



Accounts, Accounting, and Accountability in Teacher Preparation

**Brian Rowan
School of Education
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan**

Four Points

1. **As an organizational field, K-12 education pursues a diverse set of human resource strategies to prepare and develop teaching. These strategies:**
 - Represent competing institutional logics for organizing teacher preparation, and
 - Are now in flux and subject to keen debate.
2. **In this environment, UBTPPs are in a vulnerable position. Many observers question the “value” and “legitimacy” of Ed School programs as agencies of teacher preparation and development.**
3. **To counteract these argument, Ed Schools need to develop an “account” of their teacher preparation and development activities. Such an account would include:**
 - clear claims about the value that UBTPPs add to teaching quality at different points in a teaching career;
 - clear documentation of the validity of these claims.
4. **Such an account would be built up from a worthy accounting system. Such a system will be based on:**
 - much better research on teacher education processes and outcomes;
 - much data systems for documenting processes and outcomes of UBTPPs;
 - more attention to counterfactuals (i.e., competing “institutional” logics);
 - careful attention to experimentation for continuous improvement.

ALTERNATIVE INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS FOR K-12 TEACHER PREPARTION

A Typology of Human Resource Strategies

Adapted from: D. Lepak and S. Snell. (1999). The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(1): 31-48.

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| A S S E T S P E C I F I C I T Y | High | Partnership | Development |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational skill is specific to organization but peripheral to “core” functions. • Organization partners with specialist organization to provide workers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational skill is specific to organization. • Occupational training centered in organization. • Organization contracts on experience and uses internal “tournaments” for advancement. | |
| | | Contracting | Acquisition |
| | Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational skill is widely available in population. • Minimal barriers to labor market entry • Contract/advancement based on performance assessment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupational skill acquired only after selection and advanced training. • Occupational training centered in PSE’s. • Organization contracts on professional certification/training |
| | | Low | High |
| | | VALUE OF SKILLS TO ORGANIZATION | |

Applications in US Education

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| A S S E T S P E C I F I C I T Y | High | Partnership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Educational Services Group (partners for substitute teaching) • Teach for America | Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracts incentivize local experience • Careful attention to early mentoring and career ladders. • Commitment to local instructional improvement strategy with attention to leadership and PD. | |
| | Low | Contracting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce monopoly of Ed Schools through establishment of multiple (alternative) paths to entry • Eliminate tenure and single salary scale and substitute performance assessment as basis of contracting. | Acquisition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade selection criteria for entry into Ed Schools. • Develop strong initial teacher preparation programs • Develop professional “board” certification and exercise professional control over certification and advancement. | |
| | Low | | High | |
| | VALUE OF SKILLS TO ORGANIZATION | | | |

**CLAIMS ED SCHOOLS MIGHT MAKE ABOUT
VALUE ADDED TO TEACHING AT DIFFERENT
CAREER POINTS**

Claims

- **Ed School graduates are superior to other entrants to teaching on the following outcomes that add value to schools:**
 - **Better supervisor ratings (VAMs and observations)**
 - **Fewer absences**
 - **Greater longevity in teaching**
 - **More likely to advance in career ladder**

- **Ed schools produce these outcomes in several ways:**
 - **Ed Schools promote “soft skills” required for teaching and teacher leadership.**
 - **Ed Schools promote knowledge for teaching:**
 - **General intelligence**
 - **verbal ability**
 - **critical thinking**
 - **Declarative (Pedagogical Content) Knowledge**
 - **Knowledge of subject being taught**
 - **Knowledge of student learning and development**
 - **Knowledge of available behavioral routines for teaching**
 - **Knowledge of available curriculum**
 - **Knowledge of assessment practices**
 - **Ed School promote procedural competence**
 - **Quality of instruction**
 - **Impact on student learning**

Soft Skills

| |
|---|
| Claim |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ed Schools produce graduates with “soft skills” needed for teaching. |
| Warrant |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some empirical evidence that “soft skills” (related to personality and other attitudes) are positively associated with teaching outcomes. |
| Counterfactual(s) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compared to those who enter teaching from alternative routes, Ed School graduates have better soft skills.• Ed School graduates develop soft skills as they matriculate through curriculum, and do so at a greater rate than other college enrollees• Explicit training programs can be developed to improve soft skills related to teaching outcomes. |
| Basic Research Questions |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What “soft skills” contribute to teaching outcomes?• Can “soft skills” be taught (and if so how)?• How stable are “soft skills” once taught (and how do they vary across employment contexts over teaching careers)? Are there stable effects of Ed Schools or do Ed School effects “fade”? |
| Implications for Accountability |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assuming we have “metrics” or “rubrics” for measuring soft skills, can we establish “minimum” standards required for teaching?• If we have “metrics” for measuring soft skills, and Ed Schools vary in the soft skills of graduates, when should an Ed School act on evidence?• If Ed Schools should act on evidence, should they rely on selection or training as the device for improving graduate outcomes on this metric? |

General Intelligence



| |
|--|
| Claim |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ed Schools produce graduates with “general intelligence” needed for teaching. |
| Warrant |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some empirical evidence that “general intelligence” (especially verbal ability) is positively associated with teaching outcomes. |
| Counterfactual(s) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compared to those who enter teaching from alternative routes, Ed School graduates have better verbal ability.• Ed School graduates develop better general intelligence as they matriculate through the curriculum, and do so at a greater rate than other college enrollees.• Explicit training programs can be developed to improve general intelligence related to teaching outcomes. |
| Basic Research Questions |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the empirical relationship of general intelligence to teaching outcomes broadly construed?• How stable is general intelligence (and how does it develop across employment contexts over the course of a teaching career)? Are there stable effects of Ed Schools or do Ed School effects “fade”?• If general intelligence is a fixed attribute of individuals, what can be done to incentivize more intelligent individuals into teaching? |
| Implications for Accountability |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assuming we have “metrics” or “rubrics” for general intelligence, can we establish “minimum” standards required for teaching? Is a BA required?• If we have “metrics” for measuring general intelligence, and Ed Schools vary in the general intelligence of graduates, when should an Ed School act on evidence?• If Ed Schools do act on evidence, should they rely on selection or training as the device for improving graduate outcomes on this metric? |



Declarative Knowledge for Teaching

| |
|--|
| Claim |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Ed Schools produce graduates with “declarative knowledge” needed for teaching. |
| Warrant |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">There is some empirical evidence that various forms of “declarative knowledge” is positively associated with teaching outcomes. |
| Counterfactual(s) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Compared to those who enter teaching from alternative routes, Ed School graduates have better declarative knowledge for teaching.Ed School graduates develop better declarative knowledge for teaching as they matriculate through the curriculum, and do so at a greater rate than other college enrollees.Explicit training programs can be developed to improve declarative knowledge for teaching. |
| Basic Research Questions |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">What is the empirical relationship of different forms of declarative knowledge for teaching to procedural outcomes of teaching? Is a teacher always in a position to deploy declarative knowledge in practice?What is the empirical relationship of different forms of declarative knowledge for other important teaching outcomes, such as longevity, leadership, career advancement?How stable is declarative knowledge for teaching (and how does it develop across employment contexts over the course of a teaching career)? Are there stable effects of Ed Schools on these forms of knowledge or do Ed School effects “fade”? |
| Implications for Accountability |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Assuming we have “metrics” or “rubrics” for declarative knowledge, can we establish “minimum” standards required for teaching?If we have “metrics” for measuring declarative knowledge for teaching, and Ed Schools vary in the declarative knowledge of graduates, when should an Ed School act on evidence?If Ed Schools do act on evidence, should they rely on selection or training as the device for improving graduate outcomes on this metric? |

Procedural Competence in Teaching

| |
|---|
| Claim |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ed Schools produce graduates with “procedural competence” needed for teaching. |
| Warrant |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is growing empirical evidence that “procedural competence” of teachers varies widely. |
| Counterfactual(s) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compared to those who enter teaching from alternative routes, Ed School graduates have better procedural competence.• Ed School graduates develop procedural competence as they matriculate through the curriculum.• Explicit training programs can be developed to improve procedural competence. |
| Basic Research Questions |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the central dimensions of procedural competence, and how are they inter-related?• How is procedural competence related to other important teaching outcomes, such as longevity, leadership, career advancement?• How stable is teaching competence (and how does it develop across employment contexts over the course of a teaching career)? Are there stable effects of Ed Schools on these forms of knowledge or do Ed School effects “fade”? |
| Implications for Accountability |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assuming we have “metrics” or “rubrics” for procedural competence, can we establish “minimum” standards required for teaching? How should these vary across different career stages?• If we have “metrics” for measuring procedural competence, and Ed Schools vary in the procedural competence of graduates, when should an Ed School act on evidence?• If Ed Schools do act on evidence, should they rely on selection or training as the device for improving graduate outcomes on this metric? |

GETTING FROM HERE TO THERE

Accountability Requires an “Account”

- **To embrace accountability, teacher preparation programs can develop a clear set of claims about the value they add to teaching.**
 - **This includes what outcomes they produce;**
 - **At what stages of teaching;**
 - **And with what degree of persistence.**

- **In formulating this account, teacher preparation programs must think honestly about competing instructional logics (“counterfactuals). This involves:**
 - **Comparing alternative designs for producing various outcomes within traditional, university-based programs.**
 - **Comparing potential outcome tradeoffs across alternative routes into teaching.**
 - **Thinking hard about the role of teacher preparation programs in both initial certification and continuing professional development.**

Accountability Requires “Accounting” Systems

- **Such systems will be:**
 - data intensive;
 - integrate data from multiple sources (local systems, state systems, accreditation systems);
 - and require capacity building (funds and expertise).
- **Efforts to build such systems are in the early stages:**
 - NRC, CAEP, Federal agencies, and CCSO officials are meeting about such systems
 - Ed School leaders often express concerns about such systems (lack of resources, request overload, meaningless reporting requirements)
- **My argument is that the promise of such systems will be realized *ONLY* if:**
 - Ed School leaders are proactive and attempt to shape such systems; and
 - Such systems are grounded in data that addresses well-conceived claims about the value UBTPP might add to teaching.