a definitive set of criteria by which EPPs received national accreditation, TEAC chose to permit EPPs to make the case for their effectiveness. This
meant TEAC accredited institutions were guided by a set of principles rather than a set of specific standards.

CAEP. The third national accreditor, which was a result of the merger of NCATE and TEAC in 2013, is the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). CAEP became the official result of the consolidation of these two organizations and the sole accreditor for EPPs on July 1, 2013. Accreditation emerged out of a desire to improve teacher education and to improve the status of the profession. It became clear to both organizations that having two accreditors with somewhat differing guidelines, was counter to that goal. By merging the organizations, CAEP is sending a message that there is a unified voice in the accreditation of teacher education. Both NCATE and TEAC will continue to exist until all the institutions holding accreditation with each entity come up for renewal under the new CAEP requirements. Although the name and the requirements have changed, the CAEP design team worked to ensure that the existing processes of each organization remained with the least amount of change possible (CAEP, 2014).

To answer the research questions, Chapter 2 begins by providing frameworks for understanding diversity and social justice as used in this research. Chapter 2 then moves to discussions of a social identity framework, human capital theory and capabilities theory to help frame later discussions of changes to educator preparation accreditation standards and external influences to those standards. The author made a conscientious decision to limit the discussion to these three frameworks, as explained in in the second chapter. Chapter 2 ends with a broad overview of teacher certification in the United States, including the advent of NCATE, TEAC and CAEP, emphasizing the National
Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education accreditation standards from 1995 to 2013, while incorporating a synthesis of the research and literature that may have influenced those standards.

Chapter 3 discusses the choice of methodology employed in this study, historical analysis. It begins with a restatement of the problem and purpose for the research. This is followed by a discussion of the research and data analysis methodologies utilized to answer the research questions.

Chapter 4 provides the analysis of the NCATE and CAEP standards published between 1995 and 2013. This chapter also includes a discussion of the external influences that may have led to changes in the national accreditation standards across time in conjunction with the changing emphasis on diversity and social justice in the standards based on the frameworks outlined in Chapter 2.

Chapter 5 directly answers the research questions based on the analysis provided in Chapter 4. The chapters discusses the conceptualization of diversity and social justice over time within the standards for the accreditation of educator preparation and the associated socio-political influences. This discussion reiterates the need for educators to have a strong background in issues of diversity and social justice. This is followed by a discussion of the potential implications for both teacher education and K-12 schooling. Chapter 5 ends with suggestions and guidance for reform of the current national accreditation standards and further research.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

National accreditation of teacher education programs is a relatively new concept. As mentioned in Chapter 1, there is a continuing call for preparing educators with the knowledge and skill to teach effectively in diverse settings. This body of knowledge and set of skills includes an understanding of diversity and the ability to promote social justice, specifically instances of social justice that will close the achievement gap between poor and minority students when compared to their wealthier, white counterparts.

This chapter will begin by providing a framework to understand diversity and social justice as it relates to the research questions

- In what ways have diversity and social justice been conceptualized, and to what degree have they been emphasized from 1995 to 2013 in the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education accreditation standards for educator preparation?

- What influences have shaped the conceptualization of diversity and social justice and have determined the degree of emphasis over that period of time?

Next, this chapter will discuss both human capital theory and capabilities theory to frame the discussion and analysis of the data used to answer the research questions. Finally, this chapter will end with a broad overview of teacher certification in the United States, including discussions on the advent of NCATE, TEAC and CAEP as accreditors of EPPs. That discussion will emphasize the educator preparation standards from 1995 to 2013 and
a synthesis of the research, literature and policy that may have influenced those standards.

**Diversity and Social Justice in Education**

To begin, the discussions of diversity and social justice in this work are rooted in theories posited by sociological and democratic theorists. The work to frame the following discussions relied on frameworks found in volumes edited by Adams et al. (2013) and Tozer, Gallegos, Henry, Greiner and Price (2011). The selection of these works derives from their emphasis on examining diversity and social justice through the lens of social identity.

**Critical theory.** Critical theory, while an increasingly used framework by sociological theorists since its origination in the 1960s, was not used as a framework within this research. The decision to delimit the use of this framework was a conscientious one. While a potentially valid framework for examining issues of diversity and social justice, the work of critical theorists such as Freire, Giroux and Kincheloe strayed from the social identity approach of this research and the desire to define the ways in which the standards for the accreditation of teacher education conceptualized issues of diversity and social justice. Authors such as Brosio (2011) acknowledge critical theory’s emphasis on critique rather than developing definitions. Such an approach is counter to the research questions under examination, which focus on determining what is rather than what ought to be.

However, it is essential to acknowledge, at least briefly, a critical theoretical perspective on issues of diversity and social justice within research examining these concepts connections to the field of teacher education. The intersection of education and
critical theory centers on the idea of education for development, specifically how to use education to build a socially just society through the dialogue of equals (Freedman, 2007, Freire, 1993; Gadotti & Torres, 2009). The core of critical theory is freedom, democracy and critical participation.

Critical theory emphasizes a particular method of sociopolitical analysis to understand the relationship between world events and an individual’s personal experiences. Doing so developed deeper understanding of social hierarchies and how they can limit free expression throughout society, linking the various spheres of social life and power configurations (Freedman, 2007; Mayo, 1995). Critical theory, with its roots in Marxism and feminism, emphasizes examining how systems of inequality are created and reproduced and how they might be overturned.

Based on such an understanding, critical theorists often cite public schools as emphasizing a hegemonic relationship, where the teacher’s knowledge is considered superior to that of students (Freedman, 2007; Freire, 2009). These hegemonic forces shape the experiences and subjectivities of students, leading to the continued reproduction of social norms and ultimately the continued marginalization of minority groups.

**Social identity.** A social identity framework can be used to tie the concepts of diversity and social justice to the social nature of schooling. Social identity refers to the ways in which the collective characteristics of individuals makes them identifiable as a member of a social group. Students seek to identify with a social group as a mechanism for finding comfort and solace in environments that often bring to the forefront divergent values and their often associated oppressive behaviors (Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2010).
Connecting this concept to schooling is logical given that students develop their social identities, i.e. interpersonal selves, in the social groups they associate with, in addition to these groups related, unequal social locations (Feinberg, 1998; Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2010; Tatum 1997). The development of an educator’s knowledge of diversity and social justice should emphasize an appreciation for differences and an awareness of how these differences in turn can become tools for the justification of systemic inequalities (Adams et al., 2013).

Awareness is essential in normative environments, such as public schools, and in a society where access to privilege is restricted to social groups associated with those norms, a restriction based on the assumption that all have access to those norms (Adams et al. 2013; Feinberg, 1998; Young, 1990). Whether implicitly or explicitly, a system where the marginalized do not have access to social norms leads to systemic oppression. Educational environments have the capability to reproduce systemic oppression, therefore the concepts of social difference, social identity, and social inequity need to be included in the preparation of educators (Adams et al.; Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson & Orphanos, 2009; Feinberg, 1998; Young, 1990).

Social diversity is a reference to differences between social identity groups based on a myriad of social categories, including race, gender, sexuality, etc. These differences are reflective of groups’ traditions and cultural practices, and the term differences frames the concept that these are variations from societal norms determined by the dominant social majority (Adams et al., 2013; Tatum, 1997; Young, 1990). Understanding diversity in this sense helps to frame our knowledge of the root of social inequality and
marginalization as the varied and multiple social identity groups an individual identifies with hold unequal levels within society (Adams et al., 2013; Tatum, 1997; Young, 1990).

History shows that social group identities have been and continue to be used to justify marginalization of those groups that differ from accepted societal norms. In addition, these social identities and their unequal social locations are the result of evolving social construction based on specific historical conditions (Adams et al., 2013; Tatum, 1997). This knowledge leads to an understanding of how societal norming can shape a social knowledge of difference of others and provide advantages to those who fit an accepted norm. Meaning, societal norming creates systems of social inequalities based on a group’s divergence from accepted social norms, inextricably linking diversity and inequality as a socially accepted norm (Adams et al., 2013; Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2010; Tatum, 1997; Young 1990). Furthermore, marginalized groups that internalize dominant social group perceptions eventually accept the perceived limitations based on their social differences, in a sense creating a self-fulfilling prophecy and leading to marginalized subordinate groups focusing on survival (Tatum, 1997).

With diversity and social inequality having this inextricable link, providing knowledge of and creating an appreciation for diversity among future educators is necessary if one is to understand how marginalized communities experience social inequality in order to combat the social systems that maintain injustice and develop systems based on fairness and equity (Young, 1990). The need to incorporate such information in teacher education is essential, even though dominant social groups do not like being reminded of the existence of social inequality, preferring to accept
rationalizations developed to justify existing societal arrangements (Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2010; Tatum, 1997).

The issue here is the response of marginalized groups to the expectations of the dominant groups. In some cases, the marginalized may choose to not respond to oppressive behavior for fear of retaliation (Tatum, 1997). Others may choose to resist or undermine the authority of dominant groups, such as through “not-learning” (Kohl, 2007). “Not-learning” may cause marginalized groups to lose the ability to acquire knowledge or skill necessary to acclimate to the dominant culture. The choice to “not-learn” is often a difficult one and is made for fear of losing one’s own cultural identity to those who demonstrate a lack of respect for the integrity of marginalized groups (Kohl, 2007; Tatum, 1997). What is needed is an individually enabling conception of social justice.

**Social justice.** A conception of social justice should not be limited to ideas of distribution, but should consider the institutional conditions supportive of the development and exercise of individual capabilities (discussed in more detail below). When justice is defined in this way, injustice can be viewed as oppressive or dominitive social, political and institutional practices (Rawls, 1999; Young, 2011). Modern social movements center on oppression as a means for American political discourse, and therefore have adopted a mode of legal and policy analysis and evaluation that compares societal structures against a conception of individual human agency.

Societal injustices can commonly be attributed to one’s social-structural position, a multi-dimensional space derived from the accumulated outcomes of societal actions in which individuals of differing social positions and associations are distributed (Bourdieu,
1990; Giddens, 1979; Rawls, 1999; Young, 2011). Arguably, in a socially-just society the citizenry would question individual human agency being determined by a person’s social-structural position. Structural injustice occurs as a result of social-structural properties being habitually and routinely implicated in such a way that they lead to the reproduction of existing societal systems. These processes cause one or more groups of the population to be threatened by domination, limiting their ability to achieve the fullest extent of their individual human agency, while other groups have broad freedoms to develop their fullest capabilities (Giddens, 1979; Nusbaum, 2011; Rawls, 1999; Young, 2011).

Social-structural processes and institutional and social rules objectively constrain individuals by creating channels that guide them into specific directions (Nusbaum, 2011; Rawls, 1999; Reiman, 1989). This is caused by an accumulated effect of past societal actions and decisions that opened some possibilities while closing others or, at the very least, making it difficult for them to be achieved by some individuals. In this way, social structures are not constraining in a directly coercive way, rather they constrain individuals indirectly through the blocking of specific possibilities and in so doing produce differentials in the freedoms and options available to specific groups of individuals (Rawls, 1999; Young, 2011). The question becomes whether these differentials in freedom and possibility based on individuals’ social-structural positions is socially just.

To answer this, it is necessary to consider how we understand members of society when individuals are considered in terms of their social position. In these cases, people are not concerned with individuals’ desires or capabilities, rather we focus on individuals
associations in such a way that it we condition our social-structural expectations and potential interactions (Nusbaum, 2011; Young, 2011). Taking such a broad view on social-structural positions aids in identifying far reaching social inequalities that persist over time, enabling the assessment of issues of social justice and injustice. As will be described below, modern industrial societies are typically structured through the use of socio-structural inequalities (Young, 2011).

**Human Capital Theory**

Based on the discussion of diversity and social justice above, it appears that human capital theory is currently the most common philosophical approach to education. However, in a socially just democracy it is important to consider whether human capital theory as an educational approach is indeed democratic and supports the principle of intrinsic equality. To examine this question, it is best to begin with an examination of human capital theory and its relationship to a global economy. This is followed by an examination of this philosophy's effect on educational institutions, and then this information is finally compared against the principles of social justice.

In recent years, large corporations in advanced markets, such as the United States, have decreased their emphasis on high-volume industry and switched to high-value industry in response to increases in specialized demands from their consumers, while both developing and tribal markets are taking on the demand for high-volume production (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992; Spence, 2011). The profit in high-value industry exists not in the scale and volume of the product, but by continuously discovering links between solutions and needs. Whereas high-volume products can easily be managed by lower cost workers worldwide in developing and tribal markets, these solution and needs
services must be handled in advanced markets by employees who have specialized knowledge in areas related to the identification and solving of problems as well as the ability to broker the link between these two specialties (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992; Spence, 2011).

Due to the specialized fields of high-value industries, they cannot be organized like high-volume industries with vast resources, armies of production workers, and regular routines (Reich, 1992). High-value industries must keep their overhead low so they can remain flexible and emphasize experimentation (Reich, 1992). In addition, the employees must work in small collaborative teams. This design has created various forms of enterprise webs, bound together by strategic centers. These webs are spread over many profit centers, business units, spin-offs, franchises, suppliers, and dealers (Reich, 1992). As such, high-value industries have few steady employees, and these employees share in the industry's risk and returns (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992).

This new industry design is becoming common in the global economy, where there is little inter-nation competition. Within the United States, there is no longer a national labor market (Reich, 1992; Spence, 2011). Americans are now part of an international labor market, and this is true of citizens in other nations as well. American competitiveness has little to do with the industry in which they are employed, but relies heavily on their function within the company (Reich, 1992). This leads to the notion that Americans will not share equally in the success or failure of the industry. Those whose roles are valued more highly will likely receive higher rewards (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992).
Reich (1992) divides these roles into three broad categories: routine production services, in-person services, and symbolic-analytic services. The routine production services and in-person services are roles that can be filled with those with little to no specialized education. However, the symbolic-analytic services consist of roles that require advanced education and/or specialized training. Both the routine production services and symbolic analytic services are capable of worldwide fulfillment, while the in-person services are filled locally (Reich, 1992).

In the old economy, many positions that are now classified as symbolic analysts required very specialized knowledge that employees had to master. However, in the new global economy that is replete with technology, symbolic-analysts can access much of this knowledge quickly. What this new economy requires is the ability to think about and apply this information in new and creative ways (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992).

Due to the nature of their work, symbolic-analysts are likely to be the driving force behind the new global economy. In addition, their skills and insights could easily be harnessed for the public good because problem solving, problem identifying, and brokering have the potential to create value for individual consumers (Reich, 1992). Although these services do not necessarily improve society, there are times when consumer demand and public need may converge. Many times, however, the work of symbolic analysts emphasizes the increase of wealth for some while equally decreasing the wealth of others (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992; Spence, 2011). This is largely evident when taking into consideration that "American" industry is now a global enterprise. This global spread has greatly diminished the purchasing power of the American citizen (Reich, 1992; Spence, 2011).
The increase in the number of high-value industries and the aforementioned restructuring of job categories has led to an increased demand for specialized knowledge. As the demand for symbolic-analysts continues to surge, many people are seeking to learn the necessary skills for employment in symbolic-analytic fields. Even as the supply of symbolic-analysts grows globally, it is likely that Americans will continue to excel in these fields (Reich, 1992). First, the United States excels at educating its most fortunate and talented children in these fields. Second, the United States already has numerous symbolic analysts employed and they continually learn from each other (Reich, 1992). This has put great pressure on educational institutions in the United States to emphasize curriculum that supports the skills necessary to become symbolic-analysts.

Historically, American educational institutions have followed the national economy. When high-volume industry was prevalent and the demand for routine production employees was high, the standard curriculum supported the training of these skills (Reich, 1992). However, now that the national economy has shifted to high-value industries, there has not been a similar shift in the educational curriculum leaving the majority of students to receive a standardized curriculum that was designed for a standardized economy (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992). Furthermore, there has been little concern over its improvement (Kempner, 1998).

However, the small percentage of students who are likely to become symbolic analysts have educations that follow a pattern. The majority of future symbolic-analysts frequently come from supportive families, attend elite private schools or high-quality suburban schools, and then attend prestigious universities and graduate schools (Reich, 1992). What is key in the education of these future symbolic-analysts is that it refines
four key skills: abstraction, system thinking, experimentation, and collaboration by centering on system thinking and experimentation. However, most formal schooling does little in terms of experimentation or self-guided exploration due to their purported inefficiency (Reich, 1992).

This is not necessarily true for those destined to become symbolic-analysts. The nation's best educational institutions, which most of the future symbolic-analysts attend, provide students with the skills and tools for experimentation and self-guided exploration (Reich, 1992). Furthermore, students learn to collaborate in high quality schools, a skill not provided by most formal schooling in the United States. The students who attend the high-quality schools frequently enjoy more opportunities while those with less education obtain positions with declining employment numbers (Spence, 2011).

When examining this information against the expectations of a socially just society, it is important to remember that, according to Reich (1992) and Kempner (1998), a nation's economic role is to improve the standard of living for its citizens. Reich stated that this is possible by enhancing the value of what its citizens add to the global economy. Where does America stand when, upon review of the various roles its citizens can hold, some Americans add substantial value while others do not? It used to be that loyalty to one's nation correlated with economic self-interest. This is leading to a broad gap in the economic condition of various groups in the United States (Reich, 1992; Spence, 2011). There is little that can be done to narrow this gap as the more fortunate will continue to become more tightly connected to the global economy, decreasing their stake in the less fortunate. Therefore, symbolic analysts will continue to increase their
wealth while the less fortunate will continue to become poorer (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992).

What is needed is a positive economic nationalism in which citizens take responsibility for ensuring that their neighbors (taken in the broad sense) have the capacity to lead full and productive lives without the expense of others (Reich, 1992). The development of such a national purpose would definitely be the purview of America's educational institutions where students would develop a common national identity and a common political endeavor (Dahl, 1956; Feinberg, 1998; Gutmann, 1987; Reich, 1992).

Under human capital theory, the current system of inequity will remain, potentially becoming more inequitable, and our economy will become a system based on power and control (Kempner, 1998). Educational institutions will be institutions based on systems of coercion and hegemony that treat education as a commodity, a compensatory social weapon whose purpose is to maintain a system of inequity (Feinberg, 1998; Freire, 1993; Gutmann, 1987; Kempner, 1998). A socially just society, however, is one in which the citizenry is educated in a way that ensures individual human agency (Dahl, 1956; Gutmann, 1987; Kempner, 1998; Nussbaum, 2011b; Rawls, 1993; Sen, 2009). The following section outlines capabilities theory as that socially just approach to developing individual human agency.

Capabilities Theory

Some argue that the goal of education should be educating students to pursue lives worthy of human dignity. While leaders of a country may focus on national economic growth, its citizenry often strives for more, the pursuit of meaningful lives. A
prosperous country will not console a person whose life is one of inequality and deprivation (Nussbaum, 2003, 2011a, 2011b).

What is needed is an approach that allows national development, but in such a way as to create an enabling environment for its citizenry to enjoy full lives. Capabilities Theory is such an approach when utilized in educational environments. Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum are the architects of the Capabilities Approach. Nussbaum’s (2003, 2011a, 2011b) work on capabilities, what people have the ability to do and to be, provides the framework for this research. Wherein Sen’s work measures the quality of life within a society for comparative purposes, Nusbaum forgoes creating valuation and focuses on a definite account of the necessities for basic social justice within society. This approach avoids the abstraction of language commonly found in other approaches to social justice by emphasizing highly concrete, practical language that is approachable to those with no philosophical grounding (Nussbaum, 2003, 2011a). Such a framework is in line with this work, which examines the concrete and measurable standards of teacher education accreditation for the ways they conceptualize issues of diversity and social justice.

Nussbaum’s conceptualization of Capabilities Theory relates to the work of Sen, whose framework serves as political and economic programming that is superior to utilitarian and quasi-Rawlsian approaches and views capabilities in their non-reducible, plural form (Nussbaum, 2011b; Sen, 1995; Sen, 1999). The provisional definition of capabilities theory is that it is an approach capable of conducting quality-of-life assessments and theorizing about the basic tenets of social justice. In doing so, capabilities theory takes each person as an end, considering their current level of well-
being and the opportunities made available within society. Central to the theory is the concept of choice, arguing that all good societies should promote a set of substantial freedoms that the citizenry may decide to exercise, respecting the right of self-definition (Nussbaum, 2003, 2011a, 2011b).

Nussbaum (2003, 2011b) stated that capabilities theory derives from a deep concern for entrenched social injustice and inequality born out of discrimination or marginalization. Capabilities theory encourages governmental and public policy that will improve quality of life factors for a citizenry based on their personal capabilities. Nussbaum’s (2003, 2011a, 2011b) approach, which utilizes capabilities theory to construct a definition of basic social justice, adds the notions of human dignity, threshold and political liberalism to the process. While Sen’s conceptualization of capabilities theory is concerned with these ideas, it does not make central use of them in the way Nussbaum’s framework does.

The capabilities discussed in capabilities theory are what Sen (1999) refers to as substantial freedoms, a set of typically interrelated opportunities for an individual to choose or act in such a way as to improve their station politically, socially and/or economically (Nussbaum, 2011a, 2011b). Nussbaum (2011b) also refers to these as substantial freedoms, and she links these to an individual’s personal characteristics or internal capabilities. A person’s internal capabilities develop over time through interaction with social, economic, familial and political environments. Societies that have an interest in promoting combined capabilities, the ability to take action and make choices combined with the political structure necessary to do so, must support the individual development of internal capabilities. In addition, the operationalization of
capabilities occurs only when the citizenry has the political freedom and opportunity to function in that area. Meaning, combined capabilities require a supportive sociopolitical environment and the education of the person. One potential method to achieve this is through the provision of public schooling (Nussbaum, 2011a, 2011b).

Adam Smith (2008) argued that by depriving a citizenry of educational access, it in turn leads to the degradation of human character. One goal of capabilities theory is the development of innate human powers, or basic capabilities, through education. Nussbaum’s (2011a, 2011b) approach to capabilities theory posits that a socially just nation’s political duty is to ensure that every member of its citizenry moves beyond some basic threshold of combined capability, and not in a meritocratic way determined by a person’s basic capabilities.

A government’s use of capabilities theory as a foundational principle for law and public policy must center on the substance of capabilities, ranking them by their worth and importance. This is sensible given that capabilities theory is not descriptive of human nature, but rather evaluative and ethical, questioning what humanity has the ability to do. In as much, it also asks of these capabilities, which are minimally necessary for a liberally democratic and socially just society (Nussbaum, 2011a, 2011b). This approach supports the notion of human dignity, a concept arguably central to issues of social justice. While not the only foundational principle of Nussbaum’s (2011b) discussion of capabilities theory, it is a central notion. This centrality guides the dictation of public policy supportive of individual human agency in place of the focus on Gross Domestic Product and policy that serves to infantilize citizens to the status of passive recipients of public benefits (Nussbaum, 2003, 2011a, 2011b).
A socially just society distributes the notion of human dignity equally to all citizens capable of individual agency, ensuring all receive equal treatment and protection under the law. Thus, Nussbaum’s (2003, 2011a, 2011b) discussion of Capabilities Theory centers on the protection of these prepolitical, individual freedoms so essential that their removal from the citizenry has a negative impact on human dignity, leaving other freedoms to a society’s political process. The 10 Central Capabilities Nussbaum proposed are a minimum threshold to protect individual human dignity. The irreducible, heterogeneous Central Capabilities Nussbaum (2003, 2011a; 2011b, pp. 33-34) proposed are

1. Life: The ability to live a life of normal length
2. Bodily Health: The ability to be healthy, nourished and assured of adequate shelter
3. Bodily Integrity: The ability to move freely and securely, and to have opportunities for sexual choice and control
4. Senses, Imagination and Thought: The ability to use the senses, to think and to imagine in a way cultivated through education
5. Emotions: The ability to have attachments to things and to other individuals
6. Practical Reason: The ability to form a conception of good and to engage in critical reflection
7. Affiliation: The ability to live with and toward others, to express empathy, and engage in social interaction. This also relates to the ability to have self-respect and to experience non-humiliation and non-discrimination.
8. Other Species: The ability to live with concern for the natural world.
9. Play: The ability to enjoy recreational activity.

10. Control Over One’s Environment: This relates to both the political and material worlds. The ability to participate in political choices governing one’s life. The ability to hold property on an equal basis with others.

In a socially just society, these capabilities belong first to individuals, an idea essential for policy that commonly perceives families or social groups as homogenous units, denying the existence of individual human agency (Nussbaum, 2011b). Furthermore, 2 of the 10 Central Capabilities support and help to organize the remaining capabilities, namely affiliation and practical reason. When the capabilities are present at a threshold necessary of the assurance of human dignity, these two capabilities interweave among them forming a heterogeneous unity necessary for the promotion of individual human agency.

The Formation of the First Teacher Education Accreditor: Pre-1950

At the beginning of the 20th century, immigration, industrialization and immigration were strong societal influences. In addition, school enrollments surged leading to a drastic shortage of teachers. This led to the so-called ‘feminization’ of teaching as schools hired women to meet the demand. At the same time, there was a call for professional standards and a debate as to the best methodology and environment for the training of teachers. Due to a lack of knowledge about what practices led to high quality teachers, numerous councils formed between 1920 and 1940 to study the issue (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005).

One such study, the Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study, identified 83 qualities of good teachers that were rank-ordered and published as recommended
guidelines for teacher education curriculums (Charters & Waples, 1929). In 1929, Congress, with the support of the AACTE and several other teacher education groups, used the results of this study to mandate that the U.S. Commissioner of Education conduct a nationwide survey of EPPs. The National Survey of the Education of Teachers led to changes in the practice of EPPs that employed more specificity in teacher training and increased academic expectations (Cremin, 1953; Evenden, 1933).

Then, between 1938 and 1944, the American Council on Education released numerous publications on teacher education in an effort to encourage EPPs to initiate a process of self-improvement. This process involved the Council’s desire to expedite reform and increase cooperation among the multiple agencies involved in teacher education. The result was that such cooperation to create a single formula was unproductive (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005).

The end of the Second World War during this period negated much of the improvement created by these three key studies in teacher education. Many of the trained teachers flocked to war-related industries, resulting in a great decline in student enrollment in EPPs and a large increase in the number of untrained teachers working under emergency certifications (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). As a result, the NEA established the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards in 1946 to improve the status of teaching as a profession (Bigelow, 1958; Conant, 1963; VanEvery, 1979).

**The Problem of Education: 1950s-1980s**

In the 1950s, the Baby Boom generation began entering institutions of public education. During this same period, both the Progressive Education and Urban Reform
movements were beginning to fade from the political realm. Because of the Great Depression and World War II, the United States saw an increase in inner city racial and poverty ghettos that coincided with a rise in northern migration of southern ethnic minorities (Mitchell, 2011). During this same period, educational research became an identified field in its own right and the preparation of educators came under scrutiny (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). The move to national accreditation during the 1950s was intended to ensure standardization of educator preparation and enhance the quality of teacher education nationwide during a period of drastic social change (Angus, 2001; Conant, 1963; Koerner, 1963). It was during this period of the Cold War, immediately following World War II, that it became obvious that educational policy is a highly political realm, especially in matters of social equity and the securing of democratic rights for a nation’s citizenry (Mitchell, 2011).

In 1954, the first in a series of dramatic events that continues to impact educational policy occurred. The United States Supreme Court issued their decision in the Brown vs. Board of Education case, requiring the desegregation of public schools. In that same year NCATE (2014c) was founded, claiming that their mission is one of both accountability and improvement in the field of teacher education. This accountability and improvement occurs through an accreditation process in which standards are created and institutions must then demonstrate, through compelling evidence, that they are meeting these standards. The standards that underpin the accreditation process were reviewed, and if necessary revised, on a 7-year cycle against current research and policy.

According to Wise (2005), NCATE is founded on the principle of creating a strong profession by creating a shared body of research based knowledge aimed at
creating thoroughly prepared professional educators. NCATEs philosophy in developing this knowledge is democratic in nature, centered on codifying this knowledge base and developing standards through a process of consensus building among the relevant, diverse stakeholders. Tamir and Wilson (2005) express concern regarding whether or not such consensus building is an inherent good in relation to the creation of a normative view for teacher education. They argue that consensus building is indeed a necessity in democratic deliberation, but the development of standards for specialized knowledge should not be democratic and should grow out of expertise. As the NCATE standards unfold in the following sections, it will be evident that they are research based, but that the consensus driven process is important to the NCATE professional agenda.

NCATE, being the oldest of the national accreditors of teacher education, has had several versions of standards over the organization’s life. These standards set forth not only the accreditors expectations for EPPs, but also the processes and procedures for EPPs to obtain national accreditation. The following discussion will focus solely on the accreditors’ expectations for the content and procedures that EPPs use to educate teacher candidates. An overview of each of the standards will be provided for the first edition published in 1957. The discussion of subsequent editions will only involve substantive changes to the standards from the preceding edition.

In the same year that NCATE published the first set of standards for the accreditation of teacher education, the Soviets launched Sputnik leading to a public outcry against the ability of American public schools to effectively prepare graduates to work in the math and science fields (a notion similar to the current push for STEM education), exacerbating the existing condemnation of public schools providing a low
quality education lacking academic rigor (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Malen, 2011; Mitchell, 2011). This eventually led to the adoption of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1959 (Mitchell, 2011). Soon after the adoption of the NDEA, the militant unionization of teachers began with the 1960 strike of the American Federation of Teachers in New York City.

The perceived failure of public education was blamed on the inability of educationists to effectively prepare teachers. Bestor (1953) and others supported these ideas, calling American public schools an educational wasteland and providing scholarly critiques of teacher education (Conant, 1963; Koerner, 1963). It appears that many of the researchers during this era were influenced by critics’ that argued there was no science to the field of education. There was also an apparent move over time for the research to focus on the personal characteristics and behavioral dispositions of teachers and an attempt to link these characteristics to the teacher’s effectiveness in the classroom (Gage, 1963).

According to Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005), one of the first publications in this time period, written by Sarason, Davidson and Blatt (1962), identified teacher education as an unstudied problem. Their concern here was not the field of teacher education as a whole, but the disconnect between the preparation of educators and the realities of the PreK-12 classroom. This was followed with two published studies on the state of teacher education by Conant (1963) and Koerner (1963).

In Conant’s (1963) study, sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, he argued that the academic requirements for teachers were low and varied across institutions. He also put forth that there was not an effort on the part of EPPs to limit the
academic requirements in their curriculum as argued by scholars and the greater public (Goodlad, 1990). Conant ended with a recommendation that EPPs place a greater emphasis on the liberal arts and that states not dictate the amount of time spent on pedagogical sciences.

Koerner’s (1963) study carried far more condemnation on the preparation of teachers when compared to Conant’s (1963) work. Koerner took aim at the academic qualifications of education faculty, claiming that they were of “inferior intellectual quality” (p 17). Koerner concluded that the evidence supporting a science to teacher preparation was weak and called for reduced rigidity and multiple routes of entry into the profession. He claimed that the only hope of solving the problem of teacher education was through the moral and intellectual training of teachers through subject matter and a liberal education.

Regardless of these critiques of teacher education, the federal government instituted programs during the 1960s to address teacher shortages, especially in impoverished areas. The government began in 1963 by establishing federal research and development centers and regional educational laboratories. One of the largest projects established by the federal government in 1963 was the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas. The goal of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas was to develop innovative approaches, especially the use of technology in training teachers and analyzing the effectiveness of those technologies (Freiberg & Waxman, 1990). There is evidence that this field of research was linked to the competency-based approach to teacher education that began in the 1970s (Urban, 1990). This led to a heavy emphasis
on teacher outcomes and the identification of training procedures rather than student outcomes in education as research was linking target teacher behaviors to student learning outcomes (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005).

During the following 10 years, a large number of federal policies were passed that had a direct impact on public education. First, the Teacher Corps was created through Title V of the 1965 Higher Education Act, and additional fiscal and federal support of the public schools was the supposed emphasis of the 1965 adoption of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Mitchell, 2011). Then, in 1967 the Education Professions Development Act was enacted in an effort to improve the recruitment and training of teachers (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). Five years later, Title IX was enacted with the educational amendments of 1972 in order to protect individuals from discrimination in educational programs activities based on gender. Finally, in 1975 Congress passed the first version if the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, public law 94-142 in an effort to meet the needs of individuals with disabilities. At the heart of all of this legislation, congress became a key player in issues of educational equity and formalized educational governance at the federal level (Malen, 2011; Mitchell, 2011).

This augmentation of resources at the federal level did not come without a price for public schools. Tied to the federal resources and support an expectation of accountability for educational outcomes, and an accompanying threat to reorganize and punish unproductive schools and educators. This was reinforced by a turn towards fiscal and social conservatism in politics, and a belief that through research education can become a technical field without a need for cultural merit (Mitchell, 2011).
The Accountability Movement: 1980s-2000

Peck and Tucker (1973) compiled what many view as a definitive synthesis of the research on teacher education conducted during the 1960s. They posited that there was a significant increase in the amount of research in teacher education since 1964 and they attributed this increase to the large influx of federal funding that began in 1963. Peck and Tucker stated that this plethora of research demonstrated that pre-service teachers could master research proven teaching behaviors during their EPP if certain training procedures were utilized such as interaction analysis, micro-teaching, modelling and behavior modification.

Whereas Peck and Tucker (1973) seemed supportive of the research conducted in the 1960s, Haberman and Stinnett (1973) were critical of the period's research. Their argument was that the amount of research was limited, and therefore the EPPs that began using the related competency-based approach had no empirical support for doing so. This sentiment was later echoed by Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Zeichner (1979) who argued that the empirical-analytic approach that dominated the research lacked a critical nature that incorporated the problematic social arrangements of schooling.

A renewed public outcry arose at the beginning of the 1980s. Economists were showing that the United States had not kept pace with the world economy. As has typically occurred, the public pointed to concerns in the public schools. The direction for the blame, and the subsequent change in educational politics, may have been instigated by the 1983 report by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform (Goodlad, 1990; Lagemann, 2000; Ravitch, 2000).
Following the release of *A Nation at Risk*, several influential groups, such as the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, began pushing for reforms. In their report, the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) put forth that there was a need to ensure that teachers are properly prepared to meet the future needs of America’s students. This view, consistent with earlier treatises by AACTE, Judge and Gideonse eventually garnered support for the formation of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Gideonse, 1982). The Holmes Group (1986) also issued a call for educational reform directed at teacher preparation that was consistent with the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Their proposal was one in which teachers would earn an undergraduate liberal arts degree and obtain their professional educator preparation in a master’s degree program.

Another professional organization was founded in 1986, the National Network for Educational Renewal, whose mission was to expand upon the work of the Center for Educational Renewal founded by Goodlad, Sirotnik and Soder in 1985. The premise with both of these groups was that K-12 school improvement should occur in conjunction with reform in teacher education in order to establish lasting outcomes (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). Goodlad (1990) argued that the state of education had not improved greatly since the work of Koerner (1963) and Conant (1963). He posited that there was a need for more coherent EPPs whose components were linked with each other and whose mission was to prepare educators to meet the needs of an ever changing society.

Centered on the commitment that schools needed a professionally trained teaching force, these professional organizations and educational researchers sought to provide a
formal professional knowledge base for educator preparation (Houston, 1990; Shulman, 1983; Shulman, 1986b). Reynolds (1989) argued that the profession needed to become far more deliberate and rational in their approach by creating policy centered on the aforementioned knowledge base.

During the period from the 1980s to 2000, the fields of cognitive science, interpretive traditions, and relationships between research and practice were beginning to gain momentum and to influence teacher education (Lagemann, 2000). There also appears to be a heavy emphasis on participant observer research emphasizing classroom ecology during the 1980s (Erickson, 1986; Shulman, 1986b). A large shift in the focus of research on teacher education appeared to be spearheaded by both the works of Lanier and Shulman at Michigan State University during the 1970s and as the result of the National Conference on Studies of Teaching in 1974. According to Zeichner (1999), the acceptance of this shift in teacher education research appears to align with the creation of the American Educational Research Association's Division K on Teaching and Teacher Education in 1984. It was at this point that changes to the focus on teacher education research becomes most noticeable. Researchers at institutions of higher education such as Stanford University and University of Wisconsin continued their work during the 1980s and 1990s, with an emphasis on teacher cognition, specifically shifting teacher training from specific behaviors to knowledge development in a more comprehensive and interdisciplinary approach (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Lanier & Little, 1986).

Lanier and Little (1986) found that teacher education had taken on an air of conservativism and was plagued with a large number of candidates who demonstrated poor academic ability. As such, they argued that teacher education was emphasizing
group management over intellect. Not everyone agreed with the work initiated by Lanier and Little. Carter (1990) stated that many of the researchers from prior decades that argued for behavioral approaches to teacher training dismissed the work of Lanier and Little as mentalist. Houston (1990) attempted to bridge the gap between earlier research and the work of Lanier and Little. In his work, he pins the slow progress and the thin levels of research on teacher education on a lack of funding, poor research methods and no centralized research agendas.

There was a new emphasis added to educational research on teacher learning and cognition in the 1990s. A program of research emerged that explored how teachers learn to teach in diverse educational environments, educator dispositions and best practice pedagogies (Bennet, 1995; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Zeichner, 1993). In the early 1990s, NCATE required all of its specialized professional associations (SPAs) to revise their standards to be performance based. In the 1995 standards, NCATE began to evidence a shift to candidate competence by requiring EPPs to demonstrate evidence of multiple performance measures (Hamel & Merz, 2005; NCAE, 2004). In addition, NCATE began the move to align accreditation and licensing standards by incorporating the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) model licensing standards, developed by the CCSSO, into its accreditation standards which would enable states to readily accept the NCATE principles (NCATE, 2004).

**NCATE standards in 1995.** The 1995 edition of the NCATE standards marked another shift in design. According to NCATE, the 1995 standards were guided by three themes: intellectual vitality, professional community, and professional conscience. These
three themes are integrated across the four standards: 1) design of professional education; 2) candidates in professional education; 3) professional education faculty; and 4) the unit for professional education.

**Standard 1: Design of professional education.** The first standard of the 1995 edition was broad in nature and was broken into 8 parts. First, Standard 1 set forth the expectation that EPPs be guided by a conceptual framework that is knowledge-based and consistent with the unit mission. EPPs were expected to regularly evaluate the program and the conceptual framework against the growing knowledge base and candidate assessment data. Second, as in prior editions EPPs had to ensure that candidates received a broad base of knowledge through a general studies curriculum that incorporated multicultural and global perspectives. Third, NCATE still expected EPPs to ensure that candidates attained a level of competence in the content that they were licensed to teach. Fourth, NCATE maintained the expectation that teacher candidates acquired the necessary pedagogical skill to work with all students, including those from diverse cultural backgrounds and those with learning exceptionalities. Fifth, NCATE now had the expectation that EPPs train teacher candidates to integrate both the general content and their pedagogical skill to create meaningful learning experiences for all students. Sixth, EPPs were expected to ensure that the field experiences were aligned with the conceptual framework and were built on a cycle of reflection and application of theory. Finally, EPPs were expected to collaborate with their PreK-12 partners to design and deliver programs that effectively prepared school personnel and improved educational quality.
Standard 2: Candidates in professional education. The second standard in the 1995 edition of the NCATE standards related to the admission and evaluation of teacher candidates. The first criterion set the minimum acceptable standards for admission to EPPS, while the second criterion laid out expectations for the recruitment and admission of diverse teacher candidates. The third and fourth criteria set the expectation that EPPs systematically assess candidates from the point of admission to the point of program completion utilizing clear and transparent requirements.

Standard 3: Professional education faculty. Standard 3 of the 1995 edition of the NCATE standards reiterated the earlier editions expectations for faculty members. It was expected EPPs would employ faculty that were teacher scholars in their assigned field and who maintained levels of engagement with the professional education community. In addition, EPPs were expected to maintain a diverse faculty. Finally, EPPs had to maintain faculty workloads that permitted the faculty to maintain effective involvement in teaching service and scholarship while providing regular opportunities for professional development.

Standard 4: The unit for professional education. The EPP had to have a clear designation as a unit that governed and operated the teacher education program. This unit needed to ensure adequate resources were provided to support teaching and scholarship by both the faculty and the candidates and to fulfill its mission and ensure it offered high quality programs.

Murray (1996) continued Reynolds (1989) treatise that the profession needed to become far more deliberate and rational in their approach by creating policy centered on the aforementioned knowledge base. Christensen (1996) echoed this sentiment by
arguing that there was scholarly evidence demonstrating that NCATE’s accreditation standards helped to shape the research and works of EPPs and as such could serve as a guiding force for the professionalization of education. During this period, we also began to see a stark increase in the focus on teacher education accountability and increased standards, and the research began to move toward examining policy associated with teacher preparation.

Globalization during the mid-1990s led to concerns about the preparation of children for future knowledge-based jobs. This, coupled with increasing diversity and a growing achievement gap between minorities and the mainstream culture led to an urgency for educational reform. In 1996, President Clinton assembled the National Education Summit in which he and the nation's governors committed to holding schools to rigorous standards and assessments. That same year, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) issued a report stating that teacher education would have the strongest impact on K-12 student academic achievement and that the current model contained major flaws, including insufficient length of preparation, curricular fragmentation, superficial curriculum, and traditional instructional and schooling perspectives (NCATF, 1996). Later research by others supported such ideas (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Young, 2002).

There was an increase in public interest in teacher education from 1996 to 2000. Thousands of articles were printed during this period condemning teacher quality and licensure (Cochran-Smith, 2001). Many public policy debates on teacher preparation zeroed in on candidate results on licensure exams and their K-12 student outcomes. As a result, accountability in teacher education and K-12 education became the bottom line,
and thanks to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 the measure of accountability (Cochran-Smith & Fried, 2005).

In 2001, NCATE implemented a new performance-based accreditation framework that required EPPs to provide evidence of candidate performance to maintain accreditation, a drastic shift from its earlier emphasis on curriculum (NCATE, 2004). This new policy, which is also embedded in many state approval guidelines and in federal legislation, requires programs to demonstrate their effectiveness in part by their candidates’ effect on student learning (Hamel & Merz, 2005). NCATE states that this transition to a performance-based system was a response to concerns raised by policymakers and was a natural outgrowth of the standards movement in the 1980s and 1990s (NCATE, 2004). Such concerns are evidenced in the American Council on Education's President's Task Force on Teacher Education (1999) report that called for increased higher education responsibility for the preparation and continued development of the nation's teaching force. The task force recommended that this be accomplished through increased collaboration, transparent admission requirements, and strengthened program evaluation efforts. There had also been an increase in the number of states requiring candidates to pass licensure examinations since 1987. Policymakers had begun using aggregated licensure examination scores as a tool for evaluating the effectiveness of EPPs. During this process, some states proved to have high failure rates on these exams, causing policymakers to initiate changes to the Higher Education Act, linking the effectiveness of EPPs to an institution's ability to receive federal student aid (Earley, 2000). Opposing such ideas, conservative groups such as the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation advocated for deregulation of educator preparation and the creation of
alternative routes for educator preparation, arguing that there is little evidence supporting the need for pedagogical training beyond a strong academic content background (Abell Foundation, 2001; Ballou & Podgursky, 2000; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005).

In more recent years, state and federal educational policy have deviated from the long standing emphasis of evaluating instructional methodologies, classroom management and professional dispositions. Instead, modern policy emphasizes the requirement of EPPs to evaluate candidates based on evidence demonstrating their impact on K-12 student academic performance. This policy is also evidenced in the NCATE (2002) standards, which requires institutions to show evidence that teacher candidates positively impact learning for all students. In addition, federal legislation was also drafted requiring states to use similar value added forms of evidence to evaluate the performance of EPPs (Hamel and Merz, 2005). More recently, CAEP is requiring EPPs to track and demonstrate the effectiveness of graduates impact on K-12 student learning for 4 years after completing their teacher education program (2013).

**NCATE standards in 2002.** 2002 marked another large restructuring in the NCATE standards. The 2002 edition once again increased the overall number of standards, in this case from 4 to 6. The standards were: 1) candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions; 2) assessment system and unit evaluation; 3) field experiences and clinical practice; 4) diversity; 5) faculty qualifications, performance and development; and 6) unit governance and resources.

**Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.** This standard encompasses many of the expectations contained in earlier editions of the standards. Namely, that teacher candidates should be expected to demonstrate the necessary content,
pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions required to ensure all students learn. In addition, EPPs were expected to institute some form of assessment to ensure that positive student learning occurred under the teacher candidates instruction.

**Standard 2: Assessment system and unit evaluation.** As in the 1995 and other earlier editions of the NCATE standards, the 2002 edition expected EPPs to have a system of collecting and analyzing assessment data from teacher candidates and program completers. Continuous program improvement should be one intended goal of the data collection and analysis.

**Standard 3: Field experiences and clinical practice.** EPPs were expected to collaborate with school partners in the design, implementation and evaluation of their field experience requirements.

**Standard 4: Diversity.** The EPP was expected to ensure that candidates received experiences that would enable them to acquire knowledge and skills necessary to work with a diverse student population. This included experiences in working with diverse faculty, candidates and PreK-12 students.

**Standard 5: Faculty qualifications, performance, and development.** As in prior editions of the standards, faculty were expected to be well qualified in their teaching assignments and to model best practices in both teaching and assessment. The unit governance was also expected to regularly evaluate faculty performance and to provide professional development opportunities.

**Standard 6: Unit governance and resources.** The EPP was expected to have the appropriate leadership, budget, and resources to effectively prepare teacher candidates to meet professional and state standards in their licensure area.
TEAC Emerges

Although not the focus of this work, a discussion of the brief history of the secondary national accreditor for educator preparation is warranted. TEAC was founded in 1997 as a nonprofit organization whose mission was to improve the academic preparation of professional educators. There primary approach to this work was the accreditation of EPPs using a process in which the EPP makes a case for its effective preparation of professional educators. Wherein NCATE emphasized consensus building, TEAC avoided such ideas.

Evidencing this, the TEAC board of directors was not representative of the accreditors diverse stakeholders, arguing that the profession should consist of those whose actions are founded in scholarship and evidence and use this knowledge to guide their decisions (Murray, 2005; TEAC, 2014a; Wise, 2005). As such, the mission of TEAC was to provide a scientific approach to the accreditation process for EPPs based on independent research and evidence conducted at the institution (Tamir & Wilson, 2005; TEAC). However, Tamir and Wilson question the potential narrowness of such an approach. They argue that such a scientifically based process will end in teachers, and the evaluation mechanisms used to certify their skill, being reflective of a sociological process called the social construction of reality. This is because both the accreditation process and educational research are social constructions in which the agents actions reflect the hegemonic structures of society. Therefore, even with TEACs less prescriptive approach, there is still a risk of being bound by sophisticated forms of hegemony and a risk of constraining the potential liberatory nature of teacher education (Tamir & Wilson).
**TEAC standards in 2005.** The first edition of published standards by TEAC was released in 2005. This edition contained 3 “Quality Principles” that TEAC used to guide their accreditation decisions: 1) Evidence of student learning; 2) Valid assessments of student learning; and 3) Institutional learning.

*Quality principle 1: Evidence of student learning.* This quality principle is similar to the NCATE standard on curriculum. It outlined the expectation that teacher candidates develop a depth of content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. In addition, it required EPPs to ensure that teacher candidates demonstrate a “caring teaching skill.” This caring teaching skill meant that candidates accepted their students unconditionally and strived to address each student’s unique educational needs. In addition to this 3 criterion, the TEAC embedded a “cross-cutting” dimension into the first quality principle. This cross-cutting theme expected EPPs to have a basis in the liberal arts that included providing teacher candidates multicultural perspective and understanding and effectively prepared them in the use of technology.

*Quality principle 2: Valid assessments of student learning.* EPPs must provide appropriate rationales that the techniques employed to assess the performance of teacher candidates and reasonable and credible and provide evidence of the assessments’ validity and reliability.

*Quality principle 3: Institutional learning.* EPPs were expected to demonstrate that programmatic changes were driven by data and that there is a system of quality control to yield reliable evidence on the programs outcomes.

**NCATE standards in 2008.** While the NCATE standards are not drastically changed from the 2002 to the 2008 edition, the standards books contained a “Call to
Action” linking NCATE to social justice initiatives. This call to action outlined an expectation that NCATE accredited institutions would effectively prepare educators to support social justice and combat instances of discrimination. Beyond the inclusion of this call for action, only minor changes for clarity were made.

**TEAC standards in 2010.** There was no identifiable change in the TEAC quality principles in 2005 beyond providing more clarity in the principles and the expected evidence.

**A Single Teacher Education Accréditor is Formed**

A push for a single, unifying voice in teacher education accreditation began in 2011. Both NCATE and TEAC entered talks to determine the possibility of merging the two national accrediting bodies of teacher education under a single entity with a unified set of standards. This new accreditor, CAEP, became the official consolidated body of NCATE and TEAC on July 1, 2013. Both NCATE and TEAC will remain subsidiaries of CAEP until the time that all of the institutions who are accredited under the separate organizations become accredited under the new CAEP standards and guidelines. The mission of CAEP was not just to become the consolidation of CAEP, rather it has the ambitions of becoming a change agent in the profession by raining the performance of teacher candidates and PreK-12 professional educators. Furthermore, it hopes to raise the stature of the entire education profession by setting higher expectations for evidence based practice (CAEP, 2014)

**CAEP standards in 2013.** The newest national accreditor in teacher education published its first set of 5 standards in July, 2013. These standards, while containing similar content to the most recent NCATE and TEAC standards, were still markedly
different from either organization. The 5 standards are: 1) Content and Pedagogical Knowledge; 2) Clinical Partnerships and Practice; 3) Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity; 4) Program Impact; and 5) Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement. Most of these standards are broken into two parts, candidate expectations and provider expectations.

**Standard 1: Content and pedagogical knowledge.** As in many of the prior standards discussed, EPPs were expected to ensure that teacher candidates developed a deep understanding of the content within their teaching discipline and that they could use discipline specific pedagogical practice to advance their learning of all students. More specifically, candidates were expected to demonstrate an understanding of the developmental progression of the 10 Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Standards. Providers had to ensure candidates employed research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and measure student growth, especially research and data use in line with the SPA, national Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and state requirements.

**Standard 2: Clinical partnerships and practice.** CAEP put forth the expectation that EPPs ensure that their programs center on high-quality clinical practice. As part of this expectation, EPPs and their PreK-12 partners must work together to develop mutually beneficial practices for both the PreK-12 institutions and the broader community. Furthermore, the CAEP standards outline the expectation that the personnel involved in the clinical partnerships be co-selected from individuals with a demonstrated record of positive impacts on PreK-12 student learning. The design of these clinical experiences is expected to provide teacher candidate depth, breadth, diversity and
coherence in the development of their effectiveness in creating a positive impact on PreK-12 student learning. Throughout these clinical experiences, teacher candidates should participate in multiple performance-based assessments that evaluate their developing ability to have that positive-impact on PreK-12 student learning.

**Standard 3: Candidate quality, recruitment and selectivity.** The CAEP standards continue the expectation that EPPs work to recruit high-quality candidates from diverse backgrounds and populations into the field of education. In addition, the recruitment efforts should be directed at high demand fields, such as STEM and special education. Specifically, CAEP requires that, by 2020, EPPs admission requirements for teacher candidates be set to a 3.0 grade point average and that they have performed in the top 33% on nationally normed achievement tests in addition to other EPP adopted selectivity factors. Furthermore, EPPs are expected to maintain high levels of selectivity as teacher candidates progress from admission through completion of the teacher education program.

**Standard 4: Program impact.** CAEP set an expectation that EPPs demonstrate the impact of their completers on PreK-12 student learning. In addition, EPPs must show evidence of program completers’ and their employers satisfaction with their preparation.

**Standard 5: Provider quality assurance and continuous improvement.** CAEP expects that EPPs will maintain a quality assurances system containing data across multiple measures for the standards above and that they will use this data to inform continuous improvement efforts.

**CAEP’s cross-cutting themes: Diversity.** CAEP identified two key cross-cutting themes that they state are embedded throughout their standards. The first is diversity.
CAEP states that American classrooms continue to become increasingly diverse in terms of religion, culture, gender, language, disability, socio-economic status and sexual orientation. However, the diversity of educators fail to match that diversity. Therefore, CAEP states that efforts need to be increased to recruit diverse candidates and provide them experiences in diverse situations. In addition, CAEP outlines expectations for both the curriculum and clinical experiences. In terms of curriculum, EPPs need to incorporate content that broadens candidate perspectives, deepens awareness of diverse learners, and professional responsibility toward diverse learners.

**CAEP’s cross-cutting themes: Technology and digital learning.** CAEP expects technology to be incorporated into teacher training, both as a pedagogical tool to train teachers and as a key component of the curriculum. EPPs need to ensure candidates are proficient in the application of digital media and the capabilities for the use of technology in the PreK-12 classroom environment.
Chapter 3

Research Methodology and Data Analysis

Teachers that actively confront the realities affecting differences in students’ cultural knowledge enhance the learning environment and provide alternative learning experiences that guide students in their understanding of how to excel in both tradition and non-traditional educational settings (Helsing, Howell, Kegan, & Lahey, 2008; Jeffries, Powers-Costello & Dean, 2011). As such, there is a need for training in best practices that support autonomous professional judgment in diverse educational settings. The goal of such training should support professional judgment that maximizes the public good, i.e., a high quality education for all students (Tamir & Wilson, 2005).

In order to do so, educators should receive adequate training on issues of diversity and social justice in their educator preparation programs (EPPs) (Andrews & Schwab, 1993). However, in many cases the curriculum employed by EPPs is largely a combination of state regulatory requirements and national accreditation standards. This results in heads of EPPs resigning themselves to submit their programmatic curriculum to these external requirements in a reactive, conforming nature (Goodlad, 1990). As 29 states require EPPs to hold national accreditation and approximately 55% of EPPs currently hold national accreditation, the history of national accreditation, especially its emphasis on issues of diversity and social justice, bears examination (NCATE, 2014a; TEAC, 2014b). This work seeks to answer the question, “In what ways have diversity

---

2 Based on the estimated number of educator preparation programs found in the AACTE (2010) report An Emerging Picture of the Teacher Preparation Pipeline.
and social justice been conceptualized, and to what degree have they been emphasized, in the accreditation standards for educator preparation over time?” In addition, this work also explored the question, “What influences have shaped their conceptualization and determined the degree of emphasis?”

Design and Methodology

To answer these questions, the researcher conducted an historical analysis. This methodology was selected because of the desire to determine how the issue under investigation has evolved over time within a broader societal and policy context. In order to answer the questions, the researcher relied on historical and contemporary records of both a primary and secondary nature. The nature of the questions align well with a historical analysis because of the desire to systematically interpret and classify data across a period of time while employing procedures to establish relationships and determine if there is potential for the identification of directional cause-and-effect relationships (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Data gathering methods. The data to answer the research questions consisted of historical records of the NCATE, TEAC and CAEP standards and historical and contemporary research on teacher education and K-12 educational policy initiatives. The standards were obtained in electronic format from the public relations department of the new single teacher education accreditation entity, CAEP. The standards are either electronically created documents or, in the case of older editions, scanned versions of hard copies of the standards document. Each standards document contains an historical overview, a description of the standards, and rubrics for program evaluation and/or the criteria for compliance with the standards. The research on historical and contemporary
policy initiatives was obtained from library databases and organizational (such as AACTE) and governmental websites.

**Data-analysis procedures.** The data analysis for the first research question, in what ways have diversity and social justice been conceptualized, and to what degree have they been emphasized, in the accreditation standards for educator preparation over time, consisted of two stages. First, the researcher read through each of the standards documents, rubrics and/or criteria for compliance noting sections that discuss concepts of diversity and/or social justice. After the first pass, the researcher read through the sections of the text identified as discussing concepts of diversity and social justice and examined them to determine how each of the concepts were conceptualized and to what extent they were emphasized in each edition of the standards. Then, to answer the second research question, what influences have shaped their conceptualization and determined their degree of emphasis, the researcher summarized educational policy and research from the period leading up to each new edition of the standards. In addition, the researcher included a broad discussion of the socio-political context of the time. These summaries were then compared with the content of the standards in order to determine what external research, social or policy initiatives may have influenced the content of the standards.

**Personal biography.** The researcher is a doctoral candidate in educational sociology at a large, Midwestern university located in an urban locale. He is also the Director of Teacher Preparation and associate professor of education at a mid-sized Midwestern university that emphasizes technical and professional educational programs.
Prior to this appointment, he served as the Director of Teacher Preparation and assistant professor of education at a small, rural Midwestern college.

As part of both his current and past employment, the researcher maintained responsibility for the interpretation and application of national accreditation standards within the EPP for which he held administrative responsibility. The EPP for which he holds current responsibility is a relatively new program for the institution and is currently seeking national accreditation through CAEP and has recently achieved state accreditation using an approach based on the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards.
Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine in what ways diversity and social justice have been conceptualized, and to what extent they have been emphasized, in the accreditation standards for educator preparation since 1995. In addition, this study was intended to explore what influences shaped the conceptualization and emphasis of diversity and social justice in the accreditation standards for educator preparation. To explore these questions, the researcher conducted a historical analysis using historical and contemporary records of both primary and secondary nature. The results of this analysis follow.

NCATE Standards from 1995

Mission and scope. The NCATE standards for the accreditation of educator preparation published in 1995 is the point at which the organization most heavily emphasized the concepts of diversity and social justice within their standards documents. There are two distinct points within the document’s “Mission and Scope” that discuss the importance of recognizing diversity within educational environments. Where the document outlines the conceptual framework for the standards, the text reads

American society is becoming more diverse with students in classrooms drawn from many cultures and ethnic groups. Preparing teachers to teach students with diverse needs how to meet society’s demands for higher performance has created a new agenda for educators and policymakers, (NCATE, 1995, p. 3).
This statement leads into NCATE’s “Vision of the Professional Teacher” in which the organization outlines three overarching tenets that were to guide EPPs. There were two sub-items of these tenets that support the recognition of diversity. First,

All children can and should learn. Accredited schools, colleges, and departments of education should:

- ensure that new teachers meet accepted standards of practice, and attain the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach independently;
- build a body of professional knowledge, and disseminate it through the professional community;
- commit to preparing teachers for a diverse community of students;
- encourage collegiality, reflective practice, continuous improvement, and collaboration among educators and learners; and
- view teacher preparation and development as a continuum, moving from preservice preparation to supervised beginning practice to continuing professional development, (NCATE, 1995, p. 4).

This was immediately followed by the second tenet

Likewise, the new professional teacher who graduates from a professionally accredited school, college, or department of education should be able to:

- explain instructional choices based on research-derived knowledge and best practice;
- apply effective methods of teaching students who are at different developmental stages and have different learning styles, or come from culturally diverse backgrounds;
• reflect on practice, and receive and act on feedback; and
• create meaningful learning experiences for P-12 students, (NCATE, 1995, p. 4).

It is evident from the mission and scope regarding the development of the 1995 NCATE standards that there was a recognition of the general diversity of K-12 students nationwide and a desire to prepare educators to meet the needs of a diverse student demographic, an idea aligned with Gideonese’s (1982) expectation for the required content in EPPs. It also appears to align well with Nussbaum’s conception of capabilities theory, specifically a goal of providing diverse peoples an equal opportunity to reach their fullest potential. At the same time, NCATE acknowledged the human capital aim of public schooling by stating that EPPs are to prepare educators to teach diverse student populations to meet the need for employees in high performance industry. This concept was followed by the tent that EPPs are to commit to the belief that all children can and should learn, again promoting the concept of equal educational opportunity. The outlining of this recognition was incorporated into the discussion of the 1995 standards development.

**Standards development.** NCATE had an emphasis on issues of diversity and social justice in the 1995 edition of their standards for the accreditation of teacher education. In their discussion of the standards development, they state

> Professions embody deep and abiding values; teaching especially so. Ethical foundations for teaching involve professional conscience, defined as commitment to inquiry, knowledge, competence, caring, and social justice. Each of these is values is embedded in the NCATE standards, (NCATE, 1995, p.12).
This statement evidenced NCATE’s intent to take a stance that professional educators must be adequately prepared not only to understand their field, but to care for the needs of students and promote the ideals of social justice within the PreK-12 classroom. To ensure this, NCATE claimed that the authors incorporated the ideals of “inquiry, knowledge, competence, caring, and social justice,” what NCATE identified both as the abiding values of the teaching profession and the professional conscience of the professional educators, throughout the 1995 edition of the standards for the accreditation of professional education.

**Standards.** The 1995 edition of the NCATE standards were divided into 4 categories: 1) Design of Professional Education; 2) Candidates in Professional Education; 3) Professional Education Faculty; and 4) The Unit for Professional Education.

**Category I.** Category I dealt mainly with the program content and requirements for pre-service teachers, all of which were to be driven by the units Conceptual Framework(s). Regarding the conceptual framework(s), NCATE expected that

The conceptual framework(s) is written, well-articulated, and shared among professional education faculty, candidates, and other members of the professional community.

- The framework(s) is defined and makes explicit the professional commitments, dispositions, and values that support it, including the commitment to acquire and use professional knowledge on behalf of students.
- The framework(s) includes a philosophy and purposes, contains assessments statements of desired results for candidates, and provides an
associated rationale for coursework, field experiences, and program
evaluation.

• The framework(s) reflects multicultural and global perspectives which
  permeate all programs.

• The framework(s) and knowledge bases that support each professional
  education program rest on established and contemporary research, the
  wisdom of practice, and emerging education policies and practices, (1995,
  p. 15).

Through this statement, clearly NCATE expected EPPs to consider the
importance of preparing educators to understand and develop the knowledge and
skills necessary to work with a diverse student population from the outset. One of
the four requirements for the development focused specifically on the need to
incorporate into the EPP a multicultural and global perspective. As noted above,
this requirement was to be clearly articulated and embedded within all aspects of
the curriculum so the future educators could use this knowledge of diverse
cultures to provide a better education to their students. Not only was this
knowledge to be embedded within the curriculum, the standards also required that
the EPP’s conceptual framework make it clear why this knowledge is important
and the desired candidate assessment results of that knowledge.

The 1995 NCATE standards continued by stating the importance of
ensuring that there exists a strong coherence among the conceptual framework
and all other aspects of the program.
Coherence exists between the conceptual framework(s) and student outcomes, courses, field experiences, instruction and evaluation.

- Courses in general, content, profession and pedagogical, and integrative studies complement one another and are consistent with the conceptual framework(s).
- Field experiences are an integrated part of the professional education curriculum and are consistent with the conceptual framework, (NCATE, 1995, p. 15)

Not only did the standards require EPPs to develop a conceptual framework that reflected on multicultural and global perspectives, provide a clear rationale of why this knowledge was important to future educators and how the knowledge of diversity would be assessed, but it also required the EPP administrators and faculty to ensure that these perspectives were an integral part of the entire program. These perspectives were to be part of every component of the EPP’s curriculum, including the field experiences candidates participated in. The content of this statement was also reflected in the expectations for EPPs general education requirements and for the quality of instruction the EPP faculty provided to candidates. Knowledge of diversity was expected to be a part of every aspect of the teacher candidate’s training.

The standards in Category I did not reflect on knowledge of diversity alone. The Category I standards also contained a strong emphasis on issues of social justice that EPPs had to incorporate into their programs. Pre-service teachers were expected to receive pedagogical training that helped them to understand a variety of approaches to learning.
Candidates complete a well-planned sequence of courses and/or experiences in pedagogical studies that help develop understanding and use of:

- research- and experience-based principles of effective practice for encouraging the intellectual, social, and personal development of students;
- different student approaches to learning for creating instructional opportunities adapted to learners from diverse cultural backgrounds and with exceptionalities … (NCATE, 1995, p. 17).

Here again, we see that in 1995 NCATE called for students to develop a strong knowledge of students from diverse backgrounds. In this quote, however, NCATE inserted the expectation that teacher candidates not only develop knowledge of students from diverse backgrounds but that they also be able to apply that knowledge through effective practice and create a classroom environment in which all students can learn.

Beyond a knowledge of diversity, EPPs were to ensure pre-service teachers developed the knowledge and skills to work with the parents and the broader community to support “students’ learning and well-being,” (NCATE, 1995, p. 18) through a social justice approach.

Candidates complete a well-planned sequence of courses and/or experiences in pedagogical studies that help develop understanding and use of:

- collaboration with school colleagues, parents and agencies in the larger community for supporting students’ learning and well-being;
- effective interactions with parents for supporting students’ learning and well-being;
the opportunity for candidates to reflect on their teaching and its effect on student growth and learning… (NCATE, 1995, p. 18).

Another statement followed regarding the need for an integrative approach to teacher education.

The learning experiences created by teacher candidates builds on students’ prior experiences, exceptionalities, and cultural backgrounds based on membership in ethnic, racial gender, language socioeconomic, community and family groups, to help all students achieve high levels of learning, (NCATE, 1995, p. 18).

By looking at these statements holistically, it is evident that in 1995, NCATE took the stance that professional educators are to do more than teach content. Rather, it is apparent that NCATE realized that the professional educator has a duty to support not just student learning, but student developmental to achieve their fullest potential within and beyond their individual communities.

Throughout the Category I standards, it appears NCATE attempted to promote the development of knowledge of diverse populations and the development of skills to work with those diverse populations among pre-service teachers. In so doing, candidates could enact the social justice emphasis identified in these standards, which appeared to be the provision of equal education opportunity for all students.

**Category II.** The Category II standards of the 1995 NCATE standards for the preparation of professional educators dealt with the ways in which the EPPs monitored and advised candidates as they progressed through the program. The emphasis within this category dealt with programmatic efforts to recruit and maintain a diverse student
body, emphasizing equality of access and opportunity of diverse populations to train and become professional educators. Specifically, the standards state

- The unit has and implements an explicit plan with adequate resources to recruit, admit, and retain a diverse student body.
- The unit’s effort and success in meeting goals for recruiting candidates from culturally diverse backgrounds are evaluated annually, and appropriate steps are taken to strengthen its plan for the future.
- The student body is culturally diverse, (NCATE, 1995, p. 22).

NCATE’s commitment to setting expectations for EPP’s to educate teacher candidates in issues of diversity and social justice extended beyond the content and skill training provided within the curriculum. In this statement, NCATE wanted to ensure that the EPP work to develop a diverse student body within the program. Specifically, programs were to develop a plan that is reevaluated on a regular basis whereby students from diverse backgrounds would be admitted and supported through the completion of their preparation program.

**Category III.** Category III of 1995 NCATE standards for the preparation of professional educators discussed requirements and expectations of the EPPs faculty. Similar to the Category II expectations that the EPP recruit and maintain a diverse student body, NCATE expected the EPP to recruit and maintain not only diverse faculty, but a faculty knowledgeable about issues and implications of diverse educational environments. Specifically, the standards stated
Higher education faculty are knowledgeable about, and have experience with, teaching and learning, cultural difference and exceptionalities and their instructional implications, (NCATE, 1995, p. 24)

Here, the expectation was that EPP faculty have relevant experience with teaching and learning, and specifically teaching and learning within cultural difference and exceptionalities. As has been found in research, NCATE also clearly understood that cultural differences and exceptionalities have an impact on student learning and that appropriate pedagogical adjustments must be made to meet the unique needs of culturally diverse students.

Again, similar to the 1995 Category II requirements, NCATE expected EPPs to not only ensure a diverse student body, but that this diverse body of teacher candidates received their preparation from a diverse faculty. Specifically, the standards stated that:

- The unit has and implements an explicit plan with adequate resources to ensure hiring and retaining of a diverse faculty,
- The unit’s efforts and success in meeting goals for recruiting a diverse faculty are evaluated annually, and appropriate steps are taken to strengthen plans for the future,
- The faculty is culturally diverse, (NCATE, 1995, p. 25).

Much like the Category II language of NCATE’s 1995 standards, the Category III language also expected an EPP commitment to educate teacher candidates in issues of diversity and social justice extended beyond the content and skill training provided within the curriculum in a diverse environment and through the use of a diverse faculty. Again,
with this statement, NCATE wanted to ensure that the EPP curricular and field experiences were provided within a diverse environment.

With Ronald Reagan’s election to presidency in 1980, the 1980s saw the end of the Great Society era, and the reduction or termination of many of the social programs that had developed and expanded since the 1960s. The socio-political climate of the time was fueled by America’s decline in the global economic market as a result of several conditions, including the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries oil embargo, recession and stagflation. The United States also experienced a decline in their manufacturing competitiveness as a result of increased trade with Asian Pacific Rim countries. As a result, the United States had become the largest debtor in the world (Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013).

As part of this societal change, the educational policy scene became highly contentious, not only as a result of desegregation and questioning of federal intervention into local schooling under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but also as a tool for realizing starkly contrasting socio-political ideals and goals (McGuinn, 2006; Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013). Many of the concerns over equity in public schooling were yielded to a rising interest in education as a means of economic development and whether or not the United States was ready for the obviously forthcoming global competition (Reich, 1992; Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013).

Central to Reagan’s campaign was a promise to end federal intervention into public schooling through the abolishment of the United States’ Department of Education. In an effort to garner support for such a drastic change, President Reagan sanctioned a research report on public education in the United States under the National Commission
on Excellence in Education in 1983. The result, entitled *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform*, was counter to what he was looking for and helped to silence much of the public outcry at federal intervention into educational policy (Fraser, 2010; McGuinn, 2006; Superfine, 2013). The report decried the state of public education and called for a series of seemingly drastic educational reforms and for national leadership in the field.

Given that the report would not support efforts to eliminate the United States’ Department of Education, there was a drastic change in the nation’s educational priorities. The expectations for equity in schooling resulting from items such as the *Brown vs. Board of Education* Supreme Court decision and *Public Law 94-142* were replaced with an interest in education as a means of economic development, or the development of human capital as discussed in Chapter 2. International tests showed that schools in the United States were not performing as well as in other countries. With the increase in global competition, many Americans began calling for an increase in standards to increase student performance on core academic skills and keep up with the rest of the world, a sentiment echoed in *A Nation at Risk*.

As a result, testing as a means of gauging performance began to take on great importance (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992; Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013). However, this increase in the use of achievement testing quickly became a socio-political landmine. Students from minority groups and students with disabilities frequently failed such examinations at disproportionate rates when compared to their white, typically developing peers. This eventually led to a series of state and federal court challenges. Regardless, such centralizing standardization did not fade away. Rather, it steadily
increased through the mid-1980s into the early 1990’s along with increased numbers of grassroots reform efforts across the country (Superfine, 2013).

To counter this apparent downslide in academic achievement in American education, the National Commission on Excellence in Education recommended a generally “back to the basics” academic curriculum akin to that recommended by the Committee of Ten nearly a century prior while also calling for higher standards and more rigorous testing. The National Commission on Excellence in Education also made a series of recommendations for EPPs. Chief among these recommendations was a call for increased selectivity in admissions, similar to the expectations from CAEP discussed later in this chapter (Rury, 2013).

The 1995 NCATE standards followed the *A Nation at Risk* report by 12 years. Even with this span of time, this national report on the state of education in America still held strong influence over educational policy until the end of the 20th century (Fraser, 2010). This report’s cry for policy reform led to a myriad of other reports by varying groups on both the political right and left to be published in the following years, key among them was a call for a more humane stance on school reform by Bastian, Fruchter, Gittell, Greer, and Haskins (1985). Many of these reports led to national debates dominated by the theme of multiculturalism, largely framed by two opposing views authored by Nieto (1992) and Schlesinger (1998). Nieto put forth that a more equitable, multicultural approach should be pursued in K-12 schooling. Contrary to this, Schlesinger (1998) argued that K-12 schooling should seek to develop a single cultural norm or national story.
Immediately preceding the 1995 NCATE Standards, Congress passed the 1994 Improving America’s Schools Act, which noticeably increased federal intervention and monitoring of public education. This law tied federal education funding, at that time around 16% of school budgets, to a number of issues (Fraser, 2010). States were required to develop school improvement plans and establish high content and performance standards in mathematics and the language arts. Then, assessments aligned to those standards were required between certain grade bands and the performance data had to be disaggregated along a series of racial, ability and gender categories.

Following these calls for reform and policy initiatives in K-12 schooling, many scholars and policy groups also pushed for reform in the processes used in teacher preparation – a likely result of the founding of the Center for Education Renewal in 1985 and the National Network for Education Renewal in 1986, both of which supported the idea that K-12 reform must go hand in hand with reform in teacher preparation (Cochran-Smith and Fries, 2005). Goodlad (1990), the founder of the Center for Education Renewal, is noted as stating that there is a need for more coherence among EPPs under the mission of preparing educators with the skills to work in an ever-changing and diverse society. A review of educational research also shows the emergence of more research in the preparation of educators for diverse classroom environments (e.g., DiMartino, 1991; Gay, 1994; Hirsch, 1988; Kohl, 1991; Morin, 1991). It is evident that NCATE took up the banner found in the research on teacher education and emphasized the importance of preparing teachers with an understanding of social justice and the skill to work in diverse classroom environments.
The 1995 edition of the NCATE standards began by taking a strong stance that EPPs are to effectively train pre-service educators to understand and work with a diverse student population and to promote social justice within PreK-12 educational environments. Within the standards document, NCATE broadly defined diversity of K-12 students as “The wide range of ways in which human groups and populations have observable and demonstrable physical and behavioral differences.,” (NCATE, 1995, p. 71). In addition, NCATE defined the concept of cultural diversity as “The variety of cultural backgrounds of candidates, faculty, and school personnel based on ethnicity, race, language, religion, socioeconomic status, gender, regional/geographical background, and exceptionalities,” (NCATE, 1995, p. 71). A review of these statements against other language found within the standards document revealed that NCATE did indeed mean to leave the definition of diversity as broad as possible.

Repeatedly the document refers to the concept of “all students” when stating that teachers must be prepared to provide a fair and equitable education to students of diverse backgrounds. NCATE also expected EPPs to ensure that this conception of diversity was included within both the general education and the pedagogical knowledge curriculums required by pre-service teachers. Furthermore, as found in the wave of research into the preparation of teachers for diverse environments found, it is not sufficient to simply “tell” future educators about diversity. Rather, NCATE also outlined the expectation that EPPs ensure that this curriculum was provided in a diverse environment, including both diverse students and diverse faculty.

Finally, the 1995 edition of the NCATE standards required EPPs to promote social justice by ensuring candidates understand the importance of equal educational
opportunity and modeled this ideal by enacting equality of educational opportunity through their student and faculty recruitment practices. Throughout the standards, evidence showed that NCATE expected EPPs to ensure that teacher candidates were trained with the skills necessary to ensure that all students were provided an equal educational opportunity to achieve their full potential. This expectation aligns with Nussbaum’s conception of capabilities outlined in Chapter 2.

The 1995 edition of the NCATE standards defined the concept of diversity and cultural diversity broadly, encompassing many of the characteristics of diversity outlined by many scholars of multiculturalism, both historic and current, to ensure that EPPs were preparing effective teachers with the knowledge and skill to work with an increasingly diverse population of K-12 students. One area of concern that is addressed in subsequent editions of the standards is the lack of specificity it provides and that the language could be deemed as limiting when taken alone because of the definitions used stated “physical and demonstrable” differences. In addition, when more specific language was utilized, it did not mention K-12 students or teacher candidates sexual identity.

In terms of NCATE’s conception of social justice in 1995, while not specifically defined as noted in a later edition, NCATE did lay out the expectation that EPPs incorporated a conception of social justice and the expectation that all students be provided equal educational opportunity to achieve their full potential throughout the standards. One significant note was the requirement for EPPs to undertake efforts to specifically recruit teacher candidates from historically underrepresented populations, evidencing an influence by educational scholars who were beginning to note a lack of
representation by minority populations, especially in inner-city locales with high minority populations.

Even with the separation between the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 and the 1995 standards, it is apparent that there may be some policy influence as *A Nation at Risk* did raise concerns for underrepresented populations and inner city schools. In addition, NCATE undoubtedly saw the pendulum swinging toward increased standards and accountability, which came to the forefront with the 1994 *Improving America’s Schools Act* and the expectation that teacher candidates ensure that issues such as the achievement gap and the underserved, underrepresented populations be given equality of educational opportunity are addressed.

**NCATE Standards from 2002**

**Mission and scope.** The “Mission and Scope” of the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards focused largely on the belief that “all children can and should learn,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 3). NCATE defines “all children” broadly, as evidenced in the statement that “American society is becoming more diverse, with students in classrooms drawn from many cultures and ethnic groups,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 3). To accomplish this, NCATE stated that they expect institutions to “commit to preparing teachers for a diverse community of students,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 4).

Policy analysts have noted that schools still operate on a ‘factory’ model geared to the industrial society. Today’s society needs a workforce that can apply knowledge, reason analytically, and solve problems. At the same time, American society is becoming more diverse, with students in classrooms drawn from many cultures and ethnic groups. Preparing teacher to teach all students to meet
society’s demand for high performance has created a new agenda for educators and policymakers, (NCATE, 2002, p. 3).

It was evident early in the 2002 edition of the NCATE accreditation standards that there would be an emphasis on issues of diversity and social justice with K-12 schools and EPPs. Based on the above paragraph, it appears as though NCATE reviewed educational policy in preparation for this set of standards revisions.

The 2002 edition of the NCATE standards for the accreditation of educator preparation consisted of 2 categories and 6 standards. The categories were: 1) Candidate Performance and 2) Unit Capacity. The 6 standards were: 1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions; 2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation; 3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice; 4) Diversity; 5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development; 6) Unit Governance and Resources.

**Conceptual framework.** The conceptual framework for the NCATE standards guided their vision and development. Within this conceptual framework, both categories and 3 of the standards contained information regarding the training of educators to work in diverse environments. For Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions, the framework reads “Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 10). A footnote for the term “all students” reads “‘All students’ includes students with exceptionalities and of different ethnic, racial, gender, language, religious, socioeconomic, and regional/geographic origins,” (NCATE, 2002, p.10). From this, it is evident that NCATE placed importance on EPPs developing an appropriate
knowledge base of student diversity within future educators. In addition to knowledge, NCATE also included the importance of developing an appropriate skill level of knowledge application and appropriate dispositions toward diverse candidates as part of their Standard 1 framework.

NCATE realized that candidate knowledge and skill cannot be thoroughly developed in a classroom. Therefore, they incorporated the concept of diversity into their framework for Standard 3, “Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.” The language reads “The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 10). Wherein Standard 1 focused on assessing teacher candidate’s knowledge, skills and dispositions, Standard 3 emphasized the clinical experiences EPPs provided candidates to develop the ability to apply knowledge, skills and dispositions within a classroom environment.

While the Standard 1 and Standard 3 frameworks discussed the concepts of diversity, Standard 4 focused only on diversity within the both the curriculum and the clinical experiences teacher candidates participated in. The framework read:

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools, (NCATE, 2002, p. 10).
Here, NCATE laid out the expectation that EPPs ensured that all aspects of their curriculum provided teacher candidates opportunities to learn in, learn from and gain experience working diverse faculty, peers and students as part of their teacher education program.

**Standards.** The 2002 edition of the NCATE standards for the accreditation of educator preparation consisted of 2 categories and 6 standards. As in prior editions, the standards outlined expectations for EPPs in each area. In addition, NCATE provided guidance on the formation and evaluation of an EPPs conceptual framework, a document which provides a shared vision to EPPs on the development and continuous improvement of their teacher education programs.

**Conceptual framework.** An EPPs conceptual framework is intended to serve as a shared vision for the EPP in order to guide all aspects of the teacher education programming, including curriculum, field experience, assessments, etc. Within the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards, it was evident that the accreditor placed a high level of importance on the concept of diversity. Within the guidance the document provided, the authors included a statement that read, “It [the conceptual framework] reflects the unit’s commitment to diversity and the preparation of educators who help all students learn,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 12). The inclusion of this statement, with the documents emphasis on the word “all” made it clear that NCATE was committed to ensuring that teacher candidates were properly prepared to work with diverse students in diverse environments.

The emphasis on diversity within the conceptual framework guidance did not end there. Under the guidance for evidence NCATE expected EPPs to show a commitment to diversity.
The unit’s conceptual framework(s) reflects the unit’s commitment to preparing candidates to support learning for all students and provides a conceptual understanding of how knowledge, dispositions, and skills related to diversity are integrated across the curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, assessments, and evaluations, (NCATE, 2002, p. 13).

In addition, the conceptual framework guidance stated that, “The unit’s conceptual framework(s) reflects the unit’s commitment to preparing candidates who are able to use educational technology to help all students learn,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 13). In comparison to the prior addition, NCATE made it clear that they were setting high expectations for programs in the area of preparing educators to understand and work with diverse populations of students and to use available resources to ensure that all students learn. Throughout this edition of the standards, we see a heavy reliance on the phrase “all students,” defined earlier to be inclusive of a broad range of diversity.

**Standard 1.** Standard 1 of the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards outlined the expectations for teacher candidate’s knowledge, skills and dispositions. Within this standard, there were several criteria: 1) Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates; 2) Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel; 3) Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates; 4) Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates; 5) Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel; 6) Dispositions for All Candidates; 7) Student Learning for Teacher Candidates; and 8) Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel. Of these eight criteria, three made reference to issues that related to expectations for teachers concerning the conceptions of diversity and social justice discussed in Chapter 2: 1)
Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates; 2) Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates; and 3) Student Learning for Teacher Candidates.

The “Acceptable” indicator language for Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates stated that “Teacher candidates have a broad knowledge of instructional strategies that draws upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to help all students learn,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 15). For institutions to reach NCATE’s “Target” level, the expectation was that “They have in-depth understanding of the subject matter that they plan to teaching, allowing them to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 15). In both cases, the term “all students” was repeated, a broad term used by NCATE to cover multiple forms of diversity. In both cases, the emphasis was that candidates must demonstrate a level of skill so that they were able to help all students learn the academic content. More proficient EPPs, those capable of reaching target, recognized that diverse students learn academic content in diverse ways. This level of indicator expected EPPs to ensure that teacher candidates developed the pedagogical skill and depth of content knowledge so that they could present the content in multiple ways, meeting the unique needs of a diverse student population.

The “Acceptable” language for the second criteria, “Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates,” states that teacher candidates “consider the school, family and community contexts in which they work and the prior experience
of students to develop meaningful learning experiences.” (NCATE, 2002, p. 15). Under the “Target” level, the indicator language stated that teacher candidates develop meaningful learning experiences to facilitate learning for all students. They reflect on their practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning. They know how students learn and how to make ideas accessible to them. They consider school, family, and community contexts in connecting concepts to students’ prior experience and applying the ideas to real-world problems (NCATE, 2002, p. 15).

The language for “Acceptable” emphasizes the expectation of teacher candidates considering what they know about students’ backgrounds as they plan learning experiences. However, the language for “Target” has a greater emphasis on the teacher’s role in developing students’ capabilities. Here, the teacher candidate was to do more than develop meaningful learning experiences that took into consideration the unique backgrounds of each student. The language stated that teacher candidates must also reflect on their practice and seek out ways to continually improve their practice and ways in which they could strengthen the connection between the content, the learning experience and students’ own personal experiences.

For the third criterion, “Student Learning for Teacher Candidates,” the language for “Acceptable” stated that “Teacher candidates focus on student learning as shown in their assessment of student learning, use of assessments in instruction, and development of meaningful learning experiences for students based on their developmental levels and prior experience,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 16). The “Target” language stated “Teacher candidates accurately assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments
to instruction, monitor student learning, and have a positive effect on learning for all students.” In this criterion, the acceptable language focused on teacher candidates knowledge of child development and its application to the processes of teaching, learning and assessing. The language used for the “Acceptable” level of the criterion was indicative of the need for educators to consider their knowledge of child development and students’ prior learning in their pedagogical processes. The “Target” language level elicited more detailed expectations of teacher candidates’ knowledge of analyzing student learning while requiring candidates to verify that their instruction has had a positive impact on all students, again relying on broad definition of diverse student populations defined earlier.

Standard 1 of the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards emphasized the content and the pedagogical knowledge of teacher candidates. The “Acceptable” level of the language emphasized the importance of teacher candidates considering the developmental needs and past experience of students, however little consideration was given to the broader diversity that may exist. However, under the “Target” level of each criterion the language consistently used the term “all students,” which NCATE defined broadly to encompass all forms of student diversity.

**Standard 3.** Standard 3 of the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards outlined the expectations for field experiences and clinical practice. Standard 3 consisted of two criteria: 1) Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice; and 2) Candidates’ development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. Both criteria made reference to issues that related
to expectations for teachers concerning the conceptions of diversity and social justice discussed in Chapter 2.

The first criterion, “Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice,” does not directly reference concepts of diversity or social justice. Rather, the criterion uses language for the “Acceptable” level that refers to the remainder of the standards text: “Both field experiences and clinical practice reflect the unit’s conceptual framework(s) and held candidates continue to develop the content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in standards,” (NCATE, 2002, pp. 26).

The second criterion, “Candidates Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn,” discussed concepts of diversity at both the “Acceptable” and “Target” levels. Under the “Acceptable” level, the standards state that the expectation is for EPPs to ensure that “All candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 27). Under the target level, the criterion sets the expectation that EPPs ensure that “Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning by all students as shown in their work with students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in classrooms and schools,” (NCATE, 2002, p. 27).

**Standard 4.** Standard 4 of the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards outlined the expectations for EPPs to provide diverse experiences for teacher candidates. Standard 3 consisted of four criteria: 1) Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and
Experiences; 2) Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty; 3) Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates; 4) Experiences working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools (NCATE, 2002). When combined, these four criteria were intended to ensure that candidates gained a holistic understanding of diversity within educational environments through the development of knowledge and through opportunities to apply that knowledge in interactions with students, peers and faculty.

The first criterion, “Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences,” contained language referencing the issues of both diversity and social justice discussed in Chapter 2. Under the language for acceptable, the 2002 NCATE standards stated that:

Curriculum and accompanying field experiences are designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. Candidates learn to develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity and develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity. Candidates become aware of different teaching and learning styles shaped by cultural influences and are able to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities. Assessments of candidate proficiencies provide data on the ability to help all students learn, (NCATE, 2002, p. 29).

In addition, the target level for the criterion expected that the Curriculum, field experience, and clinical practice help candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity. They are based on well-developed knowledge bases for, and conceptualizations of, diversity and inclusion so that candidates can apply them effectively in schools. Candidates learn to
contextualize teaching and to draw upon representations from the students’ own experiences and knowledge. They learn how to challenge students toward cognitive complexity and engage all students, including students with exceptionalities, through instructional conversations, (NCATE, 2002, p. 29).

At both levels of criterion one, there was a general expectation that EPPs balance the acquisition of knowledge of diversity with the development of both skill for application and appropriate dispositions towards diverse students. Meaning, ensuring students understand diversity is not sufficient. Rather, NCATE expected EPPs to measure a student’s actions and behaviors at meeting the needs of diverse students and creating a classroom environment of acceptance.

**Standard 5.** Standard 5 of the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards outlined expectations for EPPs in terms of faculty knowledge of and experience working diverse settings. Within standard 5, two of the six criteria were of relevance to the questions examined: 2) Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching and 6) Unit Facilitation of Professional Development. The intention here was to ensure that the EPP and its faculty designed curriculum and employed strategies to model best practices in creating environments that met the needs of a diverse student population.

Under Criterion 2, “Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching,” the language under both the acceptable and target levels integrated knowledge of diversity. The acceptable language stated, “Faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different learning styles. They integrate diversity and technology throughout their teaching,” (NCATE, 2002, p 34). Under “Target,” we find that NCATE expected, “Teaching by the professional education faculty reflects the unit’s
conceptual framework(s), incorporates appropriate performance assessments, and integrates diversity and technology throughout coursework, field experiences, and clinical practices,” (NCATE, 2002, p 34). Both levels of this criterion demonstrated the expectation that EPP faculty modeled best practice in teaching to a diverse student population and that content regarding the integration of diversity concepts be integrated throughout their teaching. However, the “Target” level increased the expectation to also ensuring that performance-based assessments on candidates’ effectiveness at meeting the needs of diverse students.

Criterion 6, “Unit Facilitation of Professional Development,” demonstrated NCATE’s expectation that EPPs ensure professional development opportunities for faculty, including in the area of diversity. Under the language for acceptable, the criterion reads “Based upon needs identified in faculty evaluations, the unit provides opportunities for faculty to develop new knowledge and skills, especially as they relate to the conceptual framework(s), performance assessment, diversity, technology, and other emerging practices,” (NCATE, 2002, p 36). By incorporating this criterion, NCATE demonstrated their commitment to ensuring that EPP faculty were adequately prepared to provide education into the knowledge and skills teachers need to effectively work with a diverse student population.

In the 1990s, a noticeable increase in educational inequality began to emerge. During this period, approximately 25% of all children were born to young, single mothers with even higher amounts among minority populations. This increase had a dramatic effect on traditional family life and schools, which traditionally relied on families for the provision of safe and supporting environments. Such a conception is difficult in single
parent homes, more so when single parents are impoverished or live in depressed environments. At the same time, racial segregation of schooling was increasing, with approximately 75% of African-American youth attending segregated schools. Such schools have high proportions of low-income children, lower performance on standardized tests, fewer opportunities to participate in advanced coursework and fewer qualified teachers (Rury, 2013).

In 1991, Bill Clinton was elected President of the United States, thanks partially to strong support from both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. Early in his presidency, Clinton demonstrated the ability to govern in a bipartisan way, as evidenced in the passage of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act in 1994 (McGuinn, 2006; Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013; Wells, 2009). Thanks in part to Goals 2000, the mid-1990s saw an increase in efforts to pursue standards based, or systemic, reform. Contained within the core provisions of Goals 2000 were a series of state grants to support standards and aligned assessment systems and the creation of a federal oversight body, the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (Superfine, 2013; Wells, 2009).

Together, these provisions essentially cementing the federal government’s involvement in directing state level education reform efforts. In addition, congress tied states’ receipt of Title 1 funding to the condition of following the standards, assessment, and accountability guidelines outlined in Goals 2000 during the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), entitled the Improving America’s Schools Act (IASA). Furthermore, the IASA increased testing and required states to hold
schools accountable for student performance through the use of measures of adequate yearly progress (McGuinn, 2006; Superfine, 2013; Wells, 2009).

However, implementation of Goals 2000 and IASA did not go smoothly. Groups such as the Christian Coalition argued that the law was a federal overreach into locally controlled education. In 1995, the Republican Party gained control of both the House and Senate at which point they began introducing bills either to repeal Goals 2000 or to eliminate the key provisions that resulted in federal intervention into local public schooling. Thus, Clinton refused to implement or enforce key components of the law and never convened the National Education Standards and Improvement Council and later signed an appropriation bill that eliminated the National Education Standards and Improvement Council and OTL from Goals 2000. Ultimately, the authorization of Goals 2000 expired in 1999 and the attention of both the executive and legislative branches turned to the forthcoming reauthorization of the ESEA (McGuinn, 2006; Superfine, 2013; Wells, 2009).

O'Day and Smith were the authors of perhaps the most influential version of systemic reform in the 1990s. They argued, in line with the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics position at the time that standards should be interdisciplinary in nature and reflect high-level cognitive goals that demand complex critical-thinking and problem solving skills. In addition to calling for rigorous minimum standards, O'Day and Smith posited “opportunity-to-learn" standards should be in place for all schools to outline the resources to implement equitable and coherent policies surrounding challenging content (Superfine, 2013). Furthermore, both researchers and policy makers posited that such standards demanded a system of accountability, however they did not outline what such
as system should look like and discussed several potential issues in using standards as a means of enforcing accountability (Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013).

During the 1990s, a number of states began implementing both standards and associated accountability measures (Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013). During this period, the business community began participating in the standards movement as well by pushing for the creating of standards and testing designed to ensure students were prepared to become active participants in the workforce. (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Superfine, 2013). By 1999, 48 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia had adopted some form of academic content standards for student learning. In addition, 33 states also had set annual performance goals and were holding schools accountable for student attainment (Superfine, 2013).

The performance goals and accountability measures under these new standards varied from state to state (Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013). Along with the difficulties states had in implementing systemic reform, the classroom practices of teachers proved resistant to change. In most cases, classroom teachers’ practices did not align to the new standards, likely due to their prior knowledge, experience and orientation toward learning (Superfine, 2013). For many educators, the most concerning policies were those aimed specifically at measuring minority student attainment as this frequently resulted in decontextualized teaching toward the test, especially in high poverty locales. Evidence demonstrating the impact of these policies was ultimately mixed. The National Assessment of Educational Progress did show slight increases in students’ reading and mathematics scores. However, long-term analysis of various state and national exams showed a widening of the achievement gap between high- and low-poverty schools.
(Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013). In the end, this move towards standardized teaching, learning and testing led to even greater public concern with public education (Cohran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Rury, 2013).

The focus on high standards and accountability that began during the 1990s have not relented. The globalization of the world economy raised concerns that the United States would not be able to maintain its role as an economic leader without preparing more of its citizens to work effectively in a knowledge economy (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). The public realized that the best way to improve student learning was through development and implementation of a high-quality teaching force. As such, the public exhibited a high interest in the quality of teacher training. According to Cochran-Smith (2001), from 1996-2000, the New York Times printed more than 2000 articles on the topic of teacher education. Much of this, and other press, condemned teacher education as inefficient or worthless.

In line with this, the American Council on Education’s President’s Task Force on Teacher Education called for increased accountability by institutions of higher education in regards to the quality of their EPPs. In addition, they recommended that institutional presidents develop methodologies to strengthen EPP quality through collaboration, the development of clear admission guidelines, and program evaluation (American Council on Education, 1999). These recommendations followed a decade of increased use in standardized licensure exams to judge not only candidates’ fit for licensure, but for the evaluation of the teacher quality of both EPPs and states. The reports published because of candidate performance on these exams only exacerbated the political and public outcry against teacher quality and teacher preparation (Melnick & Pullin, 2000). This resulted
in a change to Title 2 of the Higher Education Act so that both states and institutions of higher education had to submit annual reports of teacher quality to the United States Secretary of Education in order to qualify for federal student aid (Early, 2000).

Such condemnation was not limited to the general public. Within higher education, there were those that sought to attack the profession of teacher education as well. Scholars and professionals described research coming from teacher educators as inconsequential and the revisions to the curriculum, especially the inclusion of multiculturalism, as “touchy-feely,” (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). Both politicians and the public consistently pointed to test results and outcomes to condemn the state of public education. By the end of the 1990’s, the emphasis in education had landed squarely on accountability (Cochran-Smith Fries, 2005; Elmore, 2002).

The 2002 edition of the NCATE standards continued the interpretation of the phrase “all students” to mean a broad representation of a diverse student population. NCATE defined “all students” to mean students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender and socioeconomic groups and students with exceptionalities. Throughout the 2002 standards document, NCATE emphasized the importance of preparing future educators to be able to ensure that all students be given the opportunity to learn and were supported appropriately to achieve academic success. When compared to earlier editions of the standards, NCATE made it clear in their 2002 standards that they were setting high expectations for EPPs in the expectations for candidate preparation to work with diverse students populations and ensuring that all students learn.

This preparation involved more than just candidate knowledge. NCATE expected EPPs to implement performance-based evaluations to measure candidate skill in helping
all students learn. This included a depth of content knowledge and proficient pedagogical skill to present content in multiple ways in order to meet the needs of a diverse student body. To support this, NCATE (2002) required EPPs to ensure candidates participated in field and clinical experiences that gave them experience working with diverse students and assess the candidates' proficiency in doing so.

This edition of the standards lent itself to the capabilities model of human rights discussed earlier. When compared with earlier versions of the standards, the 2002 edition placed a greater emphasis on teacher candidates developing students' capabilities through their knowledge and skill to create learning that was meaningful and relatable to all students. They also incorporated the expectation that EPPs measure candidates' ability to reflect on their practice in order to improve their ability to connect content, learning and students' own experience. In addition, this would ensure that candidates' had the ability to verify that their instruction has had a positive impact on all students.

The 2002 edition of the NCATE standards reflected societal trends and policy initiatives. The public's concern with the ongoing claim that there was decline in the quality of public education caused a cry for higher quality teachers that could ensure equality of educational attainment for all students. In addition, the emphasis on holding EPPs and states accountable for the quality of their teachers led to a nearly nationwide move to measure not only knowledge, but also performance. The NCATE standards reflected this repeatedly in terms of candidate knowledge of diversity and their ability to apply and reflect on that knowledge as it related to their pedagogical skill.
NCATE Standards from 2008

Mission and scope. The mission and scope of the 2008 edition of the NCATE standards varied from prior versions. The 2008 standards became focused even more on issues of social justice and teacher candidates understanding of diversity. At the beginning of the 2008 standards, NCATE stated that

American society is becoming more diverse, with students in classrooms drawn from many cultures and ethnic groups. Preparing teachers to teach all students to meet society’s demands for high performance has created a new agenda for educators and policymakers. To meet these changing needs, norms in teacher preparation and licensing are changing, (NCATE, 2008, p. 3).

Here, NCATE acknowledged the changing classroom climate and the need for similar change in the expectations of EPPs training methodologies.

This conception was reiterated in later comments wherein the 2008 standards espouse that the “NCATE standards are based on the belief that all children can and should learn. In order to attain this goal accredited institutions should … commit to preparing teachers for a diverse community of students,” (NCATE, 2008, p 4). As such, the mission and scope also stated that, “the new professional teacher who graduates from a professionally accredited institution should be able to … apply effective methods of teaching students who are at different developmental stages and have different learning styles, and come from diverse backgrounds,” (NCATE, 2008, p 4). In 2008, NCATE continued its use of the phrase “all students.” However, it expanded the definition of what this meant to “students with exceptionalities and of different ethnic, racial, gender,
sexual orientation, language, religious, socioeconomic, and regional/geographic origins,” (NCATE, 2008, p 12).

In addition to acknowledging a diverse educational environment, NCATE took a strong stance on the concept of social justice by including a call to action for social justice in the 2008 standards.

We, the members of the education profession, believe that high quality education is a fundamental right of all children. State constitutions require free public schools for all. At least since Brown v. Board of Education in 1954, our Nation has struggled to provide equal educational opportunity to all children. Now federal law requires that no child be left behind. Social justice demands that we take appropriate action to fulfill these promises by assuring high quality education for all children, (NCATE, 2008, p. 6).

Here, NCATE made it clear that they were committed to providing equality of educational opportunity and professed their belief that this opportunity had yet to come to fruition true since the Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision. The language used also makes it clear that they saw the connection between educational policy, in this case the No Child Left Behind Act, and the provision for equality of educational opportunity.

NCATE continued this call for action by drawing connections to the need to prepare high quality teachers.

We believe that all educators should be prepared in institutions that meet NCATE’s performance-based unit and program standards. These standards are periodically revised based on relevant research and input from the education
community. NCATE’s standards require educators to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to work successfully with children of all races, ethnicities, disabilities/exceptionalities, and socioeconomic groups, (NCATE, 2008, p. 6).

Here, NCATE stated its commitment to the preparation of high quality educators with performance-based standards, meaning they acknowledge that knowledge is, by itself, not sufficient for effective teaching of a diverse student body. They also acknowledged the need to have broad input from the education community into the content of the standards and the revision processes. However, NCATE did not define this broader community and therefore could mean PreK-12 educators, higher education and educational policy makers.

In relation to their call to action for social justice, NCATE outlined what it deemed to be minimum standards for educators.

NCATE standards require accountability, continuous improvement, clinical practice in P–12 school settings, qualified faculty, and sound governance. At a minimum, NCATE standards require that professional education programs prepare candidates who:

- have the content knowledge needed to teach students;
- have the pedagogical and professional knowledge needed to teach effectively;
- operationalize the belief that all students can learn;
• demonstrate fairness in educational settings by meeting the educational needs of all students in a caring, non-discriminatory, and equitable manner;
• understand the impact of discrimination based on race, class, gender, disability/exceptionality, sexual orientation, and language on students and their learning; and
• can apply their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in a manner that facilitates student learning, (NCATE, 2008, p. 7).

In this section, NCATE outlined the knowledge, skills and dispositions that it believed to be necessary for educators to work as agents of change in the promotion of equal educational opportunity. Within this section, NCATE stated that high quality teachers must have an understanding of discriminatory practices and their impact on student learning. They also put forth that educators need to be able to demonstrate a high level of skill in promoting learning among all students, a clear connection to the discussion of developing capabilities as a form of social justice in Chapter 2. Finally, teachers need to demonstrate appropriate dispositions in relation to diversity and the belief that all students can learn and to teach in such a way that all students can and do learn.

NCATE ended their call to action by supporting why they decided to take such a strong stance on this issue.

We recognize the existence of an unacceptable achievement gap based on race, ethnicity, disability/exceptionality and socioeconomic status. The gap is exacerbated by some children being assigned well prepared teachers and other children being assigned unprepared and under-prepared teachers. Closing the
achievement gap requires that all children be educated by teachers and other professional personnel who meet rigorous professional standards. We renew our commitment to social justice in schooling for all children by demanding well prepared educators for all children, (NCATE, 2008, p. 7).

NCATE, like many social and political groups at the turn of the 21st century, recognized that an achievement gap existed among racial, ethnic, ability and class groups. Furthermore, NCATE believed that they were in a position, as a national accreditor for educator preparation, to issue this call to action for social justice in education to ensure that EPPs were training and graduating highly effective educators. NCATE reiterated this commitment throughout the 2008 edition of the standards.

Standards. The 2008 edition of the NCATE standards consisted of six standards, four of which discussed issues connected to the conceptions of diversity and social justice discussed in Chapter 2. The 4 relevant standards were: 1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions; 2) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice; 3) Diversity; 4) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.

Standard 1. Standard 1 of the 2008 edition of the NCATE standards outlined the accreditor’s expectations for candidate knowledge, skills and professional dispositions at the completion of their preparation program. The standard language outlined general expectations for what teacher candidates should know and be able to do. “Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 16). NCATE continued to rely
on a broad definition for all students. In this edition, they defined the phrase to mean “students with exceptionalities and of different ethnic, racial, gender, sexual orientation, language, religious, socioeconomic, and regional/geographic origins,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 16). This definition was slightly broader than earlier editions with the inclusion of sexual orientation.

The individual criteria that were part of this standard provided a specific interpretation of the standard language. The standard consisted of seven criteria, four of which were relevant to the study’s research questions. The four relevant criteria were: 1) Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates; 2) Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates; 3) Student Learning for Teacher Candidates; and 4) Professional Dispositions for All Candidates.

Under the acceptable level for the criterion “Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates,” NCATE outlined their expectations for candidates. “They have a broad knowledge of instructional strategies that draws upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to help all students learn,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 17). Under the target level, the criterion read that teacher candidates “have in-depth understanding of the content that they plan to teach and are able to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 17). In addition, the criterion stated that candidates “are able to select and develop instructional strategies and technologies, based on research and experience, that help all students learn,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 17). In both cases, it was clear that NCATE was working toward their statements in the call to action discussed prior. Within these expectations, NCATE stated
the expectations that candidate demonstrate both knowledge of diversity and skill to apply that knowledge to ensure student learning. There was a slightly higher expectation at the target level. Here, EPPs were to demonstrate that candidates obtained an in-depth understanding of both content and pedagogical content knowledge, not simply obtaining a broad knowledge base. In addition, NCATE put forth the expectation that EPPs assess candidates’ ability to apply this in-depth knowledge to the selection of instructional strategies firmly grounded in the research to ensure equality of educational opportunity for all students.

The criterion “Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates,” put forth more in-depth expectations for candidates’ skill. Under acceptable, the criterion read that candidates “consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work and the prior experience of students to develop meaningful learning experiences,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 18). In addition, NCATE expected EPPs to ensure that candidates “have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work, and they collaborate with the professional community to create meaningful learning experiences for all students,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 18). Here, NCATE reflected trends in educational research that posited the societal impact on students’ ability to learn and the need for teachers to ensure curricular relevance. Under the target level for the criterion, the accreditor expected EPPs to ensure that candidates knew how to "develop meaningful learning experiences to facilitate learning for all students," (NCATE, 2008, p. 18). In addition, the criterion stated that candidates must “consider school, family, and community contexts in connecting concepts to students’ prior experience and applying the ideas to real-world issues,”
As noted earlier, NCATE expected candidates to demonstrate the ability to consider students socio-cultural background in the development of learning experiences that ensured all students an opportunity to learn. NCATE repeated this message under the acceptable level for the criterion “Student Learning for Teacher Candidates” with the statement that candidates “are able to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for students based on their developmental levels and prior experience,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 19).

The final criterion under Standard 1 related to the expectation that EPPs were measuring the professional dispositions for all candidates. Under the acceptable level the criterion reads, “Candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 20). Under the target level of the criterion, NCATE states that EPPs must ensure that “Candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that create caring and supportive learning environments and encourage self-directed learning by all students,” (NCATE, 2008 p. 20). EPPs needed to develop an assessment that would measure candidates’ demonstration of fairness, caring and supportive behaviors and the extent to which they demonstrated a belief that all students can learn.

Standard 1 reinforced the belief that effective educators needed sufficient content and pedagogical content knowledge in order to ensure that all students received equal educational opportunity. This knowledge must include not only academic content, but also a strong base in understanding the role that families and communities play in the development of the social and cultural context of learning. Finally, to be effective
educators for diverse student bodies, teachers must portray dispositions such as fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

**Standard 3.** Standard 3 of the 2008 edition of the NCATE standards outlined the expectations for teacher candidates’ clinical practice. This standard stems from the belief that teacher candidates need practical experience to develop and hone their skills as educators before entering the classroom as a licensed teacher. The third criterion, “Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn,” contained language specific to the research question.

The criterion “Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn” dealt with the ways in which EPPs’ clinical requirements supported teacher candidates’ development. The acceptable level of the criterion stated

Field experiences and clinical practice provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn. All candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups, (NCATE, 2008, p. 31).

Under the target level, the language read

Field experiences and clinical practice facilitate candidates’ exploration of their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to all students.

Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning by all
students as shown in their work with students with exceptionalities and those from
diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups in classrooms
and schools, (NCATE, 2008, p. 31).

In both cases, it was clear that NCATE expected EPPs to ensure that teacher candidates
participated in clinical experiences in which they interacted with students from diverse
backgrounds. In addition, EPPs were to assess candidates’ abilities and interactions with
these diverse student populations.

**Standard 4.** Standard 4 of the 2008 edition of the NCATE standards, “Diversity,”
outlined NCATE’s expectations for EPPs to ensure candidates developed a knowledge
base for diversity and had opportunities to interact with diverse students, peers and
faculty. The standard consisted of four criteria, each with strong connections to the
research questions. These criteria included: 1) Design, Implementation, and Evaluation
of Curriculum and Experiences; 2) Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty; 3)
Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates; and 4) Experiences Working with
Diverse Students in P-12 Schools.

The first criterion, “Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and
Experiences,” discussed the ways in which EPPs created learning opportunities for
teacher candidates and assessed their ability to meet diversity related requirements. The
acceptable language of the criterion stated that

The unit clearly articulates proficiencies related to diversity identified in the unit’s
conceptual framework that candidates are expected to develop during their
professional programs. Curriculum and field experiences provide a well-
grounded framework for understanding diversity, including English language
learners and students with exceptionalities. Candidates are aware of different learning styles and adapt instruction or services appropriately for all students, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities. Candidates connect lessons, instruction, or services to students’ experiences and cultures. They communicate with students and families in ways that demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences. … They develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity. Candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors that are consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are assessed, and the data are used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn, (NCATE, 2008, p. 34).

The target level of the criterion stated that EPPs

Curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice promote candidates’ development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity identified in the unit’s conceptual framework. They are based on well-developed knowledge bases for, and conceptualizations of, diversity and inclusion so that candidates can apply them effectively in schools. Candidates learn to contextualize teaching and draw effectively on representations from the students’ own experiences and cultures. They challenge students toward cognitive complexity and engage all students, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities, through instructional conversation, (NCATE, 2008, p. 34).
It was evident that this language expected EPPs to develop clear diversity related learning outcomes and related assessments to measure teacher candidates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions. These learning outcomes had to measure candidates’ ability to create learning experiences contextualized within students’ culture and life experiences in such a way that they promote the academic development of all students. In addition, NCATE expected EPPs to provide clinical experiences that ensures teacher candidates had the opportunity to practice and hone their ability to create and enact learning experiences that provided diverse students to develop their academic capabilities.

The second criterion, “Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty,” provided expectations for EPPs faculty demographics. The acceptable level of the criterion stated that

Candidates in conventional and distance learning programs interact with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and/or school faculty, both male and female, from at least two ethnic/racial groups. Faculty with whom candidates work in professional education classes and clinical practice have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts to increase or maintain faculty diversity, (NCATE, 2008, p. 35).

While the target level stated

Candidates in conventional and distance learning programs interact with professional education faculty, faculty in other units, and school faculty from a broad range of diverse groups. Higher education and school faculty with whom
candidates work throughout their preparation program are knowledgeable about and sensitive to preparing candidates to work with diverse students, including students with exceptionalities, (NCATE, 2008, p. 35). Through this criterion, NCATE set standards for the knowledge and experience of those that taught teacher candidates in EPPs. Here, NCATE specified that teacher candidates must interact with faculty from a minimum of two ethnic/racial groups, defined in a footnote as “those reported in the United States Census,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 35). In addition, EPPs, or their affiliated institutions, were to demonstrate continuous efforts to increase the diversity of the faculty in their recruitment efforts. Finally, NCATE expected faculty to be knowledgeable about and dedicated to preparing teacher candidates to work with a diverse student body.

The fourth criterion, “Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates,” set expectations for the diversity of the teacher candidates enrolled in an EPP. The acceptable level of the criterion stated

Candidates engage in professional education experiences in conventional and distance learning programs with male and female candidates from different socioeconomic groups, and at least two ethnic/racial groups. …Affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts the unit makes to increase or maintain a pool of candidates, both male and female, from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups, (NCATE, 2008, p. 35). According to the target level of the criterion

Candidates engage in professional education experiences in conventional and distance learning programs with candidates from the broad range of diverse
The active participation of candidates from diverse cultures and with different experiences is solicited, valued, and promoted in classes, field experiences, and clinical practice. Candidates reflect on and analyze these experiences in ways that enhance their development and growth as professionals, (NCATE, 2008, p. 35).

As with the criterion on working with diverse faculty, this criterion defines diverse teacher candidates based on the categories used by the U.S. Census Bureau (NCATE, 2008). However, this criterion also incorporated varied socioeconomic statuses in its definition. Through this criterion, NCATE set the expectation that EPPs demonstrate commitment to having a diverse pool of teacher candidates through their recruiting practices. Furthermore, NCATE expected EPPs to have diverse candidates actively involved in all aspects of the program, and provided diverse teacher candidates opportunities to reflect on how these experiences influenced their development as professional educators.

The fourth and final criterion in this standard, “Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools,” outlined expectations for the types of experiences EPPs provided to teacher candidates. The acceptable level of the criterion stated that field experiences or clinical practice for both conventional and distance learning programs provide experiences with male and female P–12 students from different socioeconomic groups and at least two ethnic/racial groups. Candidates also work with English language learners and students with disabilities during some of their field experiences and/or clinical practice to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for working with all students. Feedback from
peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students learn, (NCATE, 2008, p. 36).

The target level for the criterion stated that

Extensive and substantive field experiences and clinical practices for both conventional and distance-learning programs are designed to encourage candidates to interact with exceptional students and students from a broad range of diverse groups. The experiences help candidates confront issues of diversity that affect teaching and student learning and develop strategies for improving student learning and candidates’ effectiveness as teachers, (NCATE, 2008, p. 36).

This criterion also defined diversity as the racial and ethnic groups used by the U.S. Census Bureau, but also included varied socioeconomic groups, speakers of other languages and varied ability groups, (NCATE, 2008). NCATE expected EPPs to ensure that teacher candidates participated in clinical practice with diverse groups of students. In addition, supervisor feedback provided to teacher candidates must guide candidates’ professional development, improve their effectiveness in working with diverse student populations, and improve diverse students’ academic development.

The expectations NCATE outlined in Standard 4 were based on scholarship and policy evidence that classroom’s were becoming more diverse, driving the need for educators with the ability to reflect on multicultural and global perspectives and provide equitable educational opportunities for a diverse student population. During the period of the standards development, approximately 40% of P-12 students were from minority groups. However, the inverse was true in terms of the representation of minority groups
in the professional teaching force. The number of students identified as special needs increased as well because of changes in special education policy (NCATE, 2008).

To teach effectively in this changing environment and promote students’ individual capabilities, NCATE outlined expectations for teachers to understand the influence of students’ individual experiences and culture on the learning process. This understanding was not to be limited to knowledge alone. Rather, NCATE expected EPPs to guide teacher candidates’ in the development of practical skill through diverse clinical practice.

**Standard 5.** Standard 5 of the 2008 edition of the NCATE standards, “Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development,” dealt with matters connected to EPP faculty. This standard contained two criteria that related to the research questions: 1) Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching; and 2) Unit Facilitation of Professional Development. These two criteria outlined the ways in which EPPs support faculty’s efforts to prepare teacher candidates to work in diverse education environments.

The first criterion, “Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching,” expected EPP faculty to model effective strategies for working with diverse student populations. The acceptable level of the criterion stated, “Professional education faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different learning styles. They integrate diversity and technology throughout their teaching,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 39). The target level of the criterion expected that “Teaching by the professional education faculty reflects the proficiencies outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards; incorporates appropriate performance assessments; and integrates diversity and technology throughout coursework, field experiences, and clinical practices,” (NCATE,
NCATE expected that EPP faculty would integrate diversity in all of their student interactions and, in doing so, model research based best practices in working with diverse students in diverse situations.

The second criterion, “Unit Facilitation of Professional Development,” related to NCATE’s expectation that EPPs support faculty development in the area of diversity. The acceptable level stated, “Based upon needs identified in faculty evaluations, the unit provides opportunities for faculty to develop new knowledge and skills, especially as they relate to the conceptual framework, performance assessment, diversity, technology, and other emerging practices,” (NCATE, 2008, p. 40). NCATE set forth the requirement that EPP administrators evaluate faculty effectiveness, including their knowledge and skill working with diverse students. The expectation also expected EPPs to provide professional development when needed to ensure EPP faculty were providing the appropriate knowledge and skill set to teacher candidates. NCATE believed this to be essential as research supported the modeling best practices helps students to develop proper skill sets (NCATE, 2008).

President George W. Bush’s election in 2000 set in motion a new era of educational politics, and one still feeling the impact of A Nation at Risk (Fraser, 2010; McGuinn, 2006; Ravitch, 2014). A survey of voters revealed heavy concern in domestic issues, including public education. This occurred during a period in which economists published reports showing sharp increases in income inequality and a shift to a “just-in-time workforce” model. This led to an increase in worker transiency and loss of benefits for many workers. This increase in income inequality exasperated the intense racial segregation that existed (Wells, 2009).
During the decade leading up to the 21st century, a large number of low-wage workers from poor countries immigrated to the United States. Many of these immigrants lived in impoverished areas, and entered into schools with lower levels of educational attainment and limited English proficiency. Schools in urban centers felt the impact of this more than those in rural and suburban areas (Wells, 2009). Policymakers moved to place the burden of solving these inequalities on schools through a series of initiatives in the early years of the 21st century.

It had been a number of years since educational policy had garnered so much attention during an election cycle. The public saw high quality education as crucial to advancing America’s skill-based economy, but the view was that public education lacked quality (McGuinn, 2006; Superfine, 2013). For the first time in a number of years, there existed bipartisan consensus on education. As society had become more global, the media began posting international comparisons of educational attainment, all of which showed America was not in the lead. Both parties, and the media and general public, agreed that public education was broken and needed drastic reform. Policymakers used this information to create election platforms in which education was the center (Ravitch, 2014).

All of the presidential candidates had brought forth detailed educational reform plans as part of their election platforms. President G. W. Bush’s stance on education was a major shift from his Republican predecessors in the 1980s and 1990s. He sought to preserve and expand the federal government’s role in public education as a means of improving all students’ academic performance and providing school choice for parents residing in districts identified as low performing, all in an effort to close the achievement
gap between all groups of students (Fraser, 2010; McGuinn, 2006; Superfine, 2013; Wells, 2009).

These goals led to the development, and eventual passage, of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, often considered the boldest and most constraining federal education policy in history (Fraser, 2010; McGuinn, 2006; Ravitch, 2014; Superfine, 2013; Wells, 2009). This intensification of federal influence came at a time when the policy agenda was shifting from guaranteeing the rights of underserved students to mandating better education for all students, often called the shift from educational equity to educational excellence, clearly moved educational policy from an input to an output model (Wells, 2009).

The No Child Left Behind Act put in place a number of new federal mandates that built on state and national level reforms from the 1980s and 1990s and the challenged the equity paradigm put in place by the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Many viewed the bill as building on the shift to educational outcomes set in motion by Goals 2000 and the 1994 ESEA renewal. The outcomes focus led to federally mandated annual testing from third through eighth grade in an effort to ensure students were making adequate yearly progress (Fraser, 2010; McGuinn, 2006; Ravitch, 2014; Superfine, 2013). In addition, NCLB required schools to disaggregate the adequate yearly progress across student demographics. Each demographic had to make adequate yearly progress for the school to be labeled as effective (Fraser, 2010; Ravitch, 2014; Superfine, 2013). Whereas Goals 2000 and 1994 encouraged states to put in place standards and associated assessment systems, NCLB required them to do so and ties compliance to the receipt of federal funding or the receipt of a myriad of possible
sanctions (McGuinn, 2006; Ravitch, 2014; Superfine, 2013; Wells, 2009). Thus, rather than improving on or building a new comprehensive social safety net, policymakers followed the historic trend of holding public schools accountable for improving the lives of poor and disadvantaged students (Wells, 2009).

Unlike earlier policy attempts to create high standards and accountability in public schools, the United States Department of Education under President Bush proceeded to develop a series of detailed regulation to support, or enforce, the enactment of NCLB, including the withholding of federal funding mentioned earlier. That is not to say that the enactment of the law was smooth. Rather, there was a great deal of opposition to the law. This likely occurred due to its strong stance on accountability and its challenge to the established educational practices at the state and local levels (McGuinn, 2006). In 2004, a report of the Education Commission of the States found that although schools were making progress, it was insufficient in comparison to NCLB’s timetable and schools struggled with many of the law’s requirements. In addition, it showed that many schools across the nation received a rating of “needs improvement” for failing to make adequate yearly progress (McGuinn, 2006; Superfine, 2013).

That same year, 31 state legislatures began debating resolutions decrying NCLB as an intrusion on states’ rights, that it provided inadequate funding, or that its implementation was unworkable. A number of people also expressed opposition to the rules governing the calculation of adequate yearly progress measures. The states continued issuing legal opinions, resolutions and requests for increased flexibility through 2005 (McGuinn, 2006; Superfine, 2013). The media caught on to the debate and released several polls and reports showing the public opinion hard largely turned against
NCLB. In turn, the United States Department of Education sent out delegates to deliver the message that the law was staying and that if states failed to follow its guidelines they would forfeit their annual federal funding (McGuinn, 2006).

During the period since the passage of NCLB, which resulted in both policymakers and the public viewing education as an antipoverty program, the legislature has remained hesitant to emphasize social welfare policy. The beginning of the 21st century saw an increase in income inequality, rising childhood poverty rates and an increase in the number of families identified as working poor. The increased disparity that this caused between poor and wealthy children’s out of school experiences made the NCLB mandate of “closing the achievement gap” all the more complex (Wells, 2009). The increasing globalization of the economy and the demand for a skills-based workforce increased the demand for educational quality and attainment and increased the connection between education and individual and national economic success (McGuinn, 2006). Cibulka (2001) connected the rising educational theme to the production of human capital, and predicted that the theme will continue to be the driving force behind education in the future.

The federal hand in public education continued to grow with the 2004 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), following the accountability shift found in NCLB. When Congress reauthorized IDEA in 1997, they incorporated the expectation that the test scores of students with disabilities be included in accountability systems. In the 2004 reauthorization, Congress extended measures of accountability to include the use of alternative assessments to evaluate students identified as mentally retarded. Congress also required schools to set measurable annuals goals for
students with disabilities to ensure they met the definition of adequate yearly progress (McGuinn, 2006; Superfine, 2013).

Moving into the 2004 election, public opinion surrounding the increased federal role in education appeared conflicted considering the laws rocky start. In general, the public supported an increased federal hand in public education, but as they learned more about NCLB, the public’s support for the law decreased. However, the law, and increased federal intervention, ultimately garnered more support than opposition as concerns over the quality of public education continued to mount (McGuinn, 2006).

The 2008 edition of the standards began with an increased focus on diversity and social justice within its mission and scope. Within the conception of diversity put forth, NCATE once again broadened its definition of “all students” to include all of the commonly used demographics discussed in multicultural education. As part of this mission and scope, NCATE issued a statement specifically calling for action in relation to social justice, a call ingrained in the relatively recent passage of NCLB. Throughout this call, NCATE was clearly drawing what it saw as a connection between educational policy, specifically NCLB, and the provision for equality of educational opportunity.

Through the remainder of the standards document, it was clear that educational policy, including NCLB, held some influence over the accreditor’s expectations of EPPs. Much as NCLB shifted public education to an output model, the same occurred with EPPs under the 2008 NCATE standards. Throughout the standards text, more of the text indicated the need for EPPs to assess not only candidate’s knowledge, but also their ability to apply that knowledge to ensure that all students learn by contextualizing learning to account for students’ socio-cultural and familial backgrounds as well as their
prior knowledge and experience. While the output nature of the standards was reflective of the recent policy trends, this latter expectation incorporated educational research on the societal impact of student performance into the standards text.

The 2008 NCATE standards aligned well with Nussbaum’s capabilities framework discussed in Chapter 2. The emphasis throughout the document centered on ensuring that EPPs prepared educators to fully develop students’ academic capabilities. The expectation that EPPs incorporate assessments to measure teacher candidates’ abilities to do so only strengthened this call to action by NCATE.

Finally, as in prior editions of the NCATE standards, both policy and research influenced the development of the document. NCLB moved educational policy to an output model, much as the 2008 NCATE standards incorporated more expectations for EPPs to measure candidate’s skill. However, the expectations were influenced by research demonstrating the student learning was largely influenced by a student’s social upbringing, and therefore educators need contextualize student learning using meaningful pedagogy.

**Initial CAEP Standards**

As discussed in Chapter 2, 2011 saw NCATE merge with TEAC to form a new, single national accreditor for educator preparation. CAEP, the result of this merger, adopted their initial standards for the accreditation of educator preparation on August 29, 2013. This document contained five standards: 1) Content and Pedagogical Knowledge; 2) Clinical Partnership and Practice; 3) Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity; 4) Program Impact; and 5) Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement. The first three standards contained language relevant to this research. Unfortunately,
CAEP had yet to finalize their standards document or develop a rubric for the standards within the period defined by this research. The analysis relied solely on the language from the standards and individual criterion.

**Standard 1.** Standard 1 of the initial CAEP standards, “Content and Pedagogical Knowledge,” focused on what teacher candidates should learn as part of their preparation. The standard consisted of five criteria broken into two categories. The two categories were “Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions,” and “Provider Responsibilities.” The language of the standard stated that EPPs must ensure “that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards,” (CAEP, 2013, p. 2). CAEP relied on a definition for all students that differed from the one utilized by NCATE. CAEP defined all students to mean “children or youth attending P-12 schools including, but not limited to, students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin,” (CAEP, 2008, p. 3).

The fourth criterion of the standard contained discussion relevant to the research questions. CAEP’s expectation in this criterion was for EPPs to “ensure that completers demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards,” (CAEP, 2008, p. 3). It was apparent that CAEP intended for EPPs to set high standards for candidate performance as it related to working with a diverse student population. Wherein NCATE focused on candidate knowledge,
skills and dispositions, CAEP’s language discussed only candidate skill and commitment, a term that may be similar to NCATE concept of dispositions. However, although the CAEP language does not specifically discuss teacher candidate’s knowledge of diversity, it does expect EPPs to incorporate the 10 InTASC principles, including the category of the learner and learning, which does discuss teacher candidates’ knowledge of diverse student bodies (CAEP, 2013). CAEP’s goal in developing these expectations was for EPPs to help teacher candidates shift the focus on comprehension of content for themselves to the ways in which they can advance the development of their students’ capabilities using strategies designed to meet the needs of all students.

**Standard 2.** Standard 2 of the initial CAEP standards, “Clinical Partnerships and Practice,” expressed CAEP’s belief in the importance of clinical practice in preparing teacher candidates to become professional educators. The standard contained three criteria categorized as: 1) Partnerships for Clinical Preparation; 2) Clinical Educators; and 3) Clinical Experiences. CAEP expected the EPP to ensure “that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning and development,” (CAEP, 2013, p. 6). As in Standard 1, the emphasis in Standard 2 was that EPPs design clinical practice in such a way as to ensure that teacher candidates develop their skill to have a positive impact on the development of all students’ capabilities.

The last two criteria in the standard expressed this in specific ways. First, CAEP required that the “partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact
on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning and development,” (CAEP, 2013, p. 6). In addition, CAEP required EPPs to work with their partners to

design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students’ learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students, (CAEP, 2008, p. 6).
The clinical educators utilized by EPPs to mentor teacher candidates were to have a record of creating a positive impact on the development of diverse students’ capabilities. In addition, CAEP expected EPPs to create multiple measures of teacher candidates’ abilities to have a positive impact the development of diverse students’ capabilities, as well as ensure that their knowledge and dispositions were in line with research on the development of diverse learners.

**Standard 3.** Standard 3 of the initial CAEP standards, “Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity,” outlined the expectation for the types and quality of students admitted to EPPs. This standard consisted of six criteria divided into five categories: 1) Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs; 2) Admission Standards Indicate that Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability; 3) Additional Selectivity Factors; 4) Selectivity During Preparation; and 5)
Selection at Completion. Two of these criteria contained language related to the research questions.

First, CAEP expected the EPP to present “plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students,” (CAEP, 2008, p. 8). The expectation was for EPPs to develop plans to recruit students in such a way to help promote the creation of a teaching force that reflects the K-12 student population, presumably based on the definition for all students provided with Standard 1. CAEP also set expectations for the quality of the candidates selected for program completion. CAEP expected that before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development, (CAEP, 2008, p.9).

As in earlier CAEP standards, we see high expectations for teacher candidate performance. In this case, CAEP expected EPPs to ensure that teacher candidates developed the ability to positively impact the development of a diverse student population.

In Standard 3, CAEP put forth a series of provider responsibilities. The expectation was that EPPs maintain a series of high standards and selectivity from a teacher candidates’ entry into the program through their completion of the preparation
program while consistently seeking to develop a more diverse pool of teacher candidates to promote a teaching force that reflected the K-12 student population.

CAEP, resulting from the merger of NCATE and TEAC, closely followed the socio-political period during which the 2008 NCATE standards developed. Both NCLB and the general public support for federal intervention into public education still impacted the decisions of policymakers during the period following the publication of the 2008 NCATE standards. That same year, Barrack Obama was elected president of the United States. Immediately following his election, President Obama announced his education initiative, Race to the Top. This initiative contained several agenda items: the creation of a common state curriculum, teacher evaluations reflective of student performance, and the expansion of charter schools (Ravitch, 2014; Spring, 2014).

In the development of the Race to the Top initiative, Democrats for Education Reform pulled away from the long-standing Democratic political alliance with the teachers’ unions when they asserted that the unions and the existing school establishment were a central cause of educational inequalities. They argued that these entrenched systems hindered the ability to fire poor teachers, permit parental choice in schooling, create national standards and establish mayoral control of schools. The Democrats for Education Reform believed that these were all necessary items to reduce educational inequalities (Spring, 2014). This shift away from an alliance with the teachers’ unions became explosive when the Race to the Top Proposals called for the use of student test scores in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness, let alone their call for changes in tenure and merit pay (Ravitch, 2014; Spring, 2014).
In 2009, President Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act into law, the purpose being to both stabilize and stimulate the economy following the collapse of the financial services industry in 2008. While the focus was to help industries recover, the law contained a particular focus on stabilizing school systems under existing legislation. However, incorporated into the law were many of the precursors to President Obama’s educational agenda, including improving standards, robust charter school policies, turnaround strategies, and data systems linking student and teacher performance. The funding for these, and other programs, came under the Race to the Top Fund included in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act’s State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (Ravitch, 2014; Superfine, 2013).

Race to the Top quickly became a contested policy. President Obama’s signature educational reform effort abandoned the concept of educational equity as the driving factor behind federal aid, and replaced it with testing, accountability and school choice. This competitive approach to federal funding gave rise to many for-profit educational corporations offering resources and training to schools based on the premises outlined in Race to the Top. The United States Department of Education continued to increase federal influence over state and local education when it endorsed the Common Core State Standards as meeting Race to the Top guidelines and awarded grants to two testing consortia for developing tests designed to meet those same guidelines. The United States Department of Education had shifted from an industry of public interest to a for-profit enterprise (Ravitch, 2014).

The initial CAEP standards represented a shift in the accreditation of educator preparation. The language found in these standards largely mirrored the language used
by legislators in both NCLB and Race to the Top. As mentioned prior, CAEP had not yet published a rubric that clarifies the intention or meaning behind the standards at the time this research began. Once CAEP has finalized a rubric and the accreditation process, a reexamination of the CAEP standards against the questions and framework in this document will be warranted.

Throughout the initial CAEP standards, we find a strong emphasis on the output of EPPs, meaning measures of their candidates’ performance at program completion and during their initial years as professional educators. CAEP did incorporate an expectation of preparing teacher candidates to work in diverse environments. Like NCATE, CAEP relied on a broad definition of “all students.” While the emphasis was not on knowledge of diverse student populations, the expectation was the candidates’ performance measures supported the learning of all students in relation to the rigorous college and career-ready standards that were part of the Race to the Top initiative.

**Summary**

There has been a notable shift in the standards for the accreditation of educator preparation since NCATE’s 1995 standards. This shift, which has moved from a balance of measuring teacher candidates’ knowledge of diversity and their skill at working with diverse student populations to emphasizing measures of candidate performance in relation to working with diverse populations. As these standards have evolved, the conception of diversity has noticeably broadened each year, until the election of President Obama and the initiation of his Race to the Top policy. So too with the conception of social justice.
The utilization of Nussbaum’s capabilities framework did prove to fit well in working with the accreditation standards. In each edition of the standards, the emphasis on measuring teacher candidates’ impact on students’ ability to learn the contact became more robust. Ultimately, in the most recent standards published under CAEP emphasized this more heavily than in any prior standards examined in this research. In the following chapter, the researcher answer the research questions directly and reiterates the need for educators to have a strong background in issues of diversity and social justice. The chapter ends with a discussion of the potential implications for both teacher education and K-12 schooling.
Chapter Five

Discussion

Teachers must actively confront the realities affecting differences in students’ cultural knowledge in such a way that they enhance the learning environment and provide alternative learning experiences to guide students in their understanding of how to excel in both traditional and non-traditional educational settings (Helsing, Howell, Kegan, & Lahey, 2008; Jeffries, Powers-Costello & Dean, 2011). As such, EPPs must train teacher candidates in the best practices shown to support autonomous professional judgment in diverse educational settings in order to maximize the public good through the provision of a high quality education for all students (Tamir & Wilson, 2005).

However, the curriculum employed by EPPs is largely a combination of state regulatory requirements and national accreditation standards. This work answered two research questions relating to the way in which EPPs prepared educators to understand diversity and promote issues of social justice. The questions were:

- In what ways have diversity and social justice been conceptualized, and to what degree have they been emphasized from 1995 to 2013 in the National Councils for the Accreditation of Teacher Education accreditation standards for educator preparation?
- What influences have shaped the conceptualization of diversity and social justice and have determined the degree of emphasis over that period of time?

Findings and Implications

Beginning with the election of President Reagan in 1980, the era of the Great Society ended. This was largely fueled by America’s decline in the emerging global
market and its emergence as the largest global debtor. This economic shift, paired with the continued push for desegregation and the increased federal intervention into public schooling as a result of ESEA, led to a highly contentious educational policy scene. Education became a means for promoting economic development and the production of human capital.

Policy makers sought to reduce federal intervention into public schooling. As evidence of this effort, the Republican Party platform during the Reagan election incorporated the termination of the United States Department of Education. In an effort to garner support for such a drastic change, President Reagan sanctioned the *Nation at Risk* report. However, rather than supporting a call for decreased federal intervention it called for increasing the federal government’s leadership role in public education. In addition to the report, the public cried for an increase in academic standards and student performance on core academic skills. This ultimately led to standardized testing taking a central role in public schooling (Kempner, 1998; Reich, 1992; Rury, 2013; Superfine, 2013). However, this increased use of achievement testing brought to light inequalities in student performance, specifically decreased performance among minority groups and students with disabilities when compared against their white, typically developing peers.

During the same period, groups such as the Center for Education Renewal argued for reform of teacher preparation, noting that K-12 and teacher preparation policy are intertwined (Cohran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Goodlad, 1990). There was also an increased call for ensuring that teachers receive adequate training to work with diverse student populations (Gay, 1994; Hirsch, 1998; Kohl, 1991; Morin, 1991). Considering the increasing racial segregation in public schools and the low student performance found in
schools with high minority populations, the desire to accomplish naturally followed (Rury, 2013).

The continued federal intervention led to new policies meant to ensure that states and public schools yielded to the standards, assessment and accountability guidelines put forth in federal legislation. This included linking federal funding to measures of adequate yearly progress. The systemic reform efforts did garner the support of the business community, who also pushed policy makers to create standards and utilize testing that would ensure students graduate prepared to enter the workforce. However, not everyone agreed with this level of federal intervention. Conservative groups argued that the level of federal intervention resulting from policy reforms, such as IASA, Goals 2000 and NCLB, were examples of unconstitutional federal overreach into locally controlled institutions. Regardless of these changes, data showed a widening of the achievement gap between high- and low-poverty schools. Ultimately, all the federal intervention meant to address public concerns led to even greater public outcry over the quality of public education (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Rury, 2013).

Eventually, with the globalization of the world economy and continued public concern about the United States remaining an economic world leader, the public shifted its focus from K-12 education to demanding the preparation of a high quality teaching force. The public’s perception of K-12 education translated to the identification of teacher preparation as an inefficient and worthless institution (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). Eventually, policymakers began calling for increased accountability of EPPs (American Council on Education, 1999). Title II was quickly revised so that EPPs were
required to submit annual reports of teacher quality to the United States Secretary of Education in order to qualify for federal students aid (Early, 2000).

Overall, the period covered in this research saw educational policy garner a great deal of attention from both policymakers and the public. The public identified education as a necessity for the advancement of America’s skill-based economy, and the perception was that public education lacked the quality to accomplish that goal (McGuinn, 2006; Superfine, 2013). Bipartisan agreement on educational policy existed for the first time in a number of years. That agreement centered on the intensification of federal influence, a decreased focus on the guaranteed rights of underserved students, and the shift from an input to an output model for education (Wells, 2009).

Since 1995, the standards for the accreditation of educator preparation have broadly defined diversity and generally stressed the importance of preparing educators to work with a diverse student population. The way in which the standards conceptualized the meaning of diversity has only slightly evolved over the 18 years covered in this work. A shift in the emphasis on preparing educators to work in diverse environments only occurred recently under the 2013 standards issued by CAEP. Educational research generally influenced the conceptualization of diversity found within the standards, although the 2008 NCATE standards did reference the ethnic categories used by the United States Census Bureau on one occasion. In addition, the definition for “all students” became broader in 2002 and 2008, following the passage of NCLB, which required K-12 schools to disaggregate testing data on specific socioeconomic, ability, and racial categories. Considering the necessary link between K-12 educational policy and the work of EPPs, it is plausible that this policy led to the accreditors’ changing
conception of diversity to ensure teacher candidates’ preparedness for these new guidelines.

Both the NCATE and the CAEP standards consistently used the term “all students” to represent a broad range of student diversity. The definition provided by both NCATE and CAEP continued to broaden with each successive edition of the accreditation standards. In 1995, NCATE defined the term “all students” as those having physical and demonstrable differences and frequently added in the idea of an ethnically diverse student body. This left out students of varied religious or sexual identities. However, beginning in the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards we see the term “all students” defined more broadly, and without the use of the term “physical and demonstrable differences.” CAEP’s definition of diversity was similar in this regard. NCATE, and now CAEP, clearly defined diversity very broadly, using a definition of diversity commonly found in research on multicultural education based in a social identity framework.

The characteristics used in NCATE and CAEP's more recent definitions of diversity align with Kirk & Okazawa-Rey's (2010) discussion of a social identity framework. Both definitions identify diversity broadly through the use of social categorization, namely students with exceptionalities, students who are gifted, ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, sex, language, sexual identity, and religion (NCATE 2002, 2008; CAEP, 2013). Within this social identity framework, social diversity refers to differences between identity groups based on the same social categories (Adams et al, 2013; Tatum, 1997; Young 1990). In this way the accreditors' definitions of diversity use terminology similar to that used by socio-political institutions to identify the collective
characteristics of individuals and their related social group memberships. Such similarity is logical given that students develop their social identities in the social groups they associate with (Feinberg, 1998; Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2010; Tatum, 1997).

The acceptance of this definition likely stems from the historical and political usage of categorization. First, many of these categories are the same as those used in school accountability metrics, including race, language, exceptionalities and socioeconomic status. Those, and others, have also been commonly collected data as part of the U.S. Census. As such, their use within public education, and society in general, has become relatively commonplace.

The emphasis on diversity within the standards has also changed over time. In the 1995 NCATE standards, the inclusion of language related to diversity most limited mainly to candidate knowledge, with some expectation of candidates’ ability to apply the knowledge to their pedagogy. However, in the 2002 and 2008 editions of the NCATE standards there was a shift. During the years preceding and succeeding NCATE's 1995 standards, A Nation at Risk continued to have an impact and social and policy discussions related to the state of public education in the United States. At the same time, there was an increase in the levels of educational inequality leading up to the publication of NCATE's 2002 standards. This increase in inequality, paired with the increased social and political concern, led to an argument for increased accountability for students learning, especially among minority populations, in public schools.

Immediately following this call, NCATE began integrating their conception of diversity throughout the standards document. This was especially true in 2008 when candidates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions all had to evidence a firm understanding of
and ability to apply the conception of diversity to their professional practice. No longer was knowledge of diversity sufficient, candidates had to demonstrate the ability to apply this knowledge to their professional practice. There was a shift in this emphasis in the first edition of the CAEP standards. During the period from 2002 to 2013, a shift in policy occurred. NCLB and Race to the Top shifted the focus of public schooling to the measurement of student outcomes. CAEP, which maintained the broad conception of diversity found in the NCATE standards, mirrored this shift toward outcomes with a reduced the emphasis on candidate knowledge of diversity when compared with the 2002 and 2008 NCATE standards. Although the document claimed that the board integrated this conception throughout the standards, the existing standards language did not evidence this. What is evidenced in the standards document is an increased emphasis on candidates' ability to positively impact all students' learning.

Both research and policy have influenced the conceptualization and emphasis of social justice within the accreditation standards between 1995 and 2013. The conception of social justice stayed consistent during the periods covered in this research. The data demonstrated that both NCATE and CAEP perceived teachers as holding responsibility for promoting students' capabilities, defined by Nussbaum (2003, 2011a, 2011b) as what individuals have the ability to do and to be. This conception of social justice required the application of teacher candidates’ knowledge of diversity to ensure equality of educational opportunity for all students, a means by which education served to create an enabling environment for the citizenry to enjoy full lives.

Such an understanding aligned well with a conception of social justice based on Nussbaum’s capabilities approach framework. This framework, in which each person as
an end, considers individuals’ current level of well-being and the opportunities made available to them. The purpose being to identify and combat entrenched social injustice and inequality rooted in discriminatory practices and marginalization through the provision of substantial freedoms and the development of an individual’s internal capabilities. These combined capabilities occur in supportive sociopolitical environments and education of the person (Nussbaum, 2003, 2011a, 2011b; Sen, 1999). Both the NCATE and the CAEP standards for accreditation consistently evidenced this application of the capabilities framework through the expectation that EPPs assured the teacher candidates demonstrated the ability to educate all students, regardless of their social identity as described above.

Trends in research largely influenced the 1995 edition of the NCATE standards, although *A Nation at Risk* and the *Improving America’s Schools Act* were certainly influential due to their emphasis on closing the achievement gap and providing equality of educational opportunity to underserved, underrepresented populations. During the periods from 1995 to 2008, the NCATE standards increased their alignment with the social justice framework with each successive edition of the standards. In 2002, societal trends and policy demanding higher quality educators played a major role in the 2002 edition of the NCATE standards, although research influenced the understanding of societal impact on student learning. The standards increased the emphasis on candidates’ knowledge of diversity and the expectation that EPPs use adequate measures to determine candidates’ pedagogical skill.

This same trend continued with the 2008 NCATE standards, the peak of NCATE’s emphasis on social justice. The 2008 standards document contained a call for
action towards social justice in the teaching profession. The 2013 CAEP standards demonstrated an alignment to the defined social justice framework, but did not incorporate the same call for action. The 2013 CAEP standards also demonstrated the largest mirror of K-12 educational policy. Both NCLB and Race to the Top moved K-12 education to an output model of student performance. The same language forms are evident in the initial 2013 CAEP standards, which also represented a shift toward an output model in teacher education accreditation.

Limitations

The researcher utilized a qualitative, historical analysis of existing standards text and research to explore the relationship between diversity and social justice in teacher education accreditation and its influence by research and educational policy. The research data was limited to electronic versions of the standards texts, research articles from scholarly journals, and policy frameworks.

The public relations officer for the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation provided the electronic versions of the standards texts upon request. The articles utilized in the study were those identified in collected editions published by the American Educational Research Association and that were accessible through library research databases. The policy frameworks were those identified in summaries of key educational policies and were collected through ERIC.

The limitations in the data collection included limited access to certain materials. The researcher did not have access to the research used by the groups that authored the standards texts. In addition, the author did not conduct an exhaustive review of all the research and policy that occurred during the period covered in the research. Finally, the
author did not conduct interviews with the key policymakers or authors of the standards to determine what contextual factors they considered in their work.

Furthermore, due to time constraints and for reasons of brevity, the author limited his work to a relatively recent period in the extensive history of NCATE. The period utilized was identified due to the increase in the standardization of K-12 curriculum over that time. A review of policy and accreditation standards prior to 1995 may reveal different findings.

Because of these limitations, this research should not be considered exhaustive in its content nor is it generalizable. However, the findings serve as developing a basis of what is within the documents and calls for future research and examination of how the standards must change to align with what ought to be. In doing so, the field will develop a greater understanding of the influences on teachers’ efficacy as professionals that work with diverse student bodies and communities to promote students’ individual capabilities.

**Recommendations**

The trend toward policy influencing aspects of the standards for the accreditation of educator preparation raises concern. Although not examined as part of this research, there may be policy influence over areas beyond diversity and social justice, a potentiality for examination in future research. In addition to this influence over accreditation, EPPs have a federal mandate to submit reports of candidate certain candidate performance data to the United States Department of Education. This increased policy awareness of education and teacher education aligns with the increased perceptions of the quality decline public education. While teacher licensure is still controlled at the state level, federal policy is having an increased influence on state
licensure requirements. However, this policy influence disparately affects traditional routes for teacher preparation (Darling Hammond et al., 2005). According to a letter sent on January 2, 2015, to the Office of Management and Budget by the president of the American Council on Education, these increased regulations are placing a great financial burden on traditional teacher education programs.

In order to ensure that teacher educators continue to provide input into the profession’s standards, members of the profession should note the following recommendations for future research and policy work:

1. As CAEP finalizes their accreditation standards, rubrics and guidelines, it is essential that the documents are analyzed against this framework to determine if issues of diversity and social justice remain central to the accreditation standards.

2. A longitudinal study from NCATE’s inception through the finalized CAEP accreditation standards, rubrics and guidelines may help to reveal historic patterns in how diversity and social justice are conceptualized and emphasized within the standards for the accreditation of educator preparation.

3. Where possible, this work should be extended to include interviews with the framers of educational policy and the accreditation standards to provide more contextual information on the external influences on teacher education accreditation.

4. This research should be extended to compare the findings against data on teacher and student performance to help identify if the degree to which diversity and social justice is emphasized has had a positive impact on teacher and student performance.
5. Professional teacher educator bodies, such as AACTE, need to continue their push against federal intervention into teacher education accreditation and call for increased research influence in the standards.

6. Given that the research base has demonstrated the societal impact on student learning, the professional body needs to issue a call for the restoration of clear expectations for diversity and social justice within the standards for the accreditation of teacher education.

Through this work, the author focused on identifying how NCATE and CAEP conceptualized diversity and social justice within their standards, and to what degree they emphasized these concepts. Although these concepts evolved over time, they generally maintained alignment with the research on multicultural education. The author also examined socio-political influences on these conceptions and found that educational policy has had an increasing level of influence into the standards language, especially in recent years. Based on these findings, the author provided a series of research and policy recommendations to guide future work in the field.
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