



California Council on Teacher Education

Statement on NCTQ by the California Council on Teacher Education

Adopted by the CCTE Board of Directors, February 18, 2011

President (2012)

Magaly Lavadenz
Loyola Marymount University

President-Elect (2012)

Andrea Whittaker
Stanford University

Vice-President for AACTE (2012)

Reyes Quezada
University of San Diego

Vice-President for ATE (2012)

Jose Lalas
University of Redlands

Past President (2012)

James Cantor
California State University,
Dominguez Hills

Board of Directors

Alice Bullard (2011)
BTSa State Leadership Team

Juan Flores (2013)
California State University,
Stanislaus

Barbara Ford (2011)
San Francisco State University

Lettie Ramirez (2012)
California State University,
East Bay

Mary Sandy (2011)
University of California, Davis

Mona Thompson (2013)
California State University,
Channel Islands

Keith Walters (2013)
California Baptist University

Desiree Zamorano (2012)
Occidental College

Charles Zartman (2012)
California State University,
Chico

Teacher Education Quarterly

Christian J. Faltis, Editor
University of California, Davis

Issues in Teacher Education

Suzanne SooHoo
& **Joel Colbert, Co-Editors**
Chapman University

Executive Secretary

Alan H. Jones (2013)
Caddo Gap Press
3145 Geary Blvd. PMB 275
San Francisco, CA 94118
415/666-3012
Fax 415/666-3552
alan.jones@ccte.org

In January of 2011 the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) announced that it will undertake a review of teacher education programs at the 1,400 colleges and universities across the United States. The review seeks to evaluate the design quality of education department and school programs against NCTQ's own 17 standards covering many aspects of teacher education program design. The initial step in this review has been to ask colleges and universities to indicate their agreement to participate in the review.

NCTQ will partner with *U. S. News and World Report* to publish the results of the review, which are scheduled to be released in the Fall of 2012. NCTQ indicates that the review will rate or rank teacher education programs. If an institution that chooses not to participate is a public university, NCTQ plans to make open records requests to gather the documentation required for the review.

The California Council on Teacher Education Board of Directors recognizes that each of its member colleges and universities will decide independently whether or not to participate in the NCTQ review, and the CCTE Board will strongly defend such independence of its member institutions and support whatever decision each makes. Nevertheless, the CCTE Board feels obliged to share with its member institutions several serious concerns that it has about the NCTQ/USNWR project.

The idea of a national comparison and ranking of teacher education programs as proposed by NCTQ is flawed methodologically, given that the nature of such programs across the nation is purposely and appropriately quite varied based upon the independent mission of each campus, the differing sizes of the institutions, the needs of local communities, and each state's standards for teacher licensing. To attempt to judge and rank such programs in a comparative manner as NCTQ proposes is methodologically inappropriate and may well be unethical. Additionally, research procedures being utilized by NCTQ may violate federal legal guidelines for handling of student information, potentially putting any participating campus at legal risk. The NCTQ procedures and data collection are far too narrow and thin to render any credible results, most particularly because the data being collected will relate primarily to program admission and curricular design with no attention to post-graduation service in teaching, which is the most crucial index of program success. This key information missing from the NCTQ review is a major part of state and national accreditation of teacher education and thus is already collected and available.

There already exists a comprehensive nationwide voluntary accreditation structure for teacher education as well as mandatory state accreditation in each state. National standards for teacher education through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium as well as state standards developed and adopted by each state are already in place. These systems collect and report data in far greater detail than the information being sought by NCTQ, thus making the NCTQ project unnecessary, redundant, and a burden on teacher education administrators and faculty. Further, multi-campus state universities such as California State University and the University of California already have their own comprehensive evaluation systems. The NCTQ review simply creates another reporting system that will not add value to existing assessment structures and results and for those institutions that choose to participate will further stretch already limited resources.