

OKLAHOMA HOUSE BILL 1706: A CASE STUDY OF  
CONSERVATIVE EDUCATIONAL REFORM

By

JEAN AGNES LUCKOWSKI

Bachelor of Arts  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1974

Master of Arts  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1979

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1983

Thesis  
1983D  
L9410  
cop. 2



OKLAHOMA HOUSE BILL 1706: A CASE STUDY OF  
CONSERVATIVE EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Thesis Approved:

*Daniel Schakorich*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Russell D. Sany*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Randall Ketting*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Kenneth H. Davis*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman N. Durbin*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

## PREFACE

It is appropriate at this point to convey my gratitude and appreciation to the friends and teachers, and especially my family, who supported me in this endeavor. I hold in very high esteem the members of my doctoral committee: Professors Russell Dobson, J. Randall Koetting, and Kenneth St. Clair, as well as other faculty members of Oklahoma State University. One person, however, of unusual insight, intelligence, and wit has had a significant effect on my education during the last three years and the writing of this study. Professor Daniel Selakovich has been the ideal dissertation adviser; he never left me completely alone but made me suffer and endure it and write it myself.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN AMERICAN HISTORY. . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	2
Conservative vs. Radical Interpretations of the History of Education . . . . .	3
Organization of the Study. . . . .	7
Research Procedure . . . . .	9
II. CONSERVATIVE EDUCATIONAL REFORM OF THE PROGRESSIVE ERA . . . . .	14
Turner's Thesis and the Development of American Corporate Society . . . . .	14
Emergence of the Educational State . . . . .	15
Early Twentieth Century Progressives . . . . .	17
Influence of Progressives on Education . . . . .	19
Progressivism in Historical Perspective. . . . .	23
III. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION . . . . .	28
Purpose of Teacher Certification . . . . .	29
Local Autonomy of Teacher Licensure in Colonial America. . . . .	30
County Control of Teacher Certification, 1789- 1860 . . . . .	31
Period of Transition in Teacher Certification, 1860-1910. . . . .	32
Centralization of State Control Over Teacher Certification, 1910-1970 . . . . .	33
Trend Toward Performance-Based Approaches to Teacher Certification, 1970 to the Present . . . .	35
Performance-Based Teacher Education and Certifi- cation . . . . .	36
Adoption of Performance-Based Teacher Certification Within the United States . . . . .	40
Historical Development of Teacher Certification in Oklahoma. . . . .	42
IV. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND SUMMARY OF HOUSE BILL 1706 .	49
Legislative Interest in the Need for Educational Changes. . . . .	51

Chapter	Page
Interim Session, Joint House-Senate Education Committee . . . . .	53
Statewide Hearings . . . . .	56
Proposed Legislative Program on Education - 1980 Session. . . . .	59
Introduction, Debate, and Approval of House Bill 1706 . . . . .	61
Summary of House Bill 1706 . . . . .	64
Legislative Intent. . . . .	64
Minimum Salaries. . . . .	65
Professional Standards Board, Functions and Responsibilities. . . . .	65
Teacher Education - Candidates and Instructors. . . . .	65
Licensing and Certification, Qualifications and Funding . . . . .	66
Entry-Year Assistance Committee . . . . .	68
Teacher Consultants . . . . .	69
In-Service Teacher Education and Staff Staff Development . . . . .	69
Teacher Register. . . . .	70
Compliance. . . . .	70
Oklahoma Citizens' Commission on Education. . . . .	70
 V. ANALYSIS OF THE PASSAGE OF OKLAHOMA HOUSE BILL 1706 . . . . .	 77
The Thirty-Seventh Legislature . . . . .	78
Public Awareness and Support for House Bill 1706 . . . . .	84
Influence of Non-Legislative Groups. . . . .	86
The Economic Situation . . . . .	89
 VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	 93
Summary. . . . .	93
Conclusions. . . . .	94
House Bill 1706 as Conservative Reform . . . . .	94
Political Nature of House Bill 1706. . . . .	97
 BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	 102
 APPENDIXES . . . . .	 109
APPENDIX A - FORMAL INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED. . . . .	110
APPENDIX B - MEMBERS OF THE GLENN SNIDER SUB-COMMITTEE. . . . .	113
APPENDIX C - SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS . . . . .	115

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX D - MEMBERS, 1979 INTERIM SESSION JOINT HOUSE-SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE OF THE OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE . . . . .	117
APPENDIX E - PARTIAL LIST OF INDIVIDUALS REQUESTED TO TESTIFY . . . . .	120
APPENDIX F - AUTHORS, OKLAHOMA HOUSE BILL 1706. . . . .	122
APPENDIX G - OKLAHOMA SESSIONS LAW, 1980. . . . .	126

## CHAPTER I

### EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN AMERICAN HISTORY

#### Introduction

The urge to reform education is a long-standing tradition which has enjoyed the status of a fashionable cause during certain periods of time in American history. Such is the climate of contemporary America that it has again risen as an important cause around which powerful forces in society have rallied. If one views educational reform efforts as broader attempts to solve societal problems, the irony of past and present reform movements is obvious: the problems persist despite the optimism and best efforts of reformers.

Michael Katz has identified at least four similarities among reform movements within the last 200 years which help explain and summarize why reforms have not changed schooling significantly during that time.<sup>1</sup> According to Katz, educational movements are often initiated by the socially and intellectually prominent and are supported by anxious middle-class parents with input by school personnel only as reaction to other's actions. Second, their goals have been primarily extrinsic, stressing the needs of society and the economy and the future cash value of occupational training in school, not the needs of the individual. Third, the changes are usually imposed, rather than voluntary, and follow a noisy, emotional campaign for support. The final similarity is that educators have turned inward, away from



reality, and have accepted an "implausible ideology which assigned them a critical role in the salvation of individuals and of society," and in so doing allowed their growing bureaucracies to become inflexible and private.<sup>2</sup>

In describing the reformers, past and present, who have failed to maintain a healthy skepticism and realistic view of reform, Katz has eloquently illustrated the most dangerous aspect of the failure of educational reform, the implications of which this study will explore:

When educational reform becomes too bound up with personal and group interests, it loses the capacity for self-criticism. It can be a dazzling diversionary activity turning heads away from the real nature of social problems. It can become a vested interest in its own right, so pious and powerful that it can direct public scorn to anyone who doubts. But the doubters are essential; for someone must try to keep the claims of education in proper perspective, to loose the hold of interest upon the cause of reform. This has yet to be done.<sup>3</sup>

#### Purpose of the Study

In 1979, a renewed effort was begun to reform and improve the quality of Oklahoma public schools. It culminated in the passage of broad legislation concerning, among other things, minimum teachers' salaries, competency testing for pre-service teachers, and staff development requirements for continued certification. It focused on various aspects of teacher certification, in particular, and can be viewed as an example of legislative policy-making in response to public demand. Although a number of individuals and special interest groups were influential in drafting and passing the law, most appear to have reflected the idea that quality education can be insured by

competent teachers; thus, the emphasis on regulation of teacher preparation, licensing, and certification.

The law, known as House Bill 1706, has been the subject of much public debate and interest, causing particular concern, perhaps even anxiety, among those responsible for its implementation. Little attention, however, has been given to its relation to previous attempts to reform American education and the historical reform tradition on which it was based. No one has asked whether, with past reforms in mind, this law represents genuine educational reform. Thus, the emphasis of the study which follows is on understanding this particular legislation within an historical framework of educational reform.

The purpose of this study is to define and clarify House Bill 1706 as an example of legislative policy-making designed to achieve reform in education and to explore the political nature of that reform. Even though it has received the enthusiastic support of the education community both within Oklahoma and around the country, a major question this study will address is whether, as reform legislation, House Bill 1706 is more conservative in nature than reformist and, as such, whether it corresponds directly to traditional, politically expedient views of what good schooling should be. A brief discussion of what is meant by a traditional or conservative as opposed to revisionist or radical interpretation of education history may help clarify this position.

#### Conservative vs. Radical Interpretations of the History of Education

During the last 20 years, writers of educational history have

begun to question long-held beliefs about public education in the United States and the liberal scholarship that has supported it.<sup>4</sup> They have begun not only to consider questions previously thought to be unanswerable, but also to ask questions they would not have thought to ask before.<sup>5</sup> Such historians might be called revisionist, "new-left," or radical. Robert Sherman and Joseph Kirschner suggest that neither revisionist nor "new left" are valuable designations. Any historian who uses a new method of analysis and new interpretations as a result can be called a revisionist; defined this way, there have been many revisionists through history. Further, the label "new-left" too often is confused with the philosophy of Karl Marx. Sherman and Kirschner suggest the term "radical" is best used to understand the new focus and methods of educational history.<sup>6</sup> Although radical and revisionist are sometimes used interchangeably within the education community, radical will be used in this study as the more precise term by which to refer to this approach to educational history.

The radical historians have rejected what Katz refers to as both the metaphor and the method which characterized the traditional educational past:

The method has divorced inquiry into the development of educational practices and institutions from the mainstream of historical scholarship and left it narrow, antiquated, and uninteresting. The metaphor portrayed education as a flower of democracy planted in a rich and liberating loam which its seeds continually replenished.<sup>7</sup>

In this rejection, the radicals have attempted to bring the study of education into current scholarship, but not simply by "plugging schooling into the framework erected by scholars in more academically established specialties, but rather," by serving as "a catalyst which

itself has forced the expansion of interpretations and the re-opening of historical issues."<sup>8</sup>

In addition to Katz, other scholars have written educational history from a radical perspective. Joel Spring, Paul Violas, and Clarence Karier, as examples, have studied the public schools and concluded that compulsory, free education was not really for the benefit of the masses but was instead designed to control them; that common schools had narrow vocational goals and operated in the interests of the dominant middle class; and that the ladder of upward social mobility was a myth in a stratified, class-bound society.<sup>9</sup>

By contrast, traditional, conservative writers of educational history have provided a narrative of the triumph of benevolence and democracy. Early twentieth century traditional historians such as Ellwood Cubberly and Edgar Knight presented changes in American schooling as victories in the battle against selfish, religious, and undemocratic elites.<sup>10</sup> They saw the development of public education as "a story of almost uninterrupted progress in which the public assumed increasing responsibility for all citizens."<sup>11</sup> Conservative educational history rarely questioned the idea of a school system which was designed to fit children and adolescents into an existing social, political, and economic system. With these explanations in mind, the premise of this study might be phrased this way: as a method of improving public education, House Bill 1706 is more concerned with maintaining majority, system-supporting interests than with probing deeper issues involved in effecting genuine changes in education.

Directly related to this comparison with earlier conservative reform efforts is a consideration of the law's political influences and possible impact. During the last 20 years, the myth that education and politics are unrelated has slowly begun to break down. The indifference between education and political science has gradually been replaced by an awareness that the school is connected to the political system of local, state, and federal government and that the school itself often acts like a miniature political system.<sup>12</sup>

The myth of a sanitized, apolitical education system, according to Frederick Wirt and Michael Kirst, had its roots with early twentieth century Progressives.<sup>13</sup> During that time, education removed itself from what it perceived as a corrupt, inefficient, decentralized, ward-based committee system of education in American cities. The conservative reforms of an increasingly centralized, professional, and "no-politics" approach to education continued to enjoy popularity and longevity among the general public well into the 1960s.

Those ideas have been challenged by several forces at work politicizing education since then, including "intensive competition for fiscal support among public programs and their supporters," and "demands for accountability by educators to the layman and for evaluations of the results of formal schooling that citizens would understand."<sup>14</sup> More recently, Kirst has noted the shift in power away from the local level toward the state.<sup>15</sup> Corresponding to an increasing percentage of the population enrolled in or employed by educational institutions are the growing education budgets within the states. Such changes indicate the growing awareness of the political importance of education; indeed, Kirst concludes that too much is involved

for state politicians to leave educational issues to local authorities.<sup>16</sup> Given the growing allocations states are providing education and the increased authority many state legislatures, including Oklahoma's, have begun to exercise, the political nature of laws such as House Bill 1706 deserves careful consideration.

### Organization of the Study

A proper study of this or any law should include more than a chronicaling of events and actions which culminate in its successful passage. A description of House Bill 1706's chronological development as well as an analysis of the forces and influences at work within Oklahoma at the time it was passed is therefore provided. The study thus approaches the Oklahoma law from a radical perspective of educational reform, radical in this sense referring to critical analysis as an historical approach. At the same time, it identifies House Bill 1706 as conservative legislation, well within the traditional interpretation of what school reform ought to look like. Stated another way, it is a radical critique of a conservative law.

With these ideas in mind, the study begins with a discussion of what educators have meant when they have promoted educational reform. Historically, good schooling has meant different things to different people. Chapter II focuses on the emerging concept of the educational state in twentieth century American history, in particular the Progressive movement of the early twentieth century and the criticism of that period's educational reform by the so-called radical historians of the present time. Progressivism is an excellent illustration of educational reform efforts which were influenced by social, economic,

and political forces and one which has relevance for contemporary reform, including House Bill 1706.

Chapter III places the law among earlier regulations regarding certification and licensure of teachers by means of a brief history of that process in the United States and Oklahoma in particular. In initiating and approving House Bill 1706, the Oklahoma Legislature operated within an historical framework of authority to control the certification of American teachers; therefore, consideration of the history of teacher certification is appropriate and necessary.

Chapter IV details, by means of chronological narrative, the events leading to the drafting and eventual passage of House Bill 1706. Considered by many to have been the most significant piece of legislation proposed during the 1980 session of the Oklahoma Legislature, the Bill developed over a 12 month period through a variety of political activities. Some of those activities which had a direct or indirect effect on the law and which are described in Chapter IV were plans for improvement submitted by interest groups and individuals, a series of statewide hearings sponsored by a Joint House-Senate Committee on Education, and significant input through committee revisions by particular legislators and special interest groups. Chapter IV also provides a summary of House Bill 1706 which defines and clarifies the various aspects of the Bill.

An analysis of the factors involved in passing House Bill 1706 is offered in Chapter V. That analysis includes discussion of the intentions of the groups and individuals responsible for the law and some of the political realities of education legislation in Oklahoma and elsewhere. Chapter VI provides a summary and conclusions of the

study, making a final connection between the kinds of changes required by House Bill 1706 and the conservative reforms of earlier times.

#### Research Procedure

The primary research regarding this study of House Bill 1706 was conducted over a one year period and consisted of a scrutiny of the written records of the 1979 Oklahoma Legislature's Interim Session Joint House-Senate Committee on Education, the taped proceedings of 11 statewide public hearings held by the Committee from August to December, 1979, and the published documents of the Oklahoma State Department of Education from 1908 to 1980. In addition, personal interviews were completed with the leadership of the 1979 Oklahoma Legislature, members of the Joint House-Senate Committee on Education, professors of education, public school administrators, State Department of Education officials, legislative research staff members, the leadership of teachers' associations, and other respected observers of the Oklahoma educational and political system.<sup>17</sup> An effort was made to include as wide and objective a coverage of the people and groups involved in passing House Bill 1706 as possible.

The interviews did not follow a set pattern with identical questions addressed to each participant. Those interviewed were encouraged, through open-ended questions, to give their perceptions of how and why the law was passed and how it would affect the quality of education in Oklahoma. Little effort was made to limit the conversation to House Bill 1706, which resulted in informative, colorful, and valuable insights into the politics of Oklahoma. A tape recorder was used for most of the interviews, but participants were informed in



advance that their comments would be held in confidence and referred to only in general terms in the study. The interviews lasted an average of 90 minutes each.

Some difficulty was experienced in contacting and arranging for the interviews; it should be noted that research of this type has distinct disadvantages.<sup>18</sup> One might say, for example, that it is much easier for an individual to agree to an interview than it is to actually give one. An interviewer, especially one who is not a legislator's constituent, must further be prepared to be the innocent victim of an unexpected party caucus or a Rotary Club luncheon. Caution is also necessary when utilizing personal recollection of past events. At times, the view of individuals involved in this legislative effort differed noticeably from the events as they actually took place. Their perception of reality, however, is just as important as the reality itself, and helps explain some of their subsequent actions. The advantages of interviewing key participants more than compensate when one considers the information, opinions, and insights to be gained.

The writing of history in general is a creative, imaginative, but not fictional art form. It is conducted from a particular perspective of the present. In other words, the historian cannot ignore the present in studying the past. Each one writes or cultivates his or her art to provide meaning for present existence. The kinds of assumptions people hold guide their perceptions and their picture of past reality, that is, history. Such is the case for educational historians, whether traditional or revisionist.

The study of Oklahoma House Bill 1706 which follows is an attempt to pursue one person's perspective of reality. It is an attempt to draw a connection between past and present educational reform, and, in so doing, to show that educational history cannot skim itself off the top of cultural history, nor evade larger, fundamental questions.<sup>19</sup> The generalizations which result from any historical study ought ideally to serve as organizing principles, not always as answers to all the questions historians raise, but, as in this case, to help order a puzzling field and offer possibilities of what good teaching, learning, and schooling should be.

END NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Michael B. Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 213-214.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 215-216.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 217.

<sup>4</sup>Walter Feinberg, Reason and Rhetoric: the Intellectual Foundations of 20th-Century Liberal Educational Policy (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975), p. 235.

<sup>5</sup>Michael B. Katz, "The Origins of Public Education: A Reassessment," History of Education Quarterly, 16, 1976, pp. 381-407.

<sup>6</sup>Robert R. Sherman and Joseph Kirschner, Understanding History of Education (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1976), p. 60.

<sup>7</sup>Katz, "Origins," p. 381.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>As cited in Daniel Selakovich, Schools and American Society (New York: Longman, Inc.), in press. See also, Paul Violas, Training of the Urban Working Class, A History of Twentieth Century American Education (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1978).

<sup>10</sup>Selakovich, Schools.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Frederick M. Wirt and Michael W. Kirst, Political and Social Foundations of Education (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1972), p. 4.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 5-6, pp. 241-242.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 9-10.

<sup>15</sup>Michael W. Kirst, "The State Role in Regulating Local Schools," in Mary Frase Williams (Ed.), Government in the Classroom: Dollars and Power in Education (New York: Praeger Publications, 1979), p. 45.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>See Appendix A for a list of those interviewed.

<sup>18</sup>During the course of completing the interviews included in this study, the researcher compiled a list of problems encountered. A partial list of those which might be titled, "Indignities I Have Suffered," includes: (a) a certain amount of condescension, especially by aides; (b) light bulb maintenance during a 13 minute interview; (c) cancellation of same interview twice due to other commitments; (d) failure of three interviewees to show up at the appointed time and place; (e) failure to respond to repeated requests for interviews; and (f) cancellation of a scheduled interview moments before it was due to begin for less than convincing reasons.

<sup>19</sup>Maxine Greene, "The Professional Significance of History of Education," in Understanding History of Education (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1976), p. 51.

CHAPTER II  
CONSERVATIVE EDUCATIONAL REFORM OF THE  
PROGRESSIVE ERA

Turner's Thesis and the Development of  
American Corporate Society

Numerous historians have drawn upon the concept of the frontier as the key to understanding man's sociocultural development. From its inauspicious introduction at the American Historical Association convention in 1893, Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier thesis has had a lasting influence on American historiography. While Turner's theory of the frontier as a locus of democratic opportunity and rugged individualism has undergone decades of criticism and has generally been discredited, its value remains as a method of approaching historical study, particularly the American experience and including the history of education.<sup>1</sup>

William Appleman Williams, for example, has argued that the frontier was more than a social safety valve or equalizer but was in fact a "gate of escape" by which Americans could combine a Puritan sense of mission with the enlightenment notion of progress to legitimize their actions in foreign affairs.<sup>2</sup> According to Williams, expansionism helped solve the problem of maldistribution of wealth and power, not by creating institutions which would redistribute wealth but by creating institutions which would create more wealth and power.

## Emergence of the Educational State

Clarence Karier has found Williams' extension of the frontier thesis helpful in understanding the development of American corporate society, specifically the emergence of the educational state in the twentieth century. Karier viewed it as a type of new frontier and observed that:

. . . just as one of the controlling myths of the nineteenth century was the belief that the westward movement would result in social mobility, so too, one of the central myths of the twentieth century is that schooling will result in social mobility.<sup>3</sup>

Drawing on Williams' analysis of the frontier thesis, Karier found that during the late nineteenth century the school became the major vehicle for social indoctrination as well as social control. The educational state stressed bigger and more efficient schools, and in so doing, related the supposed anti-intellectualism of nineteenth century Western settlement to the twentieth century middle-class search for property status and economic security rather than knowledge and intellectual growth.<sup>4</sup> Karier further theorized that when the school doorway became the "gate of escape," a meritocratic system developed which placed blame for any failure on the individual who did not meet sufficient standards rather than on the system itself.

As mentioned above, the historiography of educational reform, until recent years, has not always reflected this kind of critical analysis. Katz, writing in 1968, suggested that it has instead had about it a kind of "cloud of sentiment," a "warm and comforting myth" which, with some few exceptions, perpetuated the idea that the

dedicated efforts of idealistic and humanitarian intellectuals won for the common working-class man the rewards of education.<sup>5</sup>

A continuing question for educational historians, whether traditional or radical, however, has been how can education best be reformed and improved? Educational reformers of the nineteenth century, for example, sought to develop the kind of educational system which would create order where they saw chaos. Horace Mann believed that better producers and consumers of wealth would be less inclined toward violent social revolution if they were more thoroughly schooled.<sup>6</sup> Other intellectuals and educators were likewise anxious to respond to the fundamental and rapid changes occurring around them. Paul Violas referred to the period following the Civil War as a crisis of transition during which industrialism displaced agriculture; the nation became more urban than rural; corporate capitalism and monopolistic arrangements altered familiar business patterns; disquieting developments in the intellectual world took place; and millions of "strangers in the land" appeared as an ominous threat to an already anxious society.<sup>7</sup>

Most Americans viewed these economic and social developments with open concern and worried that an uncontrolled, foreign-born, and urban society would result in social chaos and class warfare. In their view, a cooperative, rather than competitive form of existence was needed to insure moral, livable cities. Joel Spring has identified the question of competition versus cooperation with regard to unions and monopolies as an important way by which the image of the corporate state became clearly defined.<sup>8</sup> The union and monopoly, as

aspects of the corporation, were seen as either the cause or the cure of the various problems of urban living. One side of the debate argued that the concentration of capital and the development of labor organizations had disrupted the traditional system to such an extent that the resulting inequalities could only be cured by anti-trust legislation and restoration of the competitive market. The opposite argument held that large economic organizations were more efficient and humanitarian because they were so highly specialized and cooperative. The second argument, taken up by Progressives such as Theodore Roosevelt, Samuel Gompers, and Jane Addams, had the greatest influence on the goals and direction of public schools.<sup>9</sup> Political and social reformers alike were

. . . shocked by corruption, pinched by constricted opportunities in a world of large organizations, outraged by slums and foul working conditions in a land of plenty, concerned about swarms of immigrants crowding the ghettos . . .<sup>10</sup>

and they looked, not improperly, to public education as the solution.

#### Early Twentieth Century Progressives

Herbert Croly was a particularly articulate spokesman for the Progressives in his 1909 explanation of corporate philosophy, The Promise of American Life. In it, he defined the promise as "An improving popular economic condition, guaranteed by democratic political institutions, and resulting in moral and social amelioration."<sup>11</sup> The loss of a sense of community was not disastrous for the Progressives. Specialization, instead, promised the more valuable rewards of efficiency and economic growth. Croly's "New Nationalism," later adopted by Roosevelt and his Progressive Party, submerged the individual



within the organization so that, according to Croly, any achievement would create a greater sense of community because the value of the task would be defined in terms of its worth to the collective endeavor.<sup>12</sup>

The Progressives, representing a distinct movement, combined an array of ideas, images, heroes, and rhetoric by which Americans adapted to the realities of early twentieth century life, specifically, the political economy of the large corporation. Unconcerned with significant changes, their chief success came in adaptation and improvement. On a local level, Progressives did effect some gains, most notable of those being the extension of popular government, establishment of some control of the more blatant kinds of corruption and the rejuvenation of individual and social welfare programs. On a larger scale, however, the corporation remained dominant and the Progressive reformers improved the existing system only insofar as they made it work better. The movement had the effect of making Americans more aware of the corporate system, its weaknesses, and improved ways to operate and control it.<sup>13</sup>

Williams identified the movement as being composed of three major groups whose characteristics help further explain the nature of Progressivism. The first group was composed of the landed gentry who "performed (a) vital function in sustaining and trying to adapt the ideas and policies of an agrarian noblesse oblige to the industrial system."<sup>14</sup> Such individuals as Theodore Roosevelt and Brooks Adams, who saw themselves as "stewards of the public welfare," supplied initial crucial leadership to the movement. A second group, and one which gained the most from a new awareness of corporate capitalism, was the sophisticated corporate spokesmen such as Mark Hanna and

George Perkins. Sometimes referring to Progressivism as "the millionaire's reform movement," these occasionally disenchanting men slowly took control away from the gentry and fully developed the idea of a corporate system.<sup>15</sup>

The third and largest group within the Progressive movement was composed of middle-class businessmen and farmers who controlled some measure of political and economic power only so long as they acted as a group. For the most part, they did not like the corporate capitalism they were forced to support, but they were realistic in recognizing that they must accept the system; they needed it and had nothing to put in its place.<sup>16</sup>

#### Influence of Progressives on Education

The influence of corporate Progressivism on schooling should not be underestimated in view of the position and power of some of its main proponents. Gabriel Kolko pointed out the significant influence Roosevelt and others had in shaping the structure and direction of the federal government at that time and that, as a kind of ruling elite, they exercised a great deal of control over the definition of popular goals.<sup>17</sup> Institutional education was seen as the proper method by which the democratic social ideal of the Progressives could best be accomplished. The "collective action aimed at the realization of the collective purpose" which the Progressives advocated for the nation's schools mirrored what was happening in the cities and factories at the beginning of the twentieth century since, as Spring noted, "both were becoming dependent upon a style of living that required cooperation and specialization."<sup>18</sup> Educators thus began

interpreting the phrase "meeting the need of the individual" to mean the development of special talents of the student so that he could fit into a specialized niche in society.

The American junior high school is an example of an educational innovation of the Progressive Movement which developed in response to the specialized needs of an industrial society. Violas pointed out that the insertion of the junior high between elementary and high schools allowed educators to provide adolescents with guidance and direction so that they might explore different vocational possibilities best suited to their capacities.<sup>19</sup> The careful guidance of the junior high school student was a key aspect in facilitating differentiation. Advisory or homeroom period emerged as a way of providing this guidance. Spring noted the implementation of this concept at a St. Louis, Missouri, school, organized in 1917. Seventh grade students, after 150 to 200 hours in advisory periods, made a career choice at the end of the year and, depending on their vocational choice, were programmed into three different courses of study during their eighth year.<sup>20</sup>

An interesting aspect of the development of the junior high school was the assumptions made by educators, reformers, and psychologists at the time about the nature of adolescence. Most believed that the interests, abilities, and aptitudes stabilized and became fixed during adolescence. It was further assumed by influential writers such as G. Stanley Hall and Jane Addams, that the energies and interests of adolescents must be harnessed and directed toward socially acceptable and productive ends. Addams, in particular, hoped the goodness and purity of youth could be "recaptured from the

shoddy commercialism of modern society . . . (and) tended 'into a lambent flame with power to make clean our dingy streets.'"<sup>21</sup>

The way educators and others hoped to rechannel the energies of adolescents was to provide personal character guidance through school activities. The perceived need to provide vocational guidance and proper socialization thus made up the complete educational program for the new industrial state.<sup>22</sup> Progressive educators were persuaded that differentiation could prepare the student for his or her future occupation and socialization could convey a sense of cooperation and common purpose. Early twentieth century reformers could hardly have devised a more suitable vehicle for achieving their goals than the junior high school.

By 1930, American public education looked much different than it had during the previous two centuries; Progressivism had made an impact.<sup>23</sup> Schooling had become compulsory and national in scope. The curriculum had been expanded to include utilitarian courses which would prepare the student to be a wage-earner and consumer in the industrial economy. The schools organized extracurricular activities, including student self-government, clubs, and music organizations, all of which were designed to promote desirable psychological traits and personal habits among the students. Schools had been given the task of cultivating in young people the skills, attitudes, and values the nation required, thus legitimizing the schools' political and economic power. Forty years later, John Kenneth Galbraith named this interaction of men, machines, ideas, and organization the "technostructure" by which the expansion of industry and the rise of corporations acquired new power.<sup>24</sup>

A primary force in accomplishing this was John Dewey's pragmatic educational philosophy, considered by some to have contributed significantly, if unintentionally, to these conservative nationalistic objectives. Edgar Gumbert and Joel Spring identified two of Dewey's curriculum movements as potentially progressive and liberating but which, as a result of their application, were actually very conservative.<sup>25</sup> The child-centered curriculum emphasized the needs of the individual, while the society-centered curriculum had the problems of democratic society as its organizing principle. When applied in the context of the technostucture, both concepts emerged as reactionary.<sup>26</sup> Spring further articulated an important qualitative difference between Dewey's original work and later misconceptions of it; specifically, his concern for social unity. Dewey had advocated the replacement of the mechanical atmosphere of the classroom with social activity so that social unity would be the result of social pressure of the group. Dewey, according to Spring, had never intended that the individual lose his personal identity to the group and become an "organization man who functioned well in the new corporate state because of 'social like-mindedness' and not because of social imagination."<sup>27</sup>

John Dewey had significant influence on the Progressive Movement and upon American society far beyond the time in which he wrote.<sup>28</sup>

Williams has described him as

. . . perhaps the most cheerfully eclectic thinker ever to be taken seriously as a philosopher (who) borrowed from Emersonian transcendentalism, evolutionary Darwinism, Marxian socialism, functionalism, and Christian Capitalism with a fine and even exciting disregard of logic and consequences.<sup>29</sup>

However one views his relativistic, pragmatic philosophy, it must be recognized that it provided "in its general impact, an encouragement for ameliorative adjustment to things-as-they-are."<sup>30</sup> Leaving things as they are, a hallmark of early twentieth century Progressivism, meant leaving them to the corporation.

### Progressivism in Historical Perspective

Progressivism had a far-reaching impact on the political, economic, and social life of the United States. Williams maintained, in fact, that its influence continued through Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal into the present time.<sup>31</sup> To appreciate the influence Progressives had on society in general and education in particular, one must keep in mind their position in American history. In an analysis of the Progressive Movement, Walter Feinberg countered criticism of it by saying its critics often ignore

. . . the obvious inclination that many Progressives had toward bettering the lot of the poor, just as they also fail to evaluate progressive theory and practice in light of the real practical problems that existed at that time.<sup>32</sup>

Accordingly, their actions and philosophy ought to be judged in view of the dominant forces in early twentieth century America. Rather than being seen as malicious or too willing to compromise, Feinberg maintained that concessions to the corporate system were necessary for the success of the Progressives' general educational goals. He described as unfair the criticism that Progressivism accepted too readily technological solutions to educational problems. In addition to the Progressives, most reformers of the time believed that "technology (had) the possibility of eradicating hunger, curing

disease, and making the goods of life sufficiently plentiful as to eventually end war."<sup>33</sup>

A further criticism of Progressive reforms is that they were concerned with nothing more than socialization into the industrial system. In defense of Progressives, Feinberg questioned the assumed distinction between socializing and educating an individual. He maintained that the distinction is not important for a society intent on teaching "youngsters those insights . . . (it had) developed over a long period of time and which have proved successful in aiding its interaction with its surroundings."<sup>34</sup> In other words, the Progressives' socialization was a legitimate preparation for life.

When Frederick Jackson Turner's generation of historians rejected the idea that American history was a development of European influences, they replaced it with the notion that the American experience was distinctly unique, the result of particular forces at work in society. This chapter has attempted to explain how the Progressive era illustrates educational reform in response to political, economic and social forces in much the same way as House Bill 1706.

Turner argued that the frontier was the major factor in the country's growth and development, accounting for its distinctive democratic character. His generation looked on his thesis as a way of showing that, even though there were no physical frontiers left in the United States by 1890, there was certainly an unlimited number of opportunities for forward progress within developing institutions.<sup>35</sup> Public schools were an ideal institution which could be expected to continue what the westward expansion had begun, as Feinberg succinctly explained:

Just as the frontier had been pictured as taming people of different nationalities, forming out of them a similar character, now the school was to do the same thing. And just as it was believed the frontier had provided the nation with an escape valve whereby the discontented could move out to break new ground, now the school was to provide another kind of escape valve whereby the talented discontented could move up.<sup>36</sup>



## END NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The historiography of the American West and the frontier hypothesis is rich and varied and has consumed the best efforts of many notable historians. At the risk of over-simplifying this complex and critical area of historical research, the reader is referred to the following for further reading: Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," in The Frontier in American History (New York: H. Holt and Co., 1920); Walter Prescott Webb, The Great Frontier (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1952); Richard Hofstadter, The Progressive Historians, Turner, Beard, Parrington (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968); and Ray Allen Billington and Martin Ridge, Westward Expansion, A History of the American Frontier, Fifth Edition (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1982).

<sup>2</sup>William Appleman Williams, The Contours of American History (Chicago: Quadrangle Paperbacks, 1966), p. 377.

<sup>3</sup>Clarence J. Karier, ed., Shaping the American Educational State (New York: The Free Press, 1975), p.2.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>5</sup>Katz, Irony of Reform, p. 1.

<sup>6</sup>Karier, Shaping the Educational State, p. 4.

<sup>7</sup>Violas, Training the Working Class, pp. 1-10.

<sup>8</sup>Joel H. Spring, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), p. 6.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 19-20.

<sup>10</sup>David B. Tyack, Turning Points in American Educational History (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1967), p. 318. See also, Paul C. Violas, "Jane Addams and the New Liberation" in Roots of Crisis (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973), pp. 66-83.

<sup>11</sup>Herbert Croly, The Promise of American Life. Edited by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 22.

<sup>12</sup>Spring, Corporate State, p. 18.

<sup>13</sup>Williams, Contours, p. 390, pp. 406-407.

- <sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 391.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid., pp. 393-394.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., pp. 395-396.
- <sup>17</sup> Gabriel Kolko, The Triumph of Conservatism, A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916 (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), pp. 217-279.
- <sup>18</sup> Spring, Corporate State, p. 19.
- <sup>19</sup> Violas, Training the Working Class, pp. 159-160.
- <sup>20</sup> Spring, Corporate State, p. 99.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 102.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 105.
- <sup>23</sup> Violas, Training the Working Class, p. 229.
- <sup>24</sup> John Kenneth Galbraith, The New Industrial State, Second Edition (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1971), p. 95.
- <sup>25</sup> Edgar B. Gumbert and Joel H. Spring, The Superschool and the Superstate: American Education in the Twentieth Century (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1974), p. 75.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>27</sup> Spring, Corporate State, pp. 60-61.
- <sup>28</sup> Williams, Contours, p. 402.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 405.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid., pp. 390-391.
- <sup>32</sup> Feinberg, Reason and Rhetoric, p. 250.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 252.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 170.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 172.

## CHAPTER III

### HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION

The certification of teachers in Oklahoma's schools is the major focus of House Bill 1706. One might view it as a comprehensive, wide-ranging law designed to legislate all aspects of the certification process, from initial entry into teacher education programs to continued certification as a classroom teacher. In addition to competency examinations and entry year requirements for new teachers, House Bill 1706 contains a minimum salary schedule, an expansion of responsibilities of the Professional Standards Board, revised requirements for admission into teacher education programs and staff development of teacher education faculty, and guidelines for staff development at the district level.

To better understand this law as representative of revisions of the legal requirements concerning teacher certification, this chapter provides a brief history of the licensing and certification process in the United States and in Oklahoma in particular. An historical perspective of certification is important to the study at hand because the purpose and nature of teacher certification have varied in American educational history. As the concept of teacher preparation and education developed, so did the notion of certification of teachers.<sup>1</sup> A significant question to be addressed, then, is how have the education community and those given authority to control it arrived at

their present understanding and definition of teacher certification? Does House Bill 1706 represent less a sweeping revolution in the purpose and manner in which civil authorities certify teachers than it does a reaffirmation of earlier ideas about the conservative nature of teaching and learning? By considering the historical beginnings and evolution of teacher certification, one finds that the most recent developments around the nation and in Oklahoma take on greater significance within the history of educational reform.

### Purpose of Teacher Certification

Although the concept of certification of school personnel has evolved gradually in American educational history, most current definitions of certification include some reference to the legal requirements necessary to gain entrance to the teaching profession. Lucien Kinney described certification as "a process of legal sanction, authorizing the holder of a credential to perform specific services in the public schools of the state."<sup>2</sup> More recently and in less subtle terms, the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers in 1976 saw certification as a "mechanism for legitimizing teaching as a profession."<sup>3</sup>

The reasons for granting an individual the legal authority to teach have likewise varied and reflected larger cultural and economic forces throughout American history. At the present time, however, many would cite a double purpose of teacher licensure or certification. According to Martin Haberman and T. M. Stinnett, for example,

the public must be safeguarded against the unqualified, the charlatan, and the quack. There must be a guarantee of high quality service to the public; otherwise the

public taxes or fee payments will be wasted. Moreover, the practitioner himself, who has spent years of his life preparing for competent service in a given profession, requires protection against the unqualified.<sup>4</sup>

The history of teacher certification, from Colonial times to the present and from state to state, has been one of confusing, complex, and at times completely arbitrary regulation, practices, and standards. A shift in the source of control over certification, however, is a major characteristic common to all the states and their individual attempts to license and certify teachers. Because of this and other common experiences and despite the many differences between the states, it is possible to consider the history of certification as having developed within five chronological periods: the Colonial period of local autonomy to 1789; the period of county control from 1860 to 1869; the period of transition from 1860 to 1910; the state centralization period from 1910 to 1970; and recent revisions within the last decade. Within this framework one can investigate the origins of certification practices and the factors which were influential in their development.

#### Local Autonomy of Teacher Licensure in Colonial America

Because of the varying selectivity procedures of Colonial towns and the religious and political restrictions they placed on teacher applicants, it should be evident that no official certification existed during the Colonial period; it was, instead, a kind of local approval in which teachers were certified in effect by being hired. Kinney has called the Colonial period one of local autonomy, in part

the result of difficulties of travel and communication, the scarcity of applicants, and the importance of religious and moral conformity.<sup>5</sup> The capacity to govern (that is, to discipline) a school, moral character, loyal principles, and, to a lesser degree, academic attainments were the major requirements of Colonial teachers.

The religious influence in the Colonial period on the selection of local teachers began as early as 1664, when New Amsterdam required a license for teachers to "guard against the employment of religious dissenters."<sup>6</sup> Teachers in predominately Anglican colonies, such as New York, were given licenses through the authority of the Bishop of London. Presbyterian New England colonies gave this authority to the "Christian magistracy" who were more concerned with "the candidates' moral character and religious orthodoxy rather than his intellectual or educational preparation."<sup>7</sup>

Religious leaders influenced the civil authorities' selection not so much as a matter of right as through unofficial recognition of their power. Throughout the Colonial period the authority for hiring and thereby licensing teachers remained with the selectmen or school committees of the various towns. This policy set a precedent for later establishing the state as the agency responsible for teacher licensing and certification.

County Control of Teacher Certification,  
1789-1860

During the first years of the early National period, the personal judgment of local authorities continued to be the primary means by which teachers were granted or denied licenses. The basis for

certification in most districts was some type of oral examination in which the school committee satisfied themselves as to each applicant's competence and character. Oral examination did not guarantee, however, that a district's teachers were not "incompetent, intemperate, and immoral."<sup>8</sup> John Swett, the first state superintendent of schools in California, complained in 1876 that the examinations were ineffective, since nearly everyone who applied for an examination was issued a certificate.<sup>9</sup>

In 1825, change began to appear in the certification of teachers as the responsibility for certification moved from the local to the county level. The Ohio Court of Common Pleas was directed that year to appoint three examiners of common schools in each county whose job it would be to examine and certify teachers.<sup>10</sup> New York, in 1841, and Vermont, in 1845, established county superintendents with the authority to grant certificates. There was a clear movement during the first half of the nineteenth century away from local and toward county and eventually state responsibility for teacher certification.

#### Period of Transition in Teacher Certification,

1860-1910

The growth of normal schools, a rapid increase in the public school enrollment, and an increase in the power of state boards of education in the years from 1860 to 1910 coincided with a number of developments in teacher certification. By 1910, those developments included a gradual change in authority from the local to the state level, a movement toward state-prepared written examinations, the beginning of a shift in the primary basis for certification from

examinations to meeting certain degree and course requirements, and the appearance of differentiated or specialized certificates.<sup>11</sup>

Examination as a method of certification had, by the turn of the century, become a way of maintaining a large enough body of certified teachers to meet the needs of the public schools. As state centralization increased, however, a growing emphasis was placed on college or normal school preparation. Public normal schools were under the jurisdiction of state departments of education and state legislatures so that specific degree programs frequently developed into requirements for state certification. As early as 1849, New York recognized state normal school diplomas as teaching certificates. California did the same in 1863. College and normal school graduates were exempt from examinations and thereby eligible for some type of certification in a majority of the states by 1900. This change did not mean the end of scattered, non-standard certification among the states; by 1900 there remained 3,000 different teacher licensing agencies.<sup>12</sup> The trend toward the use of institutional credits as a basis for certification reflected the belief by many within the educational community that new functions and demands on the school required broader preparation of the teacher than an examination provided.

#### Centralization of State Control Over Teacher Certification, 1910-1970

The centralization of state control over teacher certification became firmly established after 1910. In exercising this centralized power, the states slowly abandoned the examination system and replaced it with the course credit system and the approved program approach.



Legislatures and state Boards of Education assigned responsibility for certification standards to a state licensing agency under the former and to teacher education programs at colleges and universities under the latter.<sup>13</sup>

A series of laws and regulations by legislatures and administrative bodies illustrate how the states initiated narrower, more specific certification requirements. After World War I, a National Education Association report showed that 100,000 of 600,000 teachers had less than two years' education beyond eighth grade. By 1921, 14 states had passed legislation that required high school graduation as a prerequisite for any certificate. By 1931, the certification process was chaotically diverse within the United States: more than half the states required high school graduation; several states required one year of professional work beyond high school; and 12 states required four years of college preparation for secondary certification.<sup>14</sup>

Different types of certificates were issued at this time on the basis of college credits in professional courses and by 1937, only 20 states continued to use examinations as a means of achieving certification. The examination system was most often used in certifying elementary teachers, while the academic training requirements of one or more years of college were reserved for secondary certification. A teacher shortage during World War II resulted in the issuing of large numbers of emergency certificates of questionable quality; at its height, 140,000 teachers received certificates this way.<sup>15</sup>

By the 1950s and 1960s, the individual states and their state departments of education had become more sophisticated in their operation of the certification process, but nothing resembling uniformity

among the states was evident. In 1959, 40 states required four years of college preparation for elementary teachers compared to 48 states with the same requirement for secondary teachers. Diversity existed, however, as to general education, professional education, and subject-matter specialization among those states. At that same time, 13 states also continued to use examinations as an additional prerequisite for certification. Emergency certificates were still common and varied greatly, with some requiring no college work while others specified one or more years of college preparation.<sup>16</sup>

#### Trend Toward Performance-Based Approaches to Teacher Certification, 1970 to the Present

In 1976, the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers found some evidence of common requirements for certification. They included a bachelor's degree and specific citizenship, health, age, and moral requirements. As the certification process shifted from state department transcript analysis to the approved program approach and eventually to a performance-based approach, diversity within teacher education programs and degrees became more obvious.<sup>17</sup> Along with the variation in degree programs, the last decade saw the certification of teacher education programs by state, regional, and national associations.

Accreditation associations have taken on greater influence at the higher education level since the National Commission on Accrediting was formed in 1949 with the National Council for Accrediting of Teacher Education receiving provisional recognition as the official accrediting agency for teacher education in 1956.<sup>18</sup> Since that time,

the accreditation of teacher education programs and the teacher certification process have become closely interwoven despite their differing purposes. State, regional, and national accreditation associations have as their stated purposes the assurance of quality programs for the preparation of teacher candidates within colleges and universities. Licensing, on the other hand, involves guaranteeing minimum standards for individual candidates. Accrediting and licensing have at times become confused and controversial because accredited institutions automatically issue licenses to teach to their graduates who, in turn, become duly certified teachers.<sup>19</sup>

#### Performance-Based Teacher Education and Certification

As mentioned above, growing interest in Performance-Based Teacher Education was accompanied by a call for Performance-Based Certification and has become the dominant trend in teacher certification within the last decade. House Bill 1706 may be considered an example of legislation requiring Competency-Based Certification. A brief description of the origins and characteristics of Performance-Based Teacher Education and Certification is provided here to complete this overview of certification standards and practices in the United States during the last 300 years.

Performance-Based Teacher Education is a concept which Haberman and Stinnett have called the "most notable recent development in the preparation of teachers."<sup>20</sup> Convinced that the movement promises the regeneration of teacher education, its followers have encouraged the use of new materials, new behaviors, and new certification criteria.<sup>21</sup>

It has caught the imagination of educators and promised radical changes as few movements before it have done.<sup>22</sup> Herbert Kliebard noted, however, that Performance-Based Teacher Education advocates follow "the same path that (Joseph Mayer) Rice trod some eighty years ago, one that is by now well worn" but which is now "(a)ttired in new rhetorical finery. . . ."<sup>23</sup>

A precise definition of Performance-Based or Competency-Based Teacher Education is difficult because no two people define it the same way. Alan R. Tom has analyzed a definition developed by an educator sympathetic to PBTE and considered its viability against the ideas of its critics as well as advocates. In this way he has arrived at a definition of PBTE as "a teacher training program in which the candidate acquires, to a prespecified degree, teacher performances (observable behaviors) which are demonstrably linked to student achievement."<sup>24</sup> With this definition, Tom specifies that PBTE cannot have both a strict and a loose definition of teacher performance; performance and competence cannot be defined as both "observable behaviors, verbal and nonverbal" and "meanings selected on the basis of logic and tradition."<sup>25</sup> Performance or competence thus consists of empirically testable, observable teacher behaviors.

Performance-Based Teacher Certification is derived from a similar conception of evidence verifying an individual's ability to perform as a teacher. Proponents of Performance-Based Teacher Education believe that teacher certification practices should rely on demonstrated, observable behaviors. An example of the guidelines Performance-Based Certification might include is provided by Florida's State Teacher

Education Advisory Council, which has adopted for use the following criteria:

1. Cite the types of child behavior to be fostered by school personnel.
2. Describe the competencies needed by teachers to provide the desired services.
3. Describe experiences needed to develop desired teacher competencies.
4. Present criteria for selecting candidates for the teacher program.
5. Include a follow-up to determine the effectiveness of the program.
6. Be applicable to both pre-service and in-service education programs.<sup>26</sup>

As indicated above, the roots of the PBTE movement reach beyond recent interest in its implementation. The assumptions on which it is based can be found in the behaviorist psychology of Thorndike and Skinner. PBTE is behaviorist because it assumes that teaching and learning have a stimulus-response association and that teacher training should operate accordingly. Advocates of PBTE believe, as Charters and Rice did much earlier, that certain teacher performances have strong causal links to student achievement. They are anxious to cut through "the logjam in the sea of opinions that surround the performance of teachers and identify scientifically demonstrated behaviors that define good or at least competent teaching."<sup>27</sup>

Other issues have more recently influenced the movement toward performance and competence in teacher education. Two of these are the growing taxpayer dissatisfaction with public education and a desire by higher education to demonstrate its efficacy. The criticism that education was not narrowing the wide equality gaps, presented in the

Coleman Report of 1966, has been cited as contributing to the growing interest in PBTE as a conscious effort to justify teacher education programs.<sup>28</sup> Management by objectives or the systems approach also became common in education in order to plan, design, and operate a more efficient, product-oriented teacher education program. In addition, the federal government, through the Office of Education, spent over \$12 million on exploratory and experimental projects between 1967 and 1973. Federal funds supported Teacher Corps and regional consortium projects and helped stimulate development at the state level.<sup>29</sup>

Advocates of PBTE cite these and other roots of the movement. Writing for the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Allen Schmieder found the origins of PBTE synonymous with the reasons why it should be embraced by teacher education. They include continual and conscientious introspection of the education community; press for accountability; increased focusing of political action on fiscal issues; management organization movement; press for personalization/individualization of education; desire of state education departments to develop more effective certification processes and standards; investment of federal funds in development efforts; "readiness" of educational research and development; and an increase in alternative educational systems and resulting need for dependable measures of comparison."<sup>30</sup> In a similarly revealing position paper on Performance-Based Teacher Certification, K. Fred Daniel states that this type of certification is needed simply because "it makes sense, . . . the public will demand it, . . . (and) it will strengthen the profession of teaching."<sup>31</sup>

Adoption of Performance-Based Teacher Certification Within the United States

Florida, Georgia, and Nevada serve as particular examples of those states which have adopted Performance- or Competency-Based Certification. Florida is often cited as one of the earliest states to take legislative action regarding competency tests and internship requirements for certification. In 1978, the Florida Legislature passed State Bill 549, which called for an entry examination for students enrolling in teacher education programs, a comprehensive written examination after completing degree requirements and prior to certification, and a one-year internship of successful teaching prior to certification. The Florida law included other requirements, all of which focused on the implication that colleges of education were not meeting the needs of the prospective classroom teachers.

Florida's certification requirements have been the model for similar activity in other states. The Georgia version of the Performance-Based Certification requires the successful completion of a criterion-referenced test on the content of the certification field and graduation from an approved teacher education program. A third requirement for renewable certification is the satisfactory demonstration over a three-year period of 14 performance competencies in two consecutive assessments: one in the fall and one in the following spring. Three observers--a peer teacher, a school administrator, and a state employee--rate the new teacher according to

(f)ifteen performance indicators defining five competencies. . . . Each competency is defined by two to five performance indicators that are rated on a

five-point scale. The scale points have been defined by one-sentence descriptors to reduce ambiguity and increase interrater agreement.<sup>34</sup>

One of the most recent entrants in Performance-Based Certification is Nevada. Following the establishing of a statewide pupil competency examination, it was proposed within the Nevada Assembly that some type of fifth year internship program would encourage educators to improve their profession or face competency examinations. A legislative committee suggested the formation of a Professional Standards Commission whose job would be to monitor teacher education, certification, and in-service instruction, thereby controlling the quality of education in Nevada public schools. Assembly Bill 848 was approved in 1979 which also provided for an experimental internship program. The fifth-year internship program in Nevada, as well as the testing requirements in Georgia and Florida, reflect the national trend toward Performance- or Competency-Based Teacher Certification and a model of teaching as a profession and away from an academic model of teacher education.<sup>35</sup>

By October, 1981, it was estimated that 33 states had taken some kind of action relating to performance or competency for teacher education programs, teacher certification, or both. At that time, J. T. Sandefur prepared a report for the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Task Force on Competency Assessment in Teacher Education. In it he indicated that the Performance-Based movement "is sweeping the states with impressive speed," the supporters of which have "been able to convince legislatures and state departments of education to spend millions of dollars in various assessment schemes. . . ." <sup>36</sup> Among the 33 states which have taken some action relative to



competency assessment, he found that:

1. Twenty of these states have introduced legislation to accomplish the assessment. Of those states, 12 passed legislation, legislation is still pending in two, and eight failed to pass the legislation.
2. In 12 states the department of education or the state board of education mandated, or directed in some way, the competency assessment of teachers. Action is pending in one state or under discussion in five others.
3. Twelve states have required testing for admission and 17 have testing required for certification. Eight states require testing both for admission and certification.
4. Eighteen states require testing in basic skill areas, usually English and mathematics. Twelve require testing in professional skill and ten require testing in academic areas.
5. Six states require performance assessment on the job, usually during the probationary period of one or more years.<sup>37</sup>

#### Historical Development of Teacher Certification in Oklahoma

Oklahoma's experience with the regulation of teacher certification has been similar to that of other states. Beginning with territorial days and continuing through statehood in 1907, control over certification remained with civil authorities in the form of Territorial and State Superintendents of Public Instruction, county and city superintendents, normal schools, and Territorial and State Boards of Education.<sup>38</sup> Despite the legislature's adoption of the approved-program approach in 1911 as one means of certification, certificates continued to be issued by a wide variety of authorities and at different levels within the state.<sup>39</sup> The system may be considered to have been only

slightly less fragmented than that of Colonial America if one considers that by 1918, 77 counties and 197 independent school districts in Oklahoma were issuing four grades of certificates with varying standards for certification. The Oklahoma Legislature centralized the certification process in 1919 by giving the State Board of Education the authority to certify teachers.<sup>41</sup>

A series of councils and commissions operated over the next 60 years for the purpose of improving the quality of teachers certified by the state. In 1947, the State Board created the Oklahoma Commission on Teacher Education and Certification in response to several perceived educational problems. These included the quantity and quality of preparation of large numbers of Oklahoma teachers holding substandard certificates, an oversupply of high school teachers, a shortage of elementary teachers, professionalism among educators, scarcity of in-service education, discontinuance of permanent teaching certificates, and improvement in teacher education.<sup>42</sup>

The Commission was made up of representatives of higher education, the State Board of Education, the State Regents, the State Department of Education, the Oklahoma Education Association, the Oklahoma Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Oklahoma State School Boards Association.<sup>43</sup> In 1953, they recommended certification on the basis of the completion of a program approved by the State Board of Education rather than the completion of specific courses alone. In 1969, the Oklahoma Legislature created the Professional Standards Board, composed of 27 members from similar groups across the state. As with earlier commissions, the Professional Standards Board was to provide leadership for the improvement of teacher education programs

and certification standards through recommendations to the State Board of Education.<sup>44</sup>

Although the State Board of Education has gradually simplified the certification process, the number and kinds of certificates have remained high. By 1980, the State Board of Education continued to issue four classes of certificates (Professional, Standard, Provisional, and Temporary) and five kinds of school-service certificates (elementary, elementary-secondary, secondary, professional-school service personnel, and special) on the basis of completion of approved programs in teacher education.<sup>45</sup>

The Oklahoma Legislature made extensive revisions in the state's certification process when it passed House Bill 1706. It took a firm position in support of a competency-based approach when, among other things, it mandated testing for licensure and entry-year approval certification. Oklahoma has followed some states and served as a model for others in the trend toward this type of teacher certification.

This chapter has attempted to provide an overview of the historical development of certification on a national basis. In summary, it might be noted that the authority to teach school has evolved over the past 300 years into a complex credentialing process. Local control over the system has shifted to authority being given to state agencies, typically state departments of education. The authority and consequently the power of these bureaucratic agencies has grown as a result. As this chapter has indicated, certification requirements have had a variety of cultural, economic, and political influences--religious conformity, a growing population, and subject matter expertise being just a few. Chapter IV, in the form of a chronological

narrative of the drafting and passing of House Bill 1706, addresses one of the most recent examples of the credentialing process in American education. It also was shaped in response to significant influences present at that time.

## END NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The history of teacher education may be viewed as corresponding directly to the history of teacher certification; certainly they are closely interrelated. Since this study is concerned primarily with a law which focused on certification and not preparation of Oklahoma teachers, this chapter deals with an historical summary of the former. The reader is referred to the following for an historical analysis of teacher education and preparation: Martin Haberman and T. M. Stinnett, Teacher Education and the New Profession of Teaching (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1973); M. L. Cushman, The Governance of Teacher Education (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1977); and Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson, "A History of the Professional Development of Teachers" in The 1980 Report on Educational Personnel Development, ed. C. Emily Feistritzer (Washington, D.C.: Feistritzer Publications, 1980).

<sup>2</sup>Lucien B. Kinney, Certification in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 3.

<sup>3</sup>Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, Teacher Education in the United States: the Responsibility Gap (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1976), p. 101.

<sup>4</sup>Haberman and Stinnett, Teacher Education, p. 17.

<sup>5</sup>Kinney, p. 37.

<sup>6</sup>Walter K. Beggs, The Education of Teachers (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965), pp. 44-45.

<sup>7</sup>Anthony C. LaBue, "Teacher Certification in the United States: A Brief History." The Journal of Teacher Education, XI-2, June, 1960, p. 148.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 150.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Study Commission, Teacher Education, p. 102.

<sup>11</sup>LaBue, "Teacher Certification," p. 153.

<sup>12</sup>Haberman and Stinnett, Teacher Education, p. 18.

<sup>13</sup>Robert N. Bush and Peter Enemark, "Control and Responsibility in Teacher Education" in Kevin Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education, the

Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part II) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), p. 282.

<sup>14</sup>LaBue, "Teacher Certification," pp. 159-160.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 162.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., pp. 164-166.

<sup>17</sup>Study Commission, Teacher Education, p. 103.

<sup>18</sup>Beggs, Education of Teachers, p. 60.

<sup>19</sup>Although the above discussion recognizes the close connection between certification and accreditation, this study focuses on teacher certification, and the reader is encouraged to refer to the following for a fuller treatment of accreditation's impact on education in general: Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1977).

<sup>20</sup>Haberman and Stinnett, Teacher Education, p. 93.

<sup>21</sup>Gene E. Hall and Robert W. Houston, "Competency-Based Teacher Education: Where is it Now?" New York University Education Quarterly, Summer, 1981, p. 20.

<sup>22</sup>Herbert M. Kliebard, "The Question in Teacher Education" in Donald J. McCarty and Associates (Eds.), New Perspectives on Teacher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973), p. 15.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>24</sup>Alan R. Tom, "Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education." The Educational Forum, November, 1977, p. 78.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., pp. 79-80.

<sup>26</sup>K. Fred Daniel, "Performance-Based Teacher Certification: What is it and why do we need it?" in Joel L. Burdin and Margaret T. Reagan (eds.), Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel (Washington, D.C.: Eric Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators, 1971), p. 8.

<sup>27</sup>Kliebard, "The Question," p. 15.

<sup>28</sup>A. Jon Magoon, "Teaching and Performance-Based Teacher Education" in Donald E. Lomax (Ed.), European Perspectives in Teacher Education (London: John Wiley and Sons, 1976), p. 239.

<sup>29</sup>Stanley Elam, "Performance-Based Teacher Education: What is the State of the Art?" (Washington, D.C.: American Association of

Colleges of Teacher Education, 1971), p. 3 and Bush and Enemark, "Control and Responsibility," p. 284.

<sup>30</sup>Allen A. Schmieder, "Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene" (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, the Eric Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, and the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, 1973), pp. 3-4.

<sup>31</sup>Daniel, "Performance-Based Teacher Certification," p. 6.

<sup>32</sup>Andrew A. Robinson and David Mosrie, "Florida's New Teacher Certification Law," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1979, p. 263.

<sup>33</sup>Chad D. Ellett, William Capie, and Charles E. Johnson, "Assessing Teacher Performance," Educational Leadership, December, 1980, p. 219.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid.

<sup>35</sup>Richard C. Kunkel and Evalyn Titus Dearmin, "The Political and Ideological Development of a Fifth Year Statewide Internship," Journal of Teacher Education, January-February, 1981, pp. 19-21.

<sup>36</sup>J. T. Sandefur, "Competency Assessment in Teacher Education: A Compilation of State Activity," a report prepared for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education's Task Force on Competency Assessment in Teacher Education, October, 1981, p. 1.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>38</sup>79 Oklahoma Statutes, 1890 § 1120; 74 Oklahoma Statutes, 1908 § 1359.

<sup>39</sup>John M. Folks, "An Analysis of Opinions of House Bill 1706 As Perceived by Certain Selected School-Related Groups." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1982, p. 50.

<sup>40</sup>Alta G. Watson, "A Study of the Historical Development of Teacher Certification in Oklahoma." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1974, p. 88.

<sup>41</sup>34 Oklahoma Statutes, 1931 § 7007.

<sup>42</sup>Guy A. Curry, Jr., "An Analysis of the Program of the Oklahoma Commission on Teacher Education and Certification." Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1950, p. 6.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., pp. 6-15.

<sup>44</sup>70 Oklahoma Statutes, 1971 § 6-125.

<sup>45</sup>Folks, "An Analysis of Opinions," p. 50.

CHAPTER IV  
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND SUMMARY OF  
HOUSE BILL 1706

On January 14, 1980, Oklahoma House Speaker Dan Draper and Senate President Pro Tempore Gene Howard ceremoniously announced their general legislative package for the upcoming session. Included as a key measure was a proposed increase in teachers' salaries and a major change in the requirements for teacher certification in Oklahoma. Citing "quality" and "compensation" as the major aspects of the plan, Speaker Draper explained that "Oklahoma is going to demand the best from our teachers and we are going to compensate them accordingly."<sup>1</sup>

The proposal, which was submitted to the Legislature as House Bill 1706, called for a new teacher salary schedule that would give Oklahoma's 36,000 teachers an average increase of \$1,600. Such an increase would bring their salaries to the regional average estimated by the National Education Association to be \$13,890. In 1979-1980, Oklahoma ranked seventh, ahead of Arkansas, in an eight state region with an average salary of \$13,210. The proposed minimum salary schedule would give beginning teachers \$9,975 a year while teachers with 15 years' experience and a doctoral degree would be guaranteed a minimum yearly salary of \$16,675.<sup>2</sup>

The raises were estimated to cost the state \$60 million, \$19 million more than the amount budgeted that year for teacher salary



increases by Governor George Nigh. His proposed increase of \$1,045 would cost \$41 million. When House Bill 1706 was announced, therefore, there was some speculation concerning whether it would be chosen over the governor's plan, and if so, how it would be funded. The Tulsa World went so far as to describe the proposal as setting the "stage for (a) school fight with Nigh."<sup>3</sup>

Interest was high within the education community and among the general public in view of the publicity given the salary issue. The idea of tying the increases to the "toughest professional standards in history on Oklahoma school teachers" had even greater appeal to the taxpayers and parents of school children.<sup>4</sup> Within the proposed law were outlined changes in the certification process submitted by the Joint House-Senate Education Committee.<sup>5</sup> Those certification changes, as noted earlier, revolved around alterations in teacher education programs, subject matter competency examinations, a one-year internship, and staff development requirements.

This chapter addresses the chronological development of House Bill 1706 from its inception to its successful approval by the Oklahoma Legislature and the Governor in June, 1980, and summarizes its major aspects. Like all legislation, it passed through a series of mostly political stages in its development. The purpose of this chapter is to set out those stages in brief narrative form so that the reader may be aware of the events involved in proposing, drafting, and passing House Bill 1706. A variety of historical data were used in an attempt to provide an accurate view of what occurred. Some of those include the records of the Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee, testimony given at a series of open hearings across

the state, personal correspondence among key participants, publications of particular interest groups, newspaper coverage of the issue, and personal interviews with those individuals involved.<sup>6</sup> An analysis of these events follows in Chapter V.

### Legislative Interest in the Need for Educational Changes

Long before Speaker Draper and President Pro Tempore Howard announced their legislative program for the 1980 session, the process which culminated in House Bill 1706 had begun. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly how or when the legislation began; there are conflicting opinions about where the idea for it originated. Depending on where one looks, the source may be the State Department of Education, the Oklahoma Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, or the Cooperative Council for Oklahoma School Administrators, to name only three. Evidence suggests each of these and several other groups had significant influence on the Bill. More important, however, is the fact that, given the constitutional responsibility for public education and the political realities of the issue, the State Legislature was the primary agency whose actions ultimately resulted in the changing of teacher certification in Oklahoma.<sup>7</sup> More than anything else, their actions illustrate the political nature of House Bill 1706 and public education in general.

Beginning in the late 1970s, public interest in teacher education and certification grew, along with recurrent concern over what was happening in the nation's schools. Articles in popular magazines such as Atlantic Monthly, Time, and Texas Monthly brought to the forefront

some of the problems confronting educators today as well as some of their more obvious failures in solving those problems.<sup>8</sup> Student achievement was connected with teacher quality and teacher preparation and, accurate or not, it was a perceived reality for many people and of obvious consequence for the educational and legislative communities.

When the Oklahoma Legislature met early in 1979, the leadership of the House of Representatives, new that session, gave careful consideration to the question of educational quality in the state.<sup>9</sup> Two issues surfaced as central problems which the legislative leaders felt should be addressed: school finance and teacher certification. Preliminary meetings of the House Committee on Common Education that spring revealed particular concern that there were grave inequalities in funding among Oklahoma's 621 school districts and that public confidence in teacher competence was in serious decline.<sup>10</sup> No legislation was immediately proposed; it was determined instead that a Joint House-Senate Education Committee should undertake an investigation of the problems, gather information concerning possible solutions, and draft appropriate legislation for the 1980 session.

The House leadership made it clear that, while raising teachers' salaries in Oklahoma to the regional average should be a primary goal, the Education Committee should also propose some type of justification for the salary increases.<sup>11</sup> Changes in certification requirements were suggested as providing suitable justification and it remained for the committee to develop legislation, whether in one bill or several, which would accomplish both.

Interim Session, Joint House-Senate  
Education Committee

Chairing the Joint House-Senate Education Committee was Representative Jim Fried, with Senator Rodger Randle as vice-chair. They formed two ad hoc committees that summer which were charged with generating ideas on school funding and certification standards. The committee on school finance, chaired by Professor Jack Parker from the College of Education at the University of Oklahoma, included many public school administrators from around the state. Professor Glen Snider, also from the education faculty at the University of Oklahoma, headed the second committee composed of a wide cross-section of the education community within the state.<sup>12</sup>

After these sub-committees were formed, the House-Senate Committee outlined plans to hold a series of 10 public hearings throughout the state during the interim session. In cooperation with the State Parent-Teachers Association, the Committee set up specific meetings with the news media and local educators in addition to the evening hearings open to the general public designed "to allow parents of school-age children the opportunity to voice their concerns about their public school."<sup>13</sup> Where possible, the meetings were to be held on the campus of a state university, "in order that the committee might see first hand the various teacher education programs offered throughout the state."<sup>14</sup>

The House-Senate Committee elaborated in their advance publicity on the issues they planned to consider during the hearings. A funding system "which allows one district to spend approximately \$5,000 per

child while another spends less than \$800 per pupil" was one of those.<sup>15</sup> Teachers' salaries and the possibilities of raising them to the regional average were connected to the finance question and the Committee identified them both as critical goals. A further objective to be accomplished during the interim meetings was to consider "statistics which seem to indicate that we are presently not attracting the type of students that we want into our teacher education programs."<sup>16</sup> Some of the statistics released when the hearings were announced included ACT Composite Standard Scores and Grade Point Averages after the first semester in college for selected college freshmen identified by academic field or discipline. The information appeared to show lower scores and grade point averages for those students who identified education as their college major. Further data released at that time showed the average salaries of classroom teachers in public schools across the nation for 1978-1979. Oklahoma ranked 42nd in the nation and next to the bottom regionally.<sup>17</sup> In publicizing the hearings, the House-Senate Committee made clear their intent to "challenge Oklahoma's citizens, as well as the state's educators, to confront and correct some of the most pressing education problems. . . . Our goal is to have specific pieces of legislation for introduction in early 1980."<sup>18</sup>

During the summer of 1979, the legislative research staff made extensive plans for the Committee hearings and gathered additional information the Committee had requested. The staff conducted statute searches of other states regarding school funding and teacher certification as part of their normal procedure in preparing background information for proposed legislation. Of particular interest to the Committee were practices in Florida, Georgia, and Colorado. Each had

ideas and specific features which addressed the issues under study in Oklahoma and they were relied on as examples.<sup>19</sup>

Other sources of information for the Education Committee were the National Council of State Legislatures and the Education Commission of the States. During the interim session, legislative researchers also conducted a survey of colleges of education across the state in an attempt to determine the kind of relationship that existed between higher education and public schools in Oklahoma. The staff also compiled a list of key educators around the state who might be called on to provide input and support for any proposed education legislation.<sup>20</sup> Legislators from each House and Senate district in Oklahoma were asked to submit the names of such people. The Committee then contacted those individuals to set up communication between the education and legislative communities, disseminating information, gathering opinions, and determining what would or would not have the educators' support. The preliminary research done by the legislative staff helped make it possible for the Committee to initiate and successfully pass the legislation. It gave them the names of individuals who could be called on to testify at the upcoming hearings and it prepared them for what they would hear there.<sup>21</sup> As a result of these efforts, the Legislature began to formulate possible solutions to a general question posed by one House leader: "How do we raise needed funds and raise quality standards in times of (public criticism of education and) reluctance of education to place higher standards on themselves? . . . How do we really improve education?"<sup>22</sup>

## Statewide Hearings

The series of 11 hearings organized by the Joint House-Senate Committee on Education began at the State Capitol, August 13, 1979. The meetings typically consisted of lunch with local media and officials of area colleges and public schools, tours of teacher education facilities, and public hearings combined with committee meetings at which testimony was given. Several individuals were invited to present prepared testimony at that initial meeting, as at each of the subsequent hearings around the state. Following the presentations, which usually were confined to school finance and teacher preparation/certification, time was available for comments and questions from the audience and committee members.

The committee requested testimony from such individuals as deans of colleges of education, local superintendents, representatives of area teachers' associations, and officials from the State Department of Education. At the second hearing, for example, held at Central State University in Edmond, testimony was given by Pat Mayes, President of the Norman School Board and by Ada Williams, past President of the Dallas School District Teachers Association.<sup>23</sup> At the October 2 hearing at East Central Oklahoma State University in Ada, testimony was heard from Steve McDonald, Director of Finance, State Department of Education; Larry Willis, Superintendent, Stratford Public Schools; W. R. Altmiller, Dean, School of Education, East Central Oklahoma State University; Collin Bowen, Dean, School of Education, Southeastern Oklahoma State University; and Guy Robberson, Superintendent, Lindsay Public Schools.<sup>24</sup>

The hearings were well-publicized, well-attended, and well-received. Much of the testimony was a thorough compilation of information about how the schools were currently being financed or how teachers were being prepared, often combined with concrete suggestions for improving both. Public interest soon focused on teachers, their preparation, and their salaries so that the issue of equitable school funding gave way to certification standards as the most common topic of discussion. It was perceived to be the most important area of potential legislative activity.<sup>25</sup>

As referred to above, the testimony concerning teacher education did not consist solely of criticism without suggested alternatives. Richard Wisniewski, Dean of the College of Education at the University of Oklahoma, presented a "Six-Year Plan for the Professional Preparation of Teachers."<sup>26</sup> The stated assumptions of his plan were that public confidence in public education depends on the ability of the schools to raise educational achievement levels and that meaningful change in teacher preparation requires that it be related to all aspects of education in the state. Wisniewski's plan called for a four-year bachelor's program prior to admission to teacher education, followed by one year of intensive, field-based professional preparation and a final year as a teaching intern.

The State Department of Education offered a suggested change in the certification system through the use of three levels of certification.<sup>27</sup> Level One certification would require only a bachelor's degree and be general in nature. Levels Two and Three certification would require greater amounts of specialization, with a master's degree necessary for Level Three. Their plan outlined a detailed set



of changes and requirements in admissions standards and in professional, general, and specialized education courses.

Another recommendation submitted to the Committee was a series of suggestions by Major McClure, Dean of the College of Behavioral Sciences and Director of Teacher Education at Northeastern Oklahoma State University. He recommended that teacher education programs "respond to society's request for improvement of the educational profession by accepting society's answers to the problems that they see existent."<sup>28</sup> In other words, as long as the public emphasizes a return to the basics, so should public educators. He further recommended that educators

set standards acceptable to society and continually re-evaluate them as society demands change. . . . As we show a willingness to correct those things which are observed as weaknesses by society, . . . (w)e can go to the public and ask for and receive more money to support education. . . .<sup>29</sup>

The hearings sponsored by the Joint House-Senate Education Committee during the interim session of 1979 had a significant effect on the process by which House Bill 1706 was drafted and eventually approved. In addition to the larger, more vocal groups such as the Oklahoma Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, representatives of smaller interest groups such as the Oklahoma Music Educators' Association and the Professional Educators of Norman spoke as did individual teachers, parents, taxpayers, and students.<sup>30</sup> A great deal of information and many opinions were exchanged and it is possible that as many perceptive questions were put to the Committee as it asked.<sup>31</sup> The fact that the hearings were held in different locations around the state, the nature of the testimony given, and

public awareness had substantial political impact on the Legislative Leadership responsible for House Bill 1706, further discussion of which appears in Chapter V.

During the fall of 1979, as the House-Senate Committee meetings were hearing testimony around the state, the sub-committees headed by Glen Snider and Jack Parker began to consider ways of changing and improving the quality of teachers certified in Oklahoma and the financing of its public schools. Ideas were presented and argued back and forth among the Committee's hearings and the two sub-committees. The political make-up of the task forces and the House leadership helped determine those things which were not politically feasible; those matters were reconsidered and revised accordingly.<sup>32</sup>

Proposed Legislative Program on Education -  
1980 Session

By December, the Committee began to put together the ideas and opinions of the sub-committees and the public hearings in a legislative framework, from which they would draft the legislation.<sup>33</sup> The House leadership was presented with proposed changes in the ad valorem funding procedure and the preparation and certification of teachers. The leadership, including the chairs of the House Standing Committees to which the legislation would be sent, gave their approval to the funding proposals which included a revised funding formula and new sources of revenue dedicated to public education. They also supported the teacher education/certification changes. Those changes included a fifth-year internship requirements to follow a four-year approved teacher education program. Full certification would follow the

successful completion of the intern year with the approval of an "intern committee" made up of a "master teacher," the school principal where the beginning teacher was employed, and a representative from higher education.<sup>34</sup> Curriculum examinations and State Board of Education approval of the entire system were also included in the original framework.

Changes in the teacher education program were proposed, especially in the area of field experiences. A variety of observation experience was to occur during a student's first and second years in a teacher education program as part of their required education courses. The student teaching experience during the fourth year was to include direct involvement of the student in the operation of the classroom. Competence in the oral and written use of the English language, a grade point average of 2.5 on a 4.0 scale and evidence of psychological and personal fitness to work with children were also recommended.<sup>35</sup>

Regarding currently certified teachers, the proposed framework encouraged the state to provide local districts with \$5 per Average Daily Membership to fund staff development. Local districts were to establish continuing education programs which would have State Board of Education approval and would be the basis of continued certification for teachers and administrators.<sup>36</sup>

Prior to final drafting of the proposed legislation, the House leadership decided to introduce only the teachers' salary increase and certification changes during the 1980 session and to do so through one bill rather than two.<sup>37</sup> House Bill 1706 was to be introduced and voted on as a package deal; salaries would not be increased without certification changes. There was some concern about the constitutionality

of such a Bill, since the state constitution prohibits inclusion of substantive issues within appropriations bills. An Attorney General's opinion, however, supported the leadership's plan to provide the primary funding for House Bill 1706 in a separate bill.<sup>38</sup>

After the Committee prepared the first draft of House Bill 1706, they firmly established the support of the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, both of whom became principal authors of the Bill. House Bill 1706 had a number of key authors in the House and Senate, without whose support it might have died in committee; further discussion of their influence follows in Chapter V.<sup>39</sup>

#### Introduction, Debate, and Approval of House Bill 1706

As described earlier, Speaker of the House Dan Draper and President Pro Tempore Gene Howard announced the introduction of House Bill 1706 to the Legislature on January 14, 1980. They scheduled their press announcement to coincide with the Oklahoma Education Association's annual Legislative Dinner, with former Vice-President Walter Mondale as the keynote speaker.<sup>40</sup> Both were extremely newsworthy events and they guaranteed the full attention of the state news media on education that week.

During the course of the 1980 session, House Bill 1706 was assigned to and eventually survived seven legislative committees, more than 150 amendments, and two separate votes each before the full House and Senate.<sup>41</sup> From the outset, the Governor maintained that he would not sign such a bill and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction

was publicly opposed to it.<sup>42</sup> Real opposition was limited, however, and the Bill was approved with few substantive alternations.

House Bill 1706 was assigned initially to a House Education Sub-Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education. From there it went on to the House Common Education Committee, the Appropriations and Budget Sub-Committee on Education, the House Appropriations and Budget Committee, and to a vote before the full House on February 19, 1980, where it was approved 94-4.<sup>43</sup> Before the Bill left the House the first time, there was discussion, especially by the Oklahoma news media, of the possibility of an over-budget recess as the solution to the problem of appropriating more money, in this case for teachers' salaries, than was actually available at the time. Since the state would be \$19 million short, the idea involved voting the pay raise (in the form of House Bill 1706), recessing instead of adjourning, reconvening later when sufficient tax money had accumulated to fund the deficit, appropriating the necessary money, and then adjourning the session.<sup>44</sup>

Extensive revisions were made on the Bill within the House Committees as well as on the House floor because, as with the Interim Committee six months earlier, input by interested parties was encouraged, discussed, and debated. For example, the original "Intern Committee" became "Entry Year Assistance Committee" because intern seemed to imply additional undergraduate work. Similarly, "continuing education" was changed to "staff development."<sup>45</sup> A number of motions to amend the Bill on the House floor were successfully tabled by its main House authors, Representatives Fried and Deatherage. Examples of those failed motions include the requirement that individuals sitting

for the competency examinations achieve a passing grade "within a reasonable time as set by the (State) Board (of Education)" and that higher education representatives "shall have at least one year out of every five years teaching experience in the public schools of Oklahoma" and "shall have at least three (3) years teaching experience in the public schools of Oklahoma."<sup>46</sup>

There was some concern about the Bill when it left the House and was turned over to the Senate Education Committee; the principal authors, all members of the House, obviously had no control over its progress in the Senate.<sup>47</sup> Their concern seemed warranted when it narrowly passed out of that Committee on March 17 and was sent on for consideration by the Senate Appropriations and Budget Committee.<sup>48</sup> The Bill reached the Senate floor March 26 where it underwent considerable debate and amending, similar to that in the House. Motions to require Oklahoma teachers to, among other things, "be able to speak proficient English that any average student can understand" and "be an American citizen or intend to become and have filed an application for American citizenship" were successfully tabled by one of the Bill's authors, Senator Randle.<sup>49</sup> The Senate approved the Bill the next day, March 7, by a vote of 42-1.<sup>50</sup>

On April 2, when it was clear the House refused to concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 1706, a conference committee of House and Senate members was named to consider the differences.<sup>51</sup> Final efforts to separate the teachers' salary increase from the certification procedure were made in the Senate on June 4 during the consideration of the conference committee's report, but were defeated on procedural

grounds.<sup>52</sup> The conference committee was able to resolve the differences and both Houses approved the Bill on June 5 and sent it to the Governor who signed House Bill 1706 into law five days later.<sup>53</sup>

#### Summary of House Bill 1706

##### Legislative Intent

The Legislature expressed its intent in approving House Bill 1706 in several sections of the Bill dealing with various aspects of the certification process. It declared their overall purpose to be the establishment of "qualifications of teachers in the accredited schools of this state through licensing and certification requirements to ensure that the education of the children of Oklahoma will be provided by teachers of demonstrable ability."<sup>54</sup> The Legislature further maintained that the act "shall be in addition to existing laws governing teachers" and that it should not be misconstrued as repealing any protection to teachers nor authority to local school boards or the State Board of Education "not in conflict with the provisions" of the act.<sup>55</sup>

A second area of declared intent concerned the strengthening of the screening requirements of student applications for admission into colleges of education and providing for continuing education for college of education instructors "to ensure that the future teachers of this state are taught by professional educators fully trained in their area of expertise."<sup>56</sup>

A third general area of Legislative intent was in staff development "whereby all teachers of the state continue their education

beyond initial licensing and certification by the state to ensure that the children of the state are taught by professional educators, fully trained in their areas of expertise."<sup>57</sup>

#### Minimum Salaries

In addition to changes in the certification process, House Bill 1706 also instituted a new minimum salary schedule for Oklahoma teachers. For the year 1980-1981, the range of minimum salaries was, for example, from \$10,000 for a teacher with a bachelor's degree and no experience, to \$16,550 for a teacher with a doctorate and 15 years' experience.<sup>58</sup>

#### Professional Standards Board, Functions and Responsibilities

The Legislature gave the Professional Standards Board responsibility for general leadership in the "improvement of teacher education and standards for the certification and licensing of teachers."<sup>59</sup> It was to serve in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Education in reviewing approved programs of teacher education and certification and licensing requirements and making new recommendations.

#### Teacher Education - Candidates and Instructors

The Professional Standards Board was given, with the State Department of Education, the responsibility of devising a plan to strengthen screening requirements for teacher education students. The Legislature specified two criteria which must be met: demonstrated competence in the oral and written use of the English language, and a minimum



grade point average to be established by the Standards Board. Other general guidelines were that the teacher candidate must be able to meet other criteria as specified in the act and must provide evidence of field experience under the supervision of higher education instructors.<sup>60</sup>

Along with requirements regarding the admission of students to teacher education programs, the Legislature provided for the continuing education of college education instructors. Faculty development plans must be written and submitted to the Standards Board as part of the five-year process of teacher education program review. Faculty development plans are to include "alternative means of education including but not limited to in-service training programs, higher education courses, exchange programs with public school classroom teachers, administrators, and other school personnel," and service once every five years in a public school on a weekly basis for one semester.<sup>61</sup> The act also provided that an annual statistical report be submitted to the State Board of Education and the Legislature showing the percentage of students of each college or university who have passed or failed their curriculum examinations.

#### Licensing and Certification, Quali- fications and Funding

After January 31, 1982, local districts may employ only those persons already certified to teach or entry-year teachers. In connection with this, the Legislature set out the criteria which determine whether a teacher may be issued a license or a certificate. Anyone may be issued a license who has completed required courses and college

training, has graduated from an accredited institution of higher education, has met all other requirements established by the State Board of Education, and has received a passing grade on the curriculum examination.<sup>62</sup> Anyone may be issued a certificate who holds a valid license, has served a minimum of one year as an entry-year teacher, has made application and paid the certificate fee, and has been recommended by the entry-year assistance committee, or holds an out-of-state certificate.<sup>63</sup> The curriculum examination is detailed in the act with the Legislature describing its purpose as "ensuring academic achievements of every licensed teacher."<sup>64</sup> By January 1, 1982, the State Board was to have in place examinations for the various subject areas and grade levels, written in consultation with classroom teachers and higher education instructors. Teacher candidates may take the desired curriculum examination following completion of the junior year or after completion of 90 college credit hours. They may take the examination as often as desired but they may not be licensed until they have passed. The State Board retained the right to issue any temporary or provisional certificates as needed, provided specific alternatives have been exhausted by local school boards seeking to employ an individual who does not meet minimum standards for certification.<sup>65</sup>

Funding of the curriculum examinations is provided in the act by a Revolving Fund, to be operated separately from fiscal year limitations and legislative appropriations and to be used by the State Department of Education to maintain the curriculum examination requirements. The act further specified that the Professional Standards

Board is to review and consider for adoption the format and content of the curriculum examinations.<sup>66</sup>

#### Entry-Year Assistance Committee

In conjunction with the revised certification procedure, the development of an Entry-Year Assistance Program is provided for in the act. The Legislature required that the program include guidelines for entry-year positions, for the selection and appointment of teacher consultants, and for the appointment and functions of an entry-year assistance committee and an appropriate in-service program for the entry-year teacher.<sup>67</sup> Thus, the requirements for certification to teach specify that the individual shall have completed one year as an entry-year teacher, been recommended for certification by the committee, and have received a passing grade on the curriculum examination(s).

The Legislature specified certain duties of the Entry-Year Assistance Committee. The members are to meet with the entry-year teachers as may be required by the State Board of Education, work with the teacher in classroom management and in-service training, and provide for "meaningful parental input as another criterion in evaluating the entry-year teacher's performance."<sup>68</sup> At the end of the year, the committee is to recommend whether the entry-year teacher should be issued a certificate or required to serve a second year before certification. A staff development plan, "designed to strengthen the entry-year teacher's teaching skills in any area" is to be provided.<sup>69</sup> If the entry-year teacher is not recommended for certification, the committee is directed to supply a list of reasons and the teacher may choose to have a new committee supervise the second year.

### Teacher Consultants

The act establishes and provides funds for the position of teacher consultant. Teacher consultant stipends are to provide salary and/or fringe benefit increases according to years of experience and degree(s) held. The stipend schedule varied from \$575 for a teacher with a bachelor's degree and one year experience to \$2,875 for a teacher with a doctorate and 15 years experience. The Legislature made the distribution of the mandated increase a negotiable item if the district is using the negotiation process.<sup>70</sup>

### In-Service Teacher Education and Staff Development

Funding for "in-service teacher education staff development" is also provided for in the act.<sup>71</sup> Each district is to submit a staff development plan to the State Board of Education for approval each year. The plans are to follow guidelines outlined by the Professional Standards Board and approved by the State Board of Education, including the needs of local districts.

The continuing education for certified teachers is to provide alternative means of education including "in-service programs, higher education courses or other alternative means of education designed to help teachers enrich their professional abilities."<sup>72</sup> The staff development plans of local districts are to be developed by a committee of administrators, parents, and higher education consultants, with the majority of input by classroom teachers. Teachers in each district must meet staff development requirements of the local district or

face non-renewal of their contract or nonconsideration for salary increments.

### Teacher Register

The Legislature provided for the creation of a Teacher Register, to include the name, address, type of certificate, college major, and area of certification of each licensed and certified teacher in Oklahoma. A one-year pilot program was established to determine the feasibility of such a listing on a permanent, statewide basis.<sup>73</sup>

### Compliance

To facilitate implementation of the act, the Legislature further provided that two or more districts are permitted to establish cooperative programs to carry out the law's requirements. It also allowed the State Board to give special consideration to those districts which are unable to comply with any portion of the act.<sup>74</sup>

### Oklahoma Citizens' Commission on Education

The Legislature created the Oklahoma Citizens' Commission on Education to meet the requirements "specified in the agreement between the National Conference of State Legislatures and the State Legislative Council providing for the Oklahoma Legislative School Finance Project."<sup>75</sup>

House Bill 1706 thus provided comprehensive changes in the preparation, licensure, and certification of Oklahoma teachers. New requirements were placed on the entire process from admission to teacher education programs at state colleges and universities, to initial

entry into the teaching profession, to continued certification for veteran teachers. Chapter IV has attempted to acquaint the reader with the events surrounding House Bill 1706 and to give an indication of the time and effort directed at accomplishing its approval in the Oklahoma Legislature.

## END NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Press release, 14 January 1980, Speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives, in File A of the Committee Records of the 1979 Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee, hereafter cited as House-Senate Committee Records. "Education Committee," as used in this study, refers to Common Education and not Higher Education.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Tulsa World, 15 January 1980, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup>Press release, 14 January 1980, Speaker of the House.

<sup>5</sup>Press release, December, 1979, 1979 Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee Chairman, in File B, House-Senate Committee Records.

<sup>6</sup>To maintain confidentiality, direct reference will not be made to those interviewed. As mentioned above, see Appendix A for a list of those interviewed. Personal interviews will hereafter be cited as Interview, with date of interview.

<sup>7</sup>Oklahoma Constitution, Article XIII, Section 2.

<sup>8</sup>Richard Mitchell, "Testing the Teachers, The Dallas Experiment," The Atlantic Monthly, 242, December, 1978, pp. 66-70. Gene Lyons, "Why Teachers Can't Teach," Texas Monthly, September, 1979, pp. 123-220.

<sup>9</sup>Interviews, 3 June 1982, 21 November 1982, and 30 November 1982.

<sup>10</sup>Minutes of the House Education Committee Meeting, 9 May 1979, Oklahoma State Capitol, in File B, House-Senate Committee Records.

<sup>11</sup>Interviews, 3 June 1982, 4 November 1982, 21 November 1982, and 27 December 1982.

<sup>12</sup>Interviews, 26 November 1982 and 30 November 1982, and personal correspondence from Glen Snider to Jim Fried, 13 June 1979, in File B, House-Senate Committee Records. For a list of the members of the Snider Sub-Committee, see Appendix B.

<sup>13</sup>Press release, 13 August 1979, 1979 Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee Chairman, in File A, House-Senate Committee Records.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Personal correspondence from Dan S. Hobbs to Jim Fried, 5 June 1979 and statistical reports for 1978-1979 of the National Education Association and the Oklahoma Education Association, in File B, House-Senate Committee Records.

<sup>18</sup>Press release, 13 August 1979, 1979 Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee Chairman, in File A, House-Senate Committee Records. For a complete schedule of the hearings held by the 1979 Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee, see Appendix C. See Appendix D for a list of the members of the Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee.

<sup>19</sup>Interviews, 1 February 1982, 18 August 1982, 7 December 1982, and 10 January 1983.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 7 December 1982.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Draft outline for House Bill 1706, in File B, House-Senate Committee Records.

<sup>23</sup>Meeting agenda, public hearing of the 1979 Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee, 30 August 1979, Edmond, Oklahoma, in File B, House-Senate Committee Records. For a partial list of individuals asked to present testimony before the Joint House-Senate Education Committee, see Appendix E.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., 2 October 1979, Ada, Oklahoma.

<sup>25</sup>Interviews, 26 November 1982 and 27 December 1982.

<sup>26</sup>Testimony presented before the House-Senate Education Committee by Richard Wisniewski, 15 November 1979, Norman, Oklahoma, in File B, House-Senate Committee Records.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., Stan Cobb, 15 November 1979, Norman, Oklahoma.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., Major McClure, 6 November 1979, Tahlequah, Oklahoma.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Taped proceedings, public hearings of the House-Senate Education Committee, August to December 1979, House-Senate Committee Records.

<sup>31</sup>One of the more perceptive questions of the public hearings was asked at Weatherford, Oklahoma, 19 September 1979, by a classroom



teacher. She inquired of the committee whether they believed a bachelor's degree assures competence to serve in the Oklahoma State Legislature. The chairman responded, "That's a very interesting question. . . ."

<sup>32</sup>Interview, 15 December 1982.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

<sup>34</sup>Draft outline for House Bill 1706 and Report of the Teacher Education ad hoc Sub-Committee to the House-Senate Education Committee, in File B, House-Senate Committee Records.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Interviews, 21 November 1982, 30 November 1982, and 29 December 1982.

<sup>38</sup>Interviews, 15 December 1982 and 27 December 1982.

<sup>39</sup>For a list of the authors of House Bill 1706 and their committee assignments relating to that Bill, see Appendix F.

<sup>40</sup>Interviews, 15 December 1982 and 27 December 1982.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid.

<sup>43</sup>Journal of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-Seventh Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, 1980, pp. 282-283.

<sup>44</sup>Daily Oklahoman, 14 February 1980, and interview, 27 December 1982.

<sup>45</sup>Jim Fried, "Politics of Education in Oklahoma," Journal of Thought, Special Edition, Summer, 1983 (in press).

<sup>46</sup>House Journal, pp. 275-276.

<sup>47</sup>Interview, 27 December 1982.

<sup>48</sup>Journal of the Senate of the Thirty-Seventh Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, 1980, p. 480.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 555-557.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 571.

<sup>51</sup>House Journal, p. 659.

<sup>52</sup>Senate Journal, pp. 939-940. The procedural questions raised by the failed, tabled, or out of order motions referred to here indicate an important aspect of the legislative process which was not unique to House Bill 1706. A portion of the Senate Journal of June 4, pp. 939-940, helps illustrate the point:

The Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1706 was called up for consideration. . . . Senator Randle moved adoption of the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1706, which motion was declared adopted. Senator Boatner moved to reconsider the vote whereby the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1706 was adopted. Senator Randle moved to table the Boatner motion, to reconsider which motion to table was declared adopted, the roll call thereon being as follows: . . . Senator Pierce moved to reconsider the vote whereby the Conference Committee Report for House Bill 1706 passed for the purpose of rereferring it back to the Conference Committee with instructions to separate the bill into two bills--one bill for the pay raise and one bill for the certification procedure. The Chair ruled the Pierce motion out of order in the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1706 had been adopted, thereby placing the measure on final passage. The motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Committee Conference Report was adopted had been laid on the table, and a vote recorded thereon, which was a final disposition of the motion. Senator Luton moved the previous question, which motion was declared adopted. Senator Boatner moved to appeal the ruling of the Chair on the ruling on the final disposition of the Randle motion to table the Boatner motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1706 was adopted. The Chair ruled a question of order in order and the Boatner appeal, being a question of order, was before the Senate for consideration. The roll was ordered taken on the Boatner motion to appeal, the 'ayes' voting to sustain, 'nays' voting to overrule. . . .

<sup>53</sup>Senate Journal, p. 962; House Journal, p. 990, p. 998, p. 1115.

<sup>54</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 4, 675.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid.

<sup>56</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 6, 677.

<sup>57</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 10, 680.

<sup>58</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 2, 674.

- <sup>59</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 17, 683.
- <sup>60</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 6, 676-677.
- <sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*, 677.
- <sup>62</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 7, 677-678.
- <sup>63</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>64</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 9, 679-680.
- <sup>65</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>66</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 13, 681.
- <sup>67</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 8, 678-679.
- <sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, 679.
- <sup>69</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>70</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 1, 673.
- <sup>71</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 3, 675.
- <sup>72</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 11, 680.
- <sup>73</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 12, 681.
- <sup>74</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 20, 684.
- <sup>75</sup>Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980 § 14, 682.

## CHAPTER V

### ANALYSIS OF THE PASSAGE OF OKLAHOMA HOUSE

#### BILL 1706

Oklahoma House Bill 1706 has been hailed as one of the most significant and far-sighted pieces of education legislation in the state's history. Educators both within and outside Oklahoma have praised it as a genuine reform of education through changes in teacher preparation and certification. Many have cited Oklahoma as being in the forefront in bringing quality education to the state's school children. The enthusiasm which surrounded the passage of the Bill has been exceeded only by the optimistic reports of its successful implementation in the universities, colleges, and school districts across the state.

Looking beyond the enthusiasm of specific groups who heap praise on the legislation, House Bill 1706 represents much more than an increase in salaries and new certification requirements for Oklahoma teachers. There are important political and economic factors which were largely responsible for its approval and which demand the consideration of those who concern themselves with educational reform.

Chapter V provides this author's analysis of the historical evidence surrounding the approval of House Bill 1706. It is an attempt to shed light on the education legislation process in Oklahoma by analyzing some of the factors involved, including the actions and

intentions of the people responsible for passing the laws and the role of the public in effecting educational change.

### The Thirty-Seventh Legislature

The most logical place to begin a critical analysis of House Bill 1706 is with the legislative body that drafted and passed it, the Thirty-Seventh Oklahoma Legislature. The background information they gathered, the public hearings held during the interim session, the decisions on committee assignments, House and Senate authorship, and the introduction of the legislation as one rather than two separate bills were only a few of the factors which influenced House Bill 1706.

When the National Council of State Legislatures advised the Oklahoma Legislature that it could use its interim sessions more profitably, the legislative leadership decided to take the recommendation. The result was the formation of a Joint House-Senate Committee on Education which held open hearings during the interim session. The practice had rarely been seen prior to that time but has been used since then by the Oklahoma Legislature. The public hearings associated with House Bill 1706 had a major impact on the way the Bill eventually took shape and on the general feeling of the public and the education community toward the Bill when it was introduced in the Legislature.

The fact that the hearings were held across the state, and not all in Oklahoma City at the State Capitol, was politically important. So too was the conservative nature of the testimony the Committee requested be given during the hearings. Soliciting similar testimony from the deans of the various colleges of education, public school superintendents, and representatives of special interest groups

furthered the public purpose of the committee. A third important aspect of the hearings was the resulting public awareness and support for educational change. After the hearings, many news-conscious voters realized that some kind of legislative action would be forthcoming and whatever it was, it would have to improve the educational system as they perceived it currently functioned.

Along with these factors, it should be noted that the Committee leadership prepared themselves extremely well on the educational matters they would be considering during the interim session. The varied information the legislative research staff gathered made the Committee members aware of many, although not all of the issues, problems, and possible solutions that could be expected to surface during the open hearings. Taking all their preparations into account, including statute searches and a statewide survey, it may be said that the Committee went into the interim session meetings prepared to ask very few questions for which they did not already have answers.

Two sources of background information gathered prior to the hearings help illustrate how some Committee members had begun to see the problems confronting them. The results of the survey on Oklahoma Schools of Education taken by the legislative staff just prior to the hearings supported the image, held by the Legislature and the public, of faculties out of touch with public schools. The survey showed that 46 percent of Oklahoma's college instructors had less than five years' experience in the public school classroom, and 66 percent had never taught or had not been in a public classroom since 1970.

The first statistic implied that the longer the experience as a classroom teacher or administrator (no distinction was made in the

survey), the more competent or qualified to teach the college of education instructor should be. The possibility exists that the Legislators believed professors should begin teaching at the university or college level only after 20 or 30 years' experience as a classroom teacher or administrator. Similarly, the second statistic generated by the survey, that 66 percent of the college faculty had never taught or had not been in a public school classroom, may have oversimplified the kind of contact professors have with the public schools. Teaching in a full-time capacity in a public school is only one way higher education may be involved with the public schools. The survey did not refer to the amount of time spent in supervision of student teachers, informal visits, and consultation with teachers and administrators or any number of varied contacts between public schools and colleges of education.

A second source of information which influenced the Committee members was statistical data from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, showing the relationship between students' choice of academic major and academic ability as measured by American College Testing composite standard scores and first semester college grade point average. The table indicated lower ACT scores and lower grade point averages for education students as compared with nearly every other academic field or discipline. While the table showing this information was furnished to Committee members, little effort seems to have been made to include the limitations which the State Regents recognized should accompany the use of such data. It was not made clear, for example, that the ACT data were based on a sample of only 50 percent of entering freshmen from the fall semester of 1978, or

that students' choices at the freshman level are not final, since the average student changes his or her academic major two or three times before graduation. Perhaps most important, it was not pointed out to the legislators that academic aptitude tests and grade point averages are not definitive indicators of students' ability and academic achievement. The data showing poorer performance by education majors did not at the same time indicate the existence of a widely held educational belief that there is no positive correlation between students' grades in college and achievement in later life. M.T.

A great deal of publicity and discussion centered on how public schools and higher education needed to work together more closely, by force if necessary, and how colleges of education needed to attract "better" students. The use and misuse of these two sources of statistical information does not indicate a conscious effort to mislead the legislators who would be involved in approving House Bill 1706. Both areas were very likely in need of improvement. The purpose of including them here is to show that the information may have created a negative image in the minds of many as to the way colleges of education and teacher education programs were functioning and convinced them that a legislative remedy based on a performance or competency model was needed.

On several procedural questions, the Legislative leadership made politically astute decisions. Perhaps most important of these was the decision to introduce the increase in teachers' salaries along with the certification changes in one bill. If two bills had been attempted rather than one, it is likely that the teachers' associations would have succeeded in pressuring the Legislature to pass the first



and kill the second. The teachers' association desired the much-needed salary increases but were reluctant to see the State Department gain power over teacher certification. The Legislative leadership wanted both and so included the two aspects in one bill to help assure passage.

Certainly, the favorable influence of the Bill's authors and co-authors was critical in its success. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Chairman of the House Common Education Committee, and the Vice-Chairman of the House Appropriations and Budget Committee were the main authors of House Bill 1706. Listed as co-authors were an additional 10 Senators and 39 Representatives, most of whom were members of one, or in some cases several, of the seven committees House Bill 1706 was assigned to in the Legislature. It would have been difficult to overcome this kind of support in an effort to defeat the Bill.

The large number of amendments debated and considered during the Bill's trip through the Legislature also had favorable results. As with the public hearings, the interest groups involved were all allowed to have input so that everyone believed they were getting what they wanted in House Bill 1706. Debate was encouraged, and the result was more than 150 changes in the Bill after it was first introduced. No substantive changes altered the basic focus of the Bill, however, but everyone involved left the meetings secure in the knowledge that their interests were protected. The amending process, while politically necessary for final approval, gave the appearance of the law having gone through a metamorphosis of democratic interaction. The amending process illustrates an important aspect of the political

process which House Bill 1706 or any other piece of legislation might be expected to endure on its way to approval.

A further crucial aspect of the Bill's successful passage in the Legislature was the use of the list of key educators which the Education Committee compiled from across the state. This same list of several thousand superintendents, principals, classroom teachers, teachers' association presidents and administrators, and college of education professors, among others, had been consulted during and after the interim session hearings for input on the issues involved in House Bill 1706. Throughout the process, these educators were kept informed of the Committee's activities and were in a position to later advise their Legislators when the Bill came up for consideration. The legislative leadership seemed to sense, quite rightly, that when ✓ people are consulted for their opinions, they are more likely to be supportive of a particular action. With this in mind, they used the list of educators to their best advantage.

Since the Legislature wrote and passed House Bill 1706, it is difficult to separate that body, and especially the House leadership, from other factors critical in the Bill's passage. It is possible, though, before considering some of those other factors, to suggest that, in general, the Legislature determined that the core of the problems confronting education in Oklahoma lay with teacher education. They assumed that what they heard from formal testimony and other ✓ sources was representative of the education community, and with that in mind, they proceeded to write and pass a law which, with all the best intentions, was supposed to solve those problems.

Public Awareness and Support for  
House Bill 1706

From the beginning of the interim session through the introduction and debate of House Bill 1706 in 1980, the voting public was made aware of legislative efforts to make changes in public education in Oklahoma. The statewide hearings themselves, as already mentioned, performed a valuable public relations objective. The information concerning the type of problems the Legislature faced, as well as some possible solutions, were passed on by the Legislative staff to the state media, which was almost unanimous in its support. Local newspapers gave advance publicity to the hearings and reported the testimony heard there. The state's two largest newspapers, the Daily Oklahoman and the Tulsa World, provided favorable press, especially on ✓ the issue of increased standards for teachers. The largest headlines across the state, however, were reserved for the increase in teachers' salaries; perhaps newspaper publishers determined that sort of coverage would sell more copies. While the support of the media by such daily newspapers as the Oklahoman and the World was not crucial to the successful approval of House Bill 1706, it did not harm its chances. The support in particular of the Oklahoman, extremely conservative by most definitions, helped reinforce the position of this study--that House Bill 1706 is an example of conservative educational reform in — which very little substantive change takes place.

In addition to reading and hearing a great deal about House Bill 1706, the public liked many of the Bill's various components. The idea that captured most people's attention was the competency tests

each new teacher would be required to pass prior to entering a public school classroom. The entry-year assistance committee and increased requirements during the teacher education program were obscure concepts and had very little effect on the average citizen when compared to the so-called curriculum examinations. Most voters could relate to testing as a measure of competency and those voters made their opinions known to their legislators.

Bar examinations for attorneys and board certification for physicians were frequently cited as good reasons for similar examinations for professional teachers. Legislators were especially fond of pointing out that what appeared to be good enough for doctors and lawyers ought to be good enough for teachers. The legal and medical professions provide, in general, the rewards of power, money, and status-- rewards that the education field does not usually have. It was and still is tempting to think that by modeling the way lawyers and physicians are credentialed, teachers might also share those rewards. The problems rests, however, with what research on credentialing suggests might be faulty assumptions, neither of which were discussed when House Bill 1706 was being debated: that education resembles the legal and medical fields and that certification practices in these fields are, in fact, worth copying.

Perhaps the enthusiasm of the education community for Performance- or Competency-based Teacher Education and Certification helps further explain the general popularity of House Bill 1706. Educators are eager to provide quality instruction and are not unlike the lay voting public in being attracted to a concept such as performance-based education which promises the production of high-quality, competent

teachers. Since advocates of performance-based education equate good teaching with competent teaching and are comfortable with behavioral definitions of both, the task of delivering such an educational system is straightforward and relatively easy to accomplish. That which can be defined, measured, and evaluated--such as competent teaching--is sometimes given more validity than that which defies definition and is not so easily quantified--such as good teaching. In the case of Oklahoma's House Bill 1706, performance-based education was offered as a means of providing quality education and the voters, both teachers and parents, accepted it.

#### Influence of Non-Legislative Groups

In addition to the influence of key educators identified and utilized by the legislative leadership in securing approval of House Bill 1706 and the individuals selected to give testimony at the hearings, other non-legislative groups had significant impact on the Bill. The Snider sub-committee, for example, which had been formed to assist the interim session Joint House-Senate Committee, included a wide range of education interest groups. Its 24 members represented the two major teachers' associations in Oklahoma, all levels of public school administration, and teacher education programs in the state as well as the State Legislature. With this kind of representation, the recommendations the sub-committee made were likely to be acceptable in the form of House Bill 1706. Again, the need for the support of various interest groups involved in any type of education legislation was recognized and actively sought.

The role of three major non-legislative groups in passing House Bill 1706 is an important one. The Oklahoma Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the Oklahoma State Department of Education had in common their initial disapproval of some or all of the components of House Bill 1706. As perceived from interviews — conducted for this study, the OEA did not want the salary increases tied to the certification changes; the AFT did not want the competency testing, and the State Department did not want the law.<sup>1</sup> Each one had specific reasons for opposing the law, but they all finally accepted the Bill as an eventual reality to be dealt with, particularly when their leadership realized they had more to gain than lose by its approval and implementation. When the OEA realized the House leadership was not going to separate the salary issue from the certification requirements, they proceeded to enter enthusiastically into the amending process to protect and improve their interests. The same could be said of the bureaucrats in the State Department. Once there was little doubt the Bill would become law, they effectively suggested changes which would favor their somewhat awesome task of implementing House Bill 1706. Both the OEA and the State Department soon understood the power they would gain with the implementation of House Bill 1706. In fairness to the leadership of these groups, however, many also believed the mandated changes would bring about genuine improvement of the profession and education in general.

The bargaining between the Legislature and these groups might be seen as trade-offs. For example, the teachers were willing to trade changes in the credentialing process for more money in salaries. The State Department traded some new rules and regulations for expanded

control and influence. But such trade-offs are not improper or unusual. What is interesting but not surprising is the hesitancy on the part of the leadership of these groups to acknowledge the trade-offs and the ease with which the unavoidable can be welcomed, accepted, and even praised. The OEA and the State Department have become two of the strongest and most vocal supporters of House Bill 1706, and all thought of disagreement has vanished. Everyone seems to agree that the Law is good legislation.

A final observation on the influence of non-legislative groups on House Bill 1706 deserves consideration here. When the Legislature asks for input on educational issues, there is usually no shortage of individuals who consider themselves qualified to step forward and speak as representative of the education community. It is questionable whether those well-intentioned individuals are truly representative of the larger group. In the drafting of House Bill 1706, the Legislature assumed the educators they heard from spoke for the entire education community in Oklahoma and across the nation. Such may not have been the case. Those classroom teachers and professors of education who are likely to question the way the system operates and suggest uncomfortable solutions to educational problems may be observed to be least likely to be interested in committee work at the public school or university level, or to become administrators. In other words, they exercise very little political power. It is a curious anomaly of education that there is little on which every educator can agree, and that if one dissents from the majority, one's views are rarely taken seriously. Such people are humored and valued as intellectually oddities who make things interesting but, since they are out

of the mainstream, they do not appear to have much power. House Bill 1706 was very much a mainstream bill; those who spoke for the majority exercised the most authority.

### The Economic Situation

The promise of long-term economic health in Oklahoma when the idea for House Bill 1706 was begun had an obvious and positive effect on its passage. A surplus of funds was available to the Legislature in 1979 and 1980, and little resistance was shown to spending the surplus on such things as entry-year programs and staff development.

The Oklahoma Legislature has not always been noted for its willingness to appropriate funds to implement mandated changes. House Bill 1706, which funded the teachers' salary increases, was accompanied by Senate Bill 402, which funded the various new requirements of House Bill 1706. Many of the changes House Bill 1706 made were, in fact, expensive to begin and maintain. Such costs included \$857,299 in stipends for teacher consultants, \$1,375,000 in staff development, and \$510,000 in the design and operation of the subject-matter competency examinations spent by the State Department during fiscal year 1981.<sup>2</sup> During 1982, the State Department spent approximately \$3,459,500 on implementation.<sup>3</sup> Beyond these amounts were several million dollars appropriated for the salary increases and the entry-year program.<sup>4</sup>

While other states were approving laws somewhat more limited in scope, Oklahoma adopted a comprehensive assortment of changes and requirements, partly because it could afford to do so. It would be difficult to maintain that the law would not have been passed if



Oklahoma had not been in a favorable economic position in 1980. It can at least be suggested that the state's apparent economic health removed a potential obstacle for the Bill's supporters.

This chapter has sought to analyze, on the basis of historical evidence presented in Chapter IV, some of the more significant factors involved in the Oklahoma Legislature's drafting and debating of House Bill 1706. It has focused on the groups and individuals who most affected its passage: the Legislature, the voting public, and the education community. The analysis illustrates the remarkably political as well as conservative nature of educational reform legislation and identifies those factors most crucial to its passage.

The following serves as a summary of the political factors this analysis describes as vital to the approval of House Bill 1706:

1. A large number of people were asked for their ideas and support for the legislation in activities ranging from the interim session hearings to the amending process following introduction to the Legislature.
2. There was a certain amount of bargaining and compromise that took place between the Legislature and specific interest groups and state agencies such as the Oklahoma Education Association and the State Department of Education.
3. The Legislature, the leadership in particular, compiled considerable background information on various aspects of teacher education and certification around the country and opinions concerning the state of public education within Oklahoma as preparation for House Bill 1706.
4. Statistical data concerning teacher education in Oklahoma were gathered and publicized to encourage a favorable image among legislators and the public.
5. The House leadership showed mastery of the skills necessary to guide a potentially controversial bill such as 1706 through the legislative process.
6. The Legislature succeeded in fostering a positive public attitude toward House Bill 1706.

7. The authors of House Bill 1706 focused their legislative attention on a particular aspect of education which the public perceived was in great need of improvement: quality teachers. ✓

8. House Bill 1706 was drafted to appeal directly to teachers' senses of professionalism. ✓

9. The requirements of House Bill 1706 lend themselves to visible, quantifiable verification of results: numbers of students denied or granted admission to teacher education, numbers of competency examinations passed or failed, numbers of entry-year teachers granted or denied certification, numbers of teachers earning staff development points. ✓

10. Oklahoma was experiencing a budget surplus in 1979 and 1980 which allowed implementation of a program, estimated to have cost the state 75 million dollars during the first year.<sup>2</sup>

In general, these factors indicate that while education is highly politicized, very few substantive educational issues were fully addressed and debated as part of House Bill 1706. Once the basic performance-based structure was developed and in place, the position was never seriously challenged. The Legislature went on to pass the Bill which was popular with the voters and which many educators believed represented genuine reform. ✓

END NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Interviews, 27 August and 8 December 1982.

<sup>2</sup>Interview, 27 August 1982 and personal correspondence from the State Department of Education, Fiscal Services, 8 March 1983.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 8 March 1983.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. It is somewhat difficult to determine exact amounts spent in each of the different areas included in House Bill 1706. Because of a lack of information combined with conflicting information, approximations had to be relied on to help convey a sense of the total cost of the legislation.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Summary

This study of House Bill 1706 is only one of many already completed or yet to be done regarding a comprehensive alteration in teacher education and certification in Oklahoma. The law has received considerable attention throughout the education and legislative communities in Oklahoma and around the nation. Educators within the state are busy implementing its requirements as interested observers outside the state look to it as a possible model to follow or avoid for their own certification policies. While much research concerning House Bill 1706 will necessarily focus on the implementation and results of the law, this study has considered it from an historical perspective in an attempt to clarify and analyze the legislation itself.

The study proposed to consider two related questions:

1. Does House Bill 1706 resemble other attempts to reform education and, as such, is it more conservative than reformist in its approach, and
2. What does a careful scrutiny of it contribute to our understanding and participation in the political aspects of education legislation?

The first question adds to the body of literature concerning reform within the history of American education. The second question is of even greater value because of its practical significance to educators, administrators, politicians, interest groups, and the voting public.

To build an historical framework and thereby provide possible answers to the questions the research raised, the study first considered the Progressive Movement as an earlier, more general reform attempt in American education. Second, it placed House Bill 1706 within 300 years of previous regulation concerning certification and entrance into the teaching profession. Third, it outlined the normal as well as peculiar events leading to the drafting and passage of House Bill 1706. The fourth step in presenting the study's historical evidence was its analysis of some of the political factors responsible for the Bill's approval.

### Conclusions

The primary data relied on in this case study of House Bill 1706 includes the written records of the Oklahoma Legislature, taped proceedings of legislative hearings, published documents of state agencies, and personal interviews with key participants involved in the legislation. The details of that historical evidence are presented elsewhere in this study and serve as the basis for answering the questions posed by the research. They support the conclusion that House Bill 1706 is an example of conservative educational reform when conservative is defined as a way by which majority, system-supporting interests are maintained. The data further confirm the political nature of education and explore the implications of such laws in education policy-making.

### House Bill 1706 as Conservative Reform

In their approach to reform, the authors of House Bill 1706

showed a strong resemblance to the Progressives of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In each group's effort to solve particular educational problems, different circumstances and demands were present; while House Bill 1706 addressed only a specific area, rather than education in general, both groups illustrate essentially conservative attempts to reform education.

The Progressive Movement saw the public school develop as the major vehicle for social indoctrination and control. That development was in response to such factors as the tremendous growth of industrialism at the expense of agriculture and the accompanying increase in urbanization, a large influx of unfamiliar and unpopular immigrants, and an alteration of traditional patterns of living, particularly in the business world. Within the meritocratic system that evolved, the school became a kind of "escape valve whereby the talented discontented could move up."<sup>1</sup> The same system, however, placed the responsibility for failure on the individual who did not meet sufficient standards rather than on the system itself.

The authors of House Bill 1706 faced a different set of problems than did the Progressives. Most prominent among these problems was a demand by the public for a higher quality education. In response to that demand, House Bill 1706 likewise established a meritocratic system in which behaviorally-defined standards were outlined and used to represent quality preparation and certification of teachers. Teachers who do not meet the standards are considered not competent to teach.

House Bill 1706 illustrates much of the same philosophy which motivated the Progressives. The evidence presented in this study

helps to show that both reform efforts share a desire for economic security among the population, a society-centered educational system of collective, cooperative action, and specialization for efficiency in the work place. Some examples from House Bill 1706 may help clarify the similarity.

The parents and teachers who testified at the public hearings on House Bill 1706 and who influenced their legislators showed particular concern that the schools their children attended were chaotic and useless, that students were not learning anything because their teachers were incompetent. If young people were no longer learning anything, it might be suggested that schools were not capable of assuring economic security and upward mobility. A more basic, measurable education was thought to be one solution to the problem and a standardized, quantitative plan for teacher preparation and certification the best way to accomplish such an education.

Although the specific problems of daily living which faced early twentieth century Americans are no longer present, the cooperation and specialization those problems encouraged in educational institutions continues into the 1980s. The technostructure of men, machines, and ideas Galbraith described at mid-century is with us yet; society continues to expect the school to solve most of its problems and cultivate in young people the skills, attitudes, and values the nation requires. "Meeting the needs of the individual" through the creation of an institution known as the junior high school in 1911 represents a change similar to accomplishing the same goal through entry-year assistance/assessment programs or subject-matter competency examinations prior to teacher certification in 1980.<sup>2</sup> Stated another way, it

is not the needs of the individual which are met as much as those the society deems necessary for the protection of majority interests.

The clearest similarity between the authors of House Bill 1706 and the Progressives and that which most firmly supports the belief that both were more concerned with majority system-supporting interests is the emphasis on adjustment and adaptation to societal demands. In 1979, for example, when the Director of Teacher Education at Northeastern Oklahoma State University recommended to the State Legislature that educators "set standards acceptable to society and continually re-evaluate them as society demands change . . . (so that educators) can go to the public and ask for and receive more money to support education, . . ." he could have been echoing a sentiment by a Progressive educator in 1900.<sup>3</sup>

In making this connection between the Progressive reforms and House Bill 1706, the purpose is not to deny the seriousness or legitimacy of the problems either group faced. Nor does it deny the interest a society has in maintaining itself. The Progressives were convinced that they could better the lot of large numbers of people as a result of their reforms; the supporters of House Bill 1706 were anxious to improve the quality of education in Oklahoma. The purpose is to simply recognize the conservative nature of both reform efforts. Neither one represents reform effecting genuine change in education as much as it represents traditional support for majority interests.

#### Political Nature of House Bill 1706

Less abstract and possibly of more practical importance than the conclusion that House Bill 1706 represents conservative education



legislation is a recognition of some of the political factors largely responsible for its approval. The myth of education as an apolitical social institution has generally been dispelled by earlier-cited research on politics and education. The evidence presented in this study has attempted to add to that research by further illustrating the political nature of the process whereby education legislation is drafted and approved at the state level.

A number of general factors surfaced as being in some way responsible for the approval of House Bill 1706 and which may contribute to the understanding and participation in other legislative activity in education policy-making:

1. Involving as many people as possible in the design and later support of specific legislation.
2. Bargaining between the Legislature and specific interest groups and government agencies to secure approval of a bill by the former and increased power and authority by the latter.
3. Compiling background information in preparation for proposed changes.
4. Using information, particularly statistical, to create or foster a desirable image among legislators or the public.
5. Applying legislative skills necessary to guide a bill successfully through the entire legislative process.
6. Encouraging a public awareness and positive inclination toward legislative activity.
7. Drafting legislation for which the public can perceive a need.
8. Appealing to a particular group's sense of professionalism.
9. Providing legislation which promises and can deliver visible, quantifiable results.
10. Enjoying an apparently healthy economy which allows implementation of expensive programs.

This case study of Oklahoma House Bill 1706 has identified, described, and analyzed some of the elements involved in education legislation which surely are not totally unique to that particular piece of legislation or to the politics of Oklahoma. The factors important in its approval may be related to or prove to be equally responsible for other legislative acts both in Oklahoma and around the country. Certainly, the political lessons learned or skillfully repeated in guiding House Bill 1706 to final approval provide insight to education legislation in general.

House Bill 1706 shares most of the similarities Katz suggests reform movements of the last 200 years have had in common. The law was initiated and supported by anxious middle-class parents with input by school personnel only as reaction to others' actions. The goals of the authors and supporters of the law emphasized the extrinsic, future cash value of schooling. And the campaign for House Bill 1706 was a noisy, at times heated one which resulted in imposed, rather than voluntary changes.

Katz' final similarity may be most critical for efforts to improve education. In the education community's acceptance of responsibility for "the salvation of individuals and of society," they may have failed to maintain a healthy skepticism and realistic view of educational reform.<sup>4</sup> The "dazzling diversionary activity (of House Bill 1706 may be) turning their heads away from the real nature of social problems."<sup>5</sup> Research on the implementation and results of House Bill 1706 and on other movements to reform the education and certification of teachers should consider the historical tradition on which they are based. Such

research should be aware of the political realities of education legislation and question the hold of special interest on the cause of reform.

END NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Feinberg, Reason and Rhetoric, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup>Violas, Training the Working Class, pp. 158-159.

<sup>3</sup>Testimony presented before the House-Senate Education Committee by Major McClure, 6 November 1979, Tahlequah, Oklahoma.

<sup>4</sup>Katz, Irony of Early School Reform, pp. 215-216.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 217.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Beggs, W. K. The Education of Teachers. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.
- Borrowman, M. L. Teacher Education in America, A Documentary History. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.
- Easton, D. The Political System, an Inquiry Into the State of Political Science. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1971.
- Feinberg, W. Reason and Rhetoric, the Intellectual Foundations of 20th Century Liberal Educational Policy. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1975.
- Gumbert, E. B. and Spring, J. H. The Superschool and the Superstate: American Education in the Twentieth Century. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1974.
- Haberman, M. and Stinnett, T. M. Teacher Education and the New Profession of Teaching. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973.
- Karier, C. J. Man, Society, and Education, A History of American Educational Ideas. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1967.
- Karier, C. J. (Ed.). Shaping the American Educational State, 1900 to the Present. New York: The Free Press, 1975.
- Karier, C. J., Violas, P., and Spring, J. Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973.
- Katz, M. B. Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools, the Illusion of Educational Change in America. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1971.
- Katz, M. B. (Ed.). School Reform: Past and Present. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.
- Katz, M. B. The Irony of Early School Reform, Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968

- Kinney, L. B. Certification in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Kirst, M. W. "The State Role in Regulating Local Schools." In M. F. Williams (Ed.), Government in the Classroom: Dollars and Power in Education. New York: Praeger Publishing Co., 1979.
- Kliebard, H. N. "The Question in Teacher Education." In D. J. McCarty et al. (Eds.), New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.
- McAshan, H. H. Competency-Based Education and Behavioral Objectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1979.
- Magoon, A. J. "Teaching and Performance-Based Teacher Education." In D. E. Lomax (Ed.), European Perspectives in Teacher Education. London: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.
- Mosher, E. K. and Wagoner, J. L., Jr. (Eds.). The Changing Politics of Education, Prospects for the 1980s. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1978.
- Ravitch, D. The Revisionists Revised: A Critique of the Radical Attack on the Schools. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1978.
- Sanchez, R. Schooling American Society, a Democratic Ideology. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1976.
- Selakovich, D. Schools and American Society. New York: Longman, Inc., 1983. (In press.)
- Sherman, R. R. and Kirschner, J. Understanding History of Education. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.
- Spring, J. Educating the Worker-Citizen, the Social, Economic, and Political Foundations of Education. New York: Longman, Inc., 1980.
- Spring, J. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.
- Spring, J. The Sorting Machine, National Educational Policy Since 1945. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1976.
- Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers. Teacher Education in the United States: The Responsibility Gap. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1976.
- Tyack, D. B. (Ed.). Turning Points in American Educational History. Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1967.

- Usdan, M. D. "The Changing Politics of Education at the State Level." In S. Sandow and W. Apker (Eds.), The Politics of Education. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappan, Inc., 1975, 55-73.
- Violas, P. C. The Training of the Urban Working Class, a History of Twentieth Century American Education. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1978.
- Williams, W. A. The Contours of American History. Chicago: Quadrangle Paperbacks, 1966.
- Wirt, F. M. and Kirst, M. W. Political and Social Foundations of Education. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1972.
- Wise, A. E. Legislated Learning, the Bureaucratization of the American Classroom. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

#### Book Review, Newspapers, and Yearbooks

- Katz, M. B. Review of The Revisionists Revised: A Critique of the Radical Attack on the Schools, by D. Ravitch. Harvard Educational Review, 49 (May 1979), 256-266.
- The Daily Oklahoman, 14 February 1980.
- The Oklahoma Observer, 25 January, 25 April, 10 September, 25 November 1979; 10 January, 10 July 1980.
- The Tulsa World, 15 January 1980.
- Bush, R. N. and Enemark, P. "Control and Responsibility in Teacher Education." In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education, the Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part II). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975, 265-294.
- Scribner, J. D. (Ed.). The Politics of Education, the Seventy-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.

#### Periodicals

- Cole, R. W. Jr. "Minimum Competency Tests for Teachers: Confusion Compounded." Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (December 1979), 233.
- Durkin, L. and Smith, J. M. "A Challenge for Leadership of Teacher Education in the Eighties." Peabody Journal of Education, 58 (July 1981), 183-187.

- Ellett, C. D., Capie, W., and Johnson, C. E. "Assessing Teacher Performance." Educational Leadership, 38 (December 1980), 219-220.
- Floden, R. E. "Analogy and Credentialing." Action in Teacher Education, 1 (Spring-Summer 1979), 33-39.
- Fried, J. "Politics of Education in Oklahoma." Journal of Thought, Special Edition (Summer 1983), in press.
- Giroux, H. A. "Teacher Education and the Ideology of Social Control." Journal of Education, 162 (Winter 1980), 5-27.
- Gubser, L. "Competency Testing and National Accreditation in Teacher Education." Action in Teacher Education, 1 (Spring-Summer 1979), 21-27.
- Hall, G. E. and Houston, W. R. "Competency-Based Teacher Education: Where is it Now?" New York University Education Quarterly, XII, Summer 1981, 20-27.
- Katz, M. B. "The Origins of Public Education: A Reassessment." History of Education Quarterly, 16 (Winter 1976), 381-407.
- Kleine, P. F. and Wisniewski, R. "Oklahoma's Bill 1706: A Step Forward." Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (October 1981), 115-117.
- Kunkel, R. C. and Dearmin, E. T. "The Political and Ideological Development of a Fifth Year Statewide Internship." Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (January-February 1981), 19-23.
- LaBue, A. C. "Teacher Certification in the U.S.: A Brief History." The Journal of Teacher Education, XI (June 1960), 148.
- Lyons, G. "Why Teachers Can't Teach." Texas Monthly, 7 (September 1979), 123-220.
- Mitchell, R. "Testing the Teachers: The Dallas Experiment." Atlantic Monthly, 242 (December 1978), 66-70.
- Ornstein, A. C. "Improving the Quality of Teachers." Educational Horizons, 59 (Summer 1981), 168-172.
- Robinson, A. A. and Mosrie, D. "Florida's New Teacher Certification Law." Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (December 1979), 263-264.
- Scherer, M. "Who's Afraid of Teacher Competency Tests?" Instructor, XCII (February 1983), 48-52.
- Smith, B. O. "Pedagogical Education: How About Reform?" Phi Delta Kappan, 62 (October 1980), 87-91.
- Tom, A. R. "Critique of Performance Based Teacher Education." The Educational Forum, XLII (November 1977), 77-87.



## Public Documents

- Oklahoma, Constitution. Art. XIII, sec. 2.
- Oklahoma Legislature. House. Journal of the House of Representatives, 37th Leg., 2nd Sess., 1980.
- Oklahoma Legislature. Senate. Journal of the Senate, 37th Leg., 2nd Sess., 1980.
- Oklahoma. Session Laws, 1980, Chap. 284, secs. 1-22.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. Policies and Procedures Handbook for House Bill 1706, August 1981.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. Reports of the State Superintendent's Steering Committee on Teacher Education, January 1978.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. Teacher Education, Certification, and Assignment Handbook, March 1971.
- Oklahoma. Statutes, 1890, Art. 79, sec. 1120; 1908, Art. 74, sec. 1359; 1931, Art. 34, sec. 7007; 1971, Art. 70, secs. 6-125.

## Published Reports

- Broudy, H. S. A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972.
- Daniel, K. F. "Performance-Based Teacher Certification: What is it and why do we need it?" In J. L. Burdin and M. T. Reagan (Eds.), Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators, 1971.
- Elam, S. "Performance-Based Teacher Education: What is the State of the Art?" Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1971.
- Harris, S. P. (Ed.). State Departments of Education, State Boards of Education, and Chief State School Officers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Sandefur, J. T. "Competency Assessment in Teacher Education: A Compilation of State Activity." A report prepared for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education's Task Force on Competency Assessment in Teacher Education, October 1981.

Schmieder, A. A. "Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene." Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, 1973.

#### Unpublished Dissertations

Curry, G. A. Jr. "An Analysis of the Program of the Oklahoma Commission on Teacher Education and Certification." Dissertation, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1950.

Folks, J. M. "An Analysis of Opinions of House Bill 1706 as Perceived by Certain Selected School-Related Groups." Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1982.

Watson, A. G. "A Study of the Historical Development of Teacher Certification in Oklahoma." Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1974.

#### Unpublished Materials and Sources

Oklahoma Legislature. Unofficial Records of the Joint House-Senate Interim Committee on Education. 37th Leg., 1979.

Oklahoma Legislature. House and Senate. Joint Committee on Education. Teacher Education and Educational Finance. Hearings Before the Joint House-Senate Education Committee, 37th Leg., 13 August, 30 August, 18 September, 15 September, 1 October, 16 October, 19 October, 6 November, 15 November, 17 November, 6 December 1979.

#### Interviews

Carleton, R. E. Purcell, Oklahoma, 1982.

Deatherage, C. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.

Draper, D. Jr. Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1982.

Emmons, R. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.

Fisher, L. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.

Folks, J. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.

Fried, J. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.

- King, K. Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1982.
- Leach, J. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.
- Meritt, M. Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1983.
- Randle, R. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.
- Robinson, D. Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1982.
- Rowley, G. Edmond, Oklahoma, 1982.
- Troy, F. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.
- Turlip, D. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.
- Ware, B. Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1983.
- Williams, P. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.
- Wisniewski, R. Norman, Oklahoma, 1983.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

FORMAL INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

## FORMAL INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

R. E. Carleton, Member, Oklahoma State Board of Education; Spokesperson, Oklahoma Education Association, 1979.

Cleta Deatherage, Member, Oklahoma House of Representatives and Chair, House Appropriations and Budget Committee; Vice Chair, House Appropriations and Budget Committee, 1979, and a Main Author of House Bill 1706.

Dan Draper, Jr., Speaker of the House, Oklahoma House of Representatives; Speaker of the House and Ex Officio Member of all House Committees, 1979, and a Main Author of House Bill 1706.

Ramona Emmons, Assistant Administrator, Teacher Education and Staff Development, Oklahoma State Department of Education.\*

Leslie Fisher, Oklahoma State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

John Folks, Associate Deputy State Superintendent, Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Jim Fried, Member, Oklahoma House of Representatives and Chair, House Education Committee; Chair, House Common Education Committee and Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee, 1979, and a Main Author of House Bill 1706.

Kenneth King, Professor and Associate Director of Teacher Education, Oklahoma State University, and Chair, Oklahoma Professional Standards Board.

Judy Leach, Administrator, Teacher Education and Staff Development, Oklahoma State Department of Education.\*

Mary Merritt, Counselor, Stillwater Public Schools, Member, Oklahoma Professional Standards Board, and Chair, Sub-Committee on Finance, Oklahoma Education Association.

Rodger Randle, Member, Oklahoma State Senate and Chair, Senate Appropriations and Budget Committee; Chair, Senate Education Committee, Co-Chair, Interim Session Joint House-Senate Education Committee, 1979, and Co-Author of House Bill 1706.

Donald Robinson, Dean, College of Education and Director of Teacher Education, Oklahoma State University; Spokesperson for the Oklahoma Association of Colleges of Teacher Education to the Oklahoma Legislature, 1979.

George Rowley, Superintendent, Edmond Public Schools, Spokesperson for Cooperative Council for Oklahoma School Administrators, 1979.

Frosty Troy, Editor, The Oklahoma Observer.

Debbie Turlip, Research Assistant to the Oklahoma Legislature.

Barbara Ware, Past President, Oklahoma Education Association.

Penny Williams, Member, Oklahoma House of Representatives, Chair, Sub-Committee on Common Education.\*

Richard Wisniewski, Dean, College of Education and Director of Teacher Education, University of Oklahoma; Spokesperson for the Oklahoma Association of Colleges of Teacher Education to the Oklahoma Legislature, 1979.

\*Not in present position, May, 1979 through June, 1980.

APPENDIX B

MEMBERS OF THE GLENN SNIDER SUB-COMMITTEE



MEMBERS OF THE GLENN SNIDER SUB-COMMITTEE  
(ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE STATE LEGIS-  
LATURE ON TEACHER EDUCATION, 1979)

Glenn Snider, Professor (Retired), University of Oklahoma.

Curtis W. Bailer, Teacher, Indianola, Oklahoma.

Mike Barlow, Executive Director, Oklahoma Federation of Teachers.

Tony Beaverson, Executive Director, Oklahoma Education Association.

Mary Byrd, Assistant Principal, Shawnee, Oklahoma.

R. E. Carleton, Oklahoma Education Association.

Pat Chambers, Chickasha Public Schools.

James Christian, Director of Secondary Education, Muskogee, Oklahoma.

Bert Corr, Superintendent, Poteau Public Schools.

Weldon Davis, President, Oklahoma Education Association.

Pat Dodge, Teacher, Ardmore, Oklahoma.

Lois Evans, Principal, Moore, Oklahoma.

Ira Eyster, Associate Director, Southwest Center for Human Development, University of Oklahoma.

Pat Flippin, Teacher, Moore, Oklahoma.

Jim Fried, Member, Oklahoma House of Representatives and Chair of the House Common Education Committee

Carol Frosch, Mid-Del Public Schools.

R. Fount Holland, Director, Teacher Certification, Northeastern Oklahoma State University.

Lee Ann Kennedy, Principal, Norman, Oklahoma.

Judy Marchum, Librarian, Norman, Oklahoma.

David Renfro, President, Oklahoma City Federation of Teachers.

Gene Rochelle, Principal, Lawton, Oklahoma.

Bernice Shedrick, Stillwater Public Schools.

Nancy Virtue, Coordinator, Government Relation, Oklahoma Education Association.

APPENDIX C

SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS, 1979 INTERIM  
SESSION JOINT HOUSE-SENATE EDUCATION  
COMMITTEE OF THE OKLAHOMA  
LEGISLATURE

1. State Capitol, 13 August 1979, Oklahoma City.
2. Central State University, 30 August, 1979, Edmond.
3. Southwestern Oklahoma State University, 18 September 1979,  
Weatherford.
4. Oklahoma State University, 25 September 1979, Stillwater,
5. East Central Oklahoma State University, 2 October 1979, Ada.
6. State Capitol, 16 October 1979, Oklahoma City.
7. Cameron University, 19 October 1979, Lawton.
8. Northeastern Oklahoma State University, 6 November 1979,  
Tahlequah.
9. University of Oklahoma, 15 November 1979, Norman.
10. University of Tulsa, 27 November 1979, Tulsa.
11. Northwestern Oklahoma State University, 6 December 1979, Alva.

APPENDIX D

MEMBERS, 1979 INTERIM SESSION JOINT HOUSE-  
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE OF THE  
OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

MEMBERS, 1979 INTERIM SESSION JOINT HOUSE-  
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE OF THE  
OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

House

Jim Fried, Chair

Lonnie L. Abbott

Lloyd Bengston

E. A. Red Caldwell

Helen Cole

Dorothy D. Conaghan

David C. Craighead

Oval H. Cunningham

Ross Duckett

Mike Fair

Charles Gray

James D. Holt

Fred Joiner

Bob Kerr

Robert Milacek

Rollin Reimer

M. David Riggs

Tom T. Stephenson

James B. Townsend

Robert G. Wilson

Senate

Rodger A. Randle, Vice Chair

Bernest Cain

Gilmer Capps

Don Cummins

Leon B. Field\*

James F. Howell

Don Kilpatrick

Norman A. Lamb

John D. Luton

Ernest D. Martin

Robert M. Murphy

Al Terrill

Phil Watson

John W. Young

\*Resigned from the Senate on September 30, 1979.

APPENDIX E  
PARTIAL LIST OF INDIVIDUALS REQUESTED  
TO TESTIFY

PARTIAL LIST OF INDIVIDUALS REQUESTED TO TESTIFY  
BEFORE THE 1979 INTERIM SESSION JOINT HOUSE-  
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE OF THE  
OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Ada Williams, Vice President, National Council of Urban Education Associations, Past President, Dallas Classroom Teachers.

Steve McDonald, Director of School Finance, Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Pat Mayes, President, Normal School Board.

Donald Robinson, Dean, College of Education, Oklahoma State University.

Wessyllynne Simpson, Head, Department of Education, Langston University.

Larry Willis, Superintendent, Stratford Public Schools.

W. R. Altmiller, Dean, School of Education, East Central Oklahoma State University.

Collin Bowen, Dean, School of Education, Southeastern Oklahoma State University.

Guy Robberson, Superintendent, Lindsay Public Schools.

John Elbins, Superintendent, Lawton Public Schools.

Stan Cobb, Director of Teacher Education, State Department of Education.

Ward Williams, Director of Teacher Education, Cameron University.

Bill Patton, Superintendent, Coweta Public Schools.

Major McClure, Dean, College of Behavioral Sciences and Director of Teacher Education, Northeastern Oklahoma State University.

Richard Wisniewski, Dean, College of Education, University of Oklahoma.

Wade Hamm, President, Professional Educators of Norman.

Melvin Platt, Head, School of Music, University of Oklahoma.

Weldon Perrin, Superintendent, Ardmore Public Schools.

Andy Young, Superintendent, Holdenville Public Schools.

Pat Leveridge, President, Noble Teachers Association.



APPENDIX F

AUTHORS, OKLAHOMA HOUSE BILL 1706

AUTHORS, OKLAHOMA HOUSE BILL 1706, AND THEIR  
COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS RELATING TO THAT  
BILL, THIRTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

Main Authors

Cleta Deatherage, Vice Chairman, House Appropriations and Budget Committee, Member, House Higher Education Committee and House-Senate Conference Committee on House Bill 1706.

Dan Draper, Speaker of the House and Ex Officio Member of all House Committees.

Jim Fried, Chairman, House Common Education Committee and Interim Session House-Senate Education Committee, Member, House-Senate Conference Committee on House Bill 1706.

Gene Howard, Senate President Pro Tempore and Ex Officio Member of all Senate Committees.

Co-Authors, Senate

Jimmy Birdsong

Mike Combs

Joe Johnson

Don Kilpatrick, Member, Education Committee

John Luton, Member, Education Committee

Robert Murphy, Member, Education Committee

Rodger Randle, Chairman, Education Committee, Co-Chair, Interim Session House-Senate Education Committee, and Member House-Senate Conference Committee on House Bill 1706.

Gene Stipe, Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee.

Al Terrill, Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee and Education Committee.

Marvin York

Co-Authors, House

Hannah Atkins, Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee and Higher Education Committee.

Jim Barker, member, Appropriations and Budget Committee.

Marvin L. Baughman, Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee.

E. A. Red Caldwell, Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee and  
Common Education Committee.

Charles Cleveland

Helen Cole, Member, Common Education Committee.

David Craighead, Member, Common Education Committee.

Don Denman

Ross Duckett, Member, Common Education Committee.

Don Duke

Mike Fair, Member, Common Education Committee.

Joseph Fitzgibbon, Assistant Majority Floor Whip.

Charles Gray, Member, Common Education Committee.

Frank Harbin

Robert Henry

Cal Hobson, Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee.

T. W. Bill Holaday

James Holt, Member, Common Education Committee.

Robert E. Hopkins

Fred C. Joiner, Member, Common Education Committee.

Bob Kerr, Member, Common Education Committee.

Don McCorkell, Jr., Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee.

Joe R. Manning, Jr., Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee.

Charlie O. Morgan, Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee.

Charles R. Peterson, Majority Whip.

David M. Riggs, Member, Common Education Committee.

Hollis E. Roberts

Willie Rogers, Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee.

Wiley Sparkman

Tom R. Stephenson, Member, Common Education Committee.

Jerry Steward

Stratton Taylor, Member, Common Education Committee.

Mick Thompson

James B. Townsend, Member, Common Education Committee.

Carl Twidwell

George Vaughn

J. D. Whorton, Member, Appropriations and Budget Committee.

Robert G. Wilson, Member, Common Education Committee.

Wayne Winn

APPENDIX G

OKLAHOMA SESSIONS LAW, 1980

Chapter 284  
H. B. 1706

*Be it enacted by the People of the State of Oklahoma:*

**SECTION 1. Teacher consultants—Compensation and salaries <sup>41</sup>**

A. The State Department of Education shall have the authority to allocate funds establishing teacher consultant positions for 1980-1981. Funds allocated for teacher salary increases and teacher consultant stipends for fiscal year 1981 are to provide salary and/or fringe benefit increases for each state teacher according to years of experience and degree in the following schedule. Such increases shall be in addition to the increments mandated by the state in the 1979-1980 Minimum Salary Schedule. Provided, nothing in this act shall prohibit local boards of education from providing increments in addition to those provided by the state. Provided further, funds appropriated by the state for salary increases shall not be used to fund local increments. Provided, the teacher consultant salary shall be considered as extra duty assignment for contractual purposes.

Years of Experience	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Doctor's Degree
Teacher Consultant	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00
0	\$ 325.00	\$ 725.00	\$1,125.00
1	\$ 575.00	\$ 975.00	\$1,375.00
2	\$ 675.00	\$1,075.00	\$1,475.00
3	\$ 775.00	\$1,175.00	\$1,575.00
4	\$ 875.00	\$1,275.00	\$1,675.00
5	\$1,075.00	\$1,475.00	\$1,875.00
6	\$1,075.00	\$1,475.00	\$1,875.00
7	\$1,275.00	\$1,675.00	\$2,075.00
8	\$1,275.00	\$1,675.00	\$2,075.00
9	\$1,475.00	\$1,875.00	\$2,275.00
10	\$1,475.00	\$1,875.00	\$2,275.00
11	\$1,675.00	\$2,075.00	\$2,475.00
12	\$1,675.00	\$2,075.00	\$2,475.00
13	\$1,875.00	\$2,275.00	\$2,675.00
14	\$1,875.00	\$2,275.00	\$2,675.00
15	\$2,075.00	\$2,475.00	\$2,875.00

Such funds are to be allocated on an actual cost basis plus the district's contribution to Federal Insurance Contributions Act (F.I.C.A.) as prescribed by law. Provided, in those districts which do not pay F.I.C.A. payments, only the actual cost of the increase shall be allocated for each state teacher.

B. Provided, further, if the professional staff and the board of education of a school district are using the negotiation process as set out by Oklahoma law, the distribution of the mandated increase may become a negotiable item. Provided, however, that if a majority of the professional staff of a school district has by election approved an agreement with the board of education of the district in lieu of statutory negotiations, the board of education and school administration may work with the duly elected representatives of its professional staff to adopt a salary schedule which meets or exceeds the state minimum. Provided further, that nothing in this act shall prohibit any board of education or school administration from working with a committee elected by classroom teachers for the purpose of determining a salary schedule which meets or exceeds the state minimum.

SECTION 2. 70 O.S.1971, Section 18-114, as last amended by Section 24, Chapter 282, O.S.L.1979 (70 O.S.Supp.1979, Section 18-114), is amended to read as follows:

**§ 18-114. Minimum salaries**

During the school year 1980-81, and thereafter, teachers in the public schools of Oklahoma shall receive in salary and/or fringe benefits no less than the amounts provided in the following schedule:

**MINIMUM SALARY SCHEDULE**

Years of Experience	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Doctor's Degree
0	\$10,000	\$11,000	\$12,000
1	11,050	12,050	13,050
2	11,350	12,350	13,350
3	11,550	12,550	13,550
4	11,850	12,850	13,850
5	12,150	13,150	14,150
6	12,350	13,350	14,350
7	12,650	13,650	14,650
8	12,850	13,850	14,950
9	13,150	14,150	15,150
10	13,350	14,350	15,350
11	13,650	14,650	15,650
12	13,850	14,850	15,850
13	14,150	15,150	16,150
14	14,250	15,250	16,250
15	14,550	15,550	16,550

Any of the degrees referred to herein must be from a college recognized by the State Board of Education. Provided, that the State Board of Education shall accept teaching experience from out-of-state school districts that are accredited by their state board of education or appropriate state accrediting agency. Provided, further, that no board of education shall apply more than five (5) years' active duty in the military service or out-of-state teaching experience as a certified teacher or its equivalent for the purpose of salary increments and retirement. The State Board of Education shall recognize for purposes of certification and salary increments the years of experience of a certified teacher who teaches in the Department of Corrections' educational program beginning with fiscal year 1981. Said provision shall apply whether or not a state of emergency exists or is declared in existence.

The State Board of Education shall submit to the Legislature no later than December 31, 1980, a proposed schedule for the compensation of

teachers for the participation in a district's staff development program. Such compensation schedule shall address only a yearly compensation for a teacher's involvement in the staff development program.

**SECTION 3. In-service teacher education and staff development plans and programs <sup>42</sup>**

Each school district shall receive an appropriate amount of funds for the exclusive purpose of in-service teacher education staff development. Such funds shall be used for in-service teacher education and staff development during the school year 1980-1981. These funds shall be expended for in-service programs and planning staff development programs within guidelines outlined by the Professional Standards Board and as approved and adopted by the State Board of Education. All funds provided local districts after the school year 1980-1981, shall be provided by and subject to the approval of plans submitted to the State Board of Education by each local district no later than July 1, 1981. Such plan shall conform to planning and implementation guidelines outlined by the Professional Standards Board and as approved and adopted by the State Board of Education, including provisions for the development of staff development guidelines in each local district as established by local district committees, as defined in this act, and approved by each local district. Beginning with the school year 1981-1982, the revised plans of each school district for the succeeding year shall be submitted by May 1st of each year.

**SECTION 4. Qualifications of teachers—Intent of Legislature—Exemptions <sup>43</sup>**

It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Legislature to establish qualifications of teachers in the accredited schools of this state through licensing and certification requirements to ensure that the education of the children of Oklahoma will be provided by teachers of demonstrated ability. It is further declared to be the intent of the Legislature that this act shall be in addition to existing laws governing teachers, and nothing herein shall be construed as repealing or amending any protection to teachers prescribed, nor as removing or diminishing any existing power, authority or responsibilities of the local board of education and the State Board of Education not in conflict with the provisions of this act. Non-degreed vocational teachers and school nurses certified under rules and regulations promulgated by the State Board of Education shall be exempt from the provisions of this act, excepting those provisions concerning the staff development programs.

**SECTION 5. Definitions <sup>44</sup>**

As used in this act:

1. "Board" means the State Board of Education;
2. "Licensed teacher" means any person who holds a valid license to teach, issued by the Board in accordance with this act and the rules and regulations of the Board;
3. "Staff development program" means the program mandated by this act for the continuous improvement and enrichment of the certified and licensed teachers of this state;
4. "Teacher education faculty development committee" means the committee recommended by this act for the continuous improvement and enrichment of higher education instructors in the colleges of education;
5. "Department" means the State Department of Education;
6. "Entry-year assistance committee" means a committee in a local school district for the purpose of reviewing the teaching performance of



an entry-year teacher and making recommendations to the Board. An entry-year assistance committee shall consist of a teacher consultant, the principal or an assistant principal of the employing school or an administrator designated by the local board and a teacher educator in a college or school of education of an institution of higher learning, or a teacher educator in a department or school outside the institution's college of education. Provided that, if available, qualified teacher consultants shall have expertise in the teaching field of the entry-year teacher and, if possible, the higher education members of the entry-year assistance committee shall have expertise and experience in the teaching field of the entry-year teacher. However, in all cases, at least one member of the entry-year assistance committee shall have expertise and experience in the teaching field of the entry-year teacher;

7. "Entry-year teacher" means any licensed teacher who is employed in an accredited school to serve as a teacher under the guidance and assistance of a teacher consultant and an entry-year assistance committee. Any such person shall have completed the program of the college or school of education of the accredited institution of higher learning from which the person has been graduated, and shall have passed a curriculum examination in those subject areas of approval in which the entry-year teacher seeks certification;

8. "Certified teacher" or "certificated teacher" means any teacher who has been issued a certificate by the Board in accordance with this act and the rules and regulations of the Board;

9. "Teacher consultant" means any teacher holding a standard certificate who is employed in a school district to serve as a teacher and who has been appointed to provide guidance and assistance to an entry-year teacher employed by the school district. A teacher consultant shall be a classroom teacher and have a minimum of two (2) years of classroom teaching experience as a certified teacher. No certified teacher shall serve as a teacher consultant more than two (2) consecutive years, although such certified teacher may serve as a teacher consultant for more than two (2) years.

A teacher consultant shall be selected by the principal from a list submitted by the bargaining unit where one exists. In the absence of a bargaining agent, the teachers shall elect the names to be submitted. No teacher may serve as a teacher consultant for more than one entry-year teacher at a time; and

10. "Instructor" means any individual who is employed in a teaching capacity in an institution of higher education, approved by the Board for the preparation of education personnel.

**SECTION 6. Screening of college applicants—Criteria for approval of teacher education programs—Intent of Legislature—Annual report <sup>45</sup>**

A. The Board shall require the Department and the Professional Standards Board to work with any designated authority from the schools or colleges of education of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education for the development of a plan to strengthen the screening requirements of college student applicants for admission into the education colleges of the schools of higher education. Criteria for the approval of teacher education programs in Oklahoma colleges and universities shall include, but not be limited to, substantial evidence that persons who enter teacher education programs demonstrate:

1. Competency in the oral and written use of the English language; and
2. A minimum grade point average as established by the Professional Standards Board.

Criteria adopted by the Board shall also require that the teacher candidate satisfactorily demonstrate his ability to meet criteria established pursuant to this act at the completion of the teacher education program and provide evidence of having worked with children or youth in a variety of situations.

Criteria shall also include a greater emphasis upon field work in accredited schools by prospective teachers under the supervision of higher education instructors.

It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Legislature that the Board work with the State Regents for Higher Education and the various universities in establishing a procedure whereby all college of education instructors continue their education during their tenure at a state university to ensure that the future teachers of this state are taught by professional educators fully trained in their area of expertise. Each approved program of teacher education shall have a teacher education faculty development committee that shall include at least one public school classroom teacher as a member. The committee shall write and review faculty development plans for each faculty member directly involved in the teacher education process. Individual faculty development plans shall be submitted to the Professional Standards Board as a normal part of the five-year process of teacher education program review.

It is further declared to be the intent of the Legislature that such faculty development plans provide alternative means of education including, but not limited to:

1. In-service training programs;
2. Higher education courses;
3. Exchange programs with public school classroom teachers, administrators, and other school personnel; and
4. Programs whereby all full-time college of education faculty members, including the Dean of the college of education, are required once every five (5) years to serve in a state accredited public school the equivalent of at least one-half day per week for one semester in responsibilities related to their respective college of education teaching fields.

All state-supported public school systems shall participate in the aforementioned programs when so requested by the Board.

B. On or before July 1, 1981, the Board shall adopt rules and regulations requiring specific improvements to strengthen the screening of student applicants and field activity and placement as set out in subsection A of this section, where such rules and regulations shall be reviewed and amended or readopted by the Board at least once every five (5) years.

C. To assist the Board in setting specific requirements as set out in subsections A and B of this section, the Department shall annually prepare a statistical report showing the percentage of students from each of the Oklahoma institutions of higher learning who have passed or failed the curriculum examinations for certification which are set out in Section 9 of this act. The annual report shall show the percentages for each college or university separately and shall be distributed to each member of the Board and to the Legislature, at a time to be established by the Board.

#### SECTION 7. Licensure and certification—Qualifications <sup>46</sup>

A. After January 31, 1982, the board of education of each school district shall employ and contract in writing, as required in Section 6-101 of Title 70, only with persons certified to teach by the Board or with entry-year teachers, in accordance with this act, except as otherwise provided by law.

B. The Board shall issue a license to teach to any person who:

1. Has successfully completed all college training and courses required by the Board;
2. Has been graduated from an accredited institution of higher education;
3. Has met all other requirements as may be established by the Board;
4. Has made the necessary application and paid a curriculum examination fee in an amount prescribed by the Board. Such curriculum examination fee shall be paid to the Board and be deposited to the Teachers' Curriculum Examination Revolving Fund created by this act; and
5. Has received a passing grade in the curriculum examination in accordance with this act.

C. The Board shall issue a certificate to teach to any person who:

1. Holds a license to teach in accordance with this act;
2. Has served a minimum of one (1) school year as an entry-year teacher;
3. Has made the necessary application and paid the certification fee as prescribed by the Board; and
4. Has been recommended for certification by the entry-year assistance committee; or
5. Holds an out-of-state certificate and meets standards set by the Board.

D. Any person holding a valid certificate, issued prior to February 1, 1982, shall be a certified teacher for purposes of this act, subject to any staff development requirements prescribed by this act or the Board.

**SECTION 8. Entry-year assistance program—Persons eligible—Assistance committee—Compensation and salaries—Special committee<sup>47</sup>**

A. On or before May 31, 1981, the Department shall develop an Entry-year Assistance Program which shall be approved by the Board. Such program shall be developed in consultation with the teacher education institutions and the local boards of education. Such program shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Guidelines for entry-year teacher positions in the local school districts and assignments thereto;
2. Requirements and guidelines for selection and appointment of teacher consultants which must include any requirements specified in this act;
3. Guidelines for the appointment and functions of an entry-year assistance committee; and
4. An appropriate in-service program for the entry-year teacher.

B. Except as otherwise provided in this act, no person shall be certified to teach in the accredited schools of this state, unless such person:

1. Has completed one (1) school year of teaching service as an entry-year teacher in the Entry-year Assistance Program as set out in this act;
2. Has been recommended for certification by the appointed entry-year assistance committee after completion of not less than one or more than two school years of entry-year teaching service; and
3. Has received a passing grade on the curriculum examination as prescribed by the Board.

C. Any person who has been issued a license to teach by the Board may be employed in an accredited school as an entry-year teacher upon appointment by the local school board.

D. Upon placement of a licensed teacher in an entry-year teacher position, the local board shall appoint the entry-year assistance committee members, as prescribed in this act, who shall have the following duties:

1. Meet with the entry-year teacher as may be required by the Board;
2. Work with the entry-year teacher to assist in all matters concerning classroom management and in-service training for that teacher;
3. Provide for meaningful parental input as one criterion in evaluating the entry-year teacher's performance;
4. Upon completion of one (1) school year of entry-year assistance, make recommendations to the Board as to whether the entry-year teacher should be issued a certificate or whether such entry-year teacher shall be required to serve as an entry-year teacher for one (1) additional school year. In the event an entry-year teacher serves a second year, the recommendation of the entry-year assistance committee to the Board after the second year shall be for either certification or noncertification.

Upon recommendation from the entry-year assistance committee for noncertification or an additional year in the Entry-year Assistance Program, such entry-year assistance committee shall, upon request of the entry-year teacher, supply a list to said entry-year teacher of the reasons for such recommendation. Said list of reasons shall remain confidential, except as otherwise provided by the entry-year teacher.

In the event an entry-year teacher is required to serve an additional year in the Entry-year Assistance Program, such entry-year teacher shall not be required to be under the supervision of the same entry-year assistance committee, or any member of the committee, which supervised the entry-year teacher during the initial year in the Program; and

5. In the event the committee recommendation to the Board is for certification, an entry-year assistance committee shall also recommend a staff development program for the entry-year teacher, designed to strengthen the entry-year teacher's teaching skills in any area identified by the committee.

All entry-level years shall count toward salary and fringe benefit adjustments and tenure.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate are requested to appoint a special committee of three (3) members from each House to deliver to the Legislature one (1) year after the effective date of the provisions of this act a report evaluating the effectiveness of this act in accomplishing its objectives and recommending necessary changes.

#### **SECTION 9. Curriculum examinations—Temporary certificates <sup>48</sup>**

A. The Department, with recommendations of the Professional Standards Board, shall develop curriculum examinations in the various subject areas and grade levels for purposes of ensuring academic achievement of each licensed teacher in the area such teacher is certified to teach, as prescribed by the Board.

Prior to January 1, 1982, the Board shall adopt various curriculum examinations as required by this act. The Board shall, before adopting such examinations, consult with classroom teachers and higher education instructors in developing examinations which shall test the achievement of teacher candidates in every area of certification offered by the Board. The Board, consistent with the purposes of this section, shall develop rules and procedures to guarantee the confidentiality of examinations.

B. Following completion of the junior year or after having completed ninety (90) college credit hours each teacher candidate shall be eligible

to take the curriculum examination. No teacher candidate shall be eligible for licensing until having passed the curriculum examination. Certification shall be limited to those subject areas of approval in which the licensed teacher has received a passing grade on the curriculum examination.

A teacher candidate may take the curriculum examination as many times as he or she desires, subject to any limit imposed by the Board.

C. A teacher may be certified in as many areas as such teacher meets the necessary requirements of the Board and has successfully passed the examination.

D. The Board shall offer the first curriculum examinations on or before February 1, 1982, and thereafter shall offer the curriculum examinations at least two times per calendar year on dates to be established by the Board.

E. Nothing in this act shall restrict the right of the Board to issue a temporary or provisional certificate, as needed. Provided, however, prior to the issuance of a temporary certificate, the local district shall document substantial efforts to employ a teacher who holds a provisional or standard certificate in the teaching field. In the event a district is unable to hire an individual meeting this criteria, the district shall document efforts to employ an individual with a provisional or standard certificate in another curricular area with academic preparation in the field of need. Only after these alternatives have been exhausted will the district be allowed to employ an individual meeting minimum standards as established by the State Board of Education for the issuance of temporary certificates. By February 1, 1982, the Department shall submit a plan to substantially reduce or eliminate the number of temporary certificates issued.

**SECTION 10. Staff development procedure—Intent of Legislature 49**

It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Legislature to establish a staff development procedure whereby all teachers of the state continue their education beyond initial licensing and certification by the state to ensure that the children of the state are taught by professional educators, fully trained in their areas of expertise. Furthermore, such staff development procedure shall provide alternative means of education, including one or more of the following: In-service programs, higher education courses, or other alternative means of education designed to help teachers enrich their professional abilities.

**SECTION 11. Staff development programs—Staff development committee—Content of program—Approval—Failure to meet requirements 50**

A. Prior to July 1, 1981, the local boards of education of this state shall establish staff development programs for the certified and licensed teachers and administrators employed by said board. Such programs shall be adopted by each local school board based upon recommendations of a staff development committee appointed by the school board for said district. Such staff development committee shall include classroom teachers, administrators and parents of the local school district and shall consult with higher education instructors. A majority of the members of the staff development committee shall be composed of classroom teachers. The teacher members shall be selected from a list of names submitted by the bargaining agent where one exists. In the absence of a bargaining agent, the teachers will elect a list of names to be submitted to the local board of education. The programs adopted may include, but not be limited to:

1. In-service training programs; and
2. Higher education courses.

Such programs shall be submitted for approval to the Board. No local school shall receive state funds for staff development until such time as said local board's program has been approved by the Board.

Beginning with the school year 1981-1982, the revised plans of each local school board shall be submitted by May 1st of each year.

B. Any licensed and certified teacher in this state shall be required by the local school board to meet the staff development requirements established by said local school board, or established through the negotiation process. Failure of any teacher to meet local school board staff development requirements may be grounds for nonrenewal of such teacher's contract by the local school board. Such failure may also be grounds for nonconsideration of salary increments affecting said teacher.

**SECTION 12. Teacher Register <sup>51</sup>**

A. The Board shall cause the Department to prepare on or before May 15, 1981, and maintain a preliminary Teacher Register for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such register. The Teacher Register shall include the name, address, type of certificate, college academic major and each certified teaching subject of each and every person licensed and certified to teach by the Board. The Department shall initiate and conduct a pilot program between July 1, 1980, and July 1, 1981, which shall establish a job availability list for a limited number of local school districts as prescribed by the Board. Such program shall include a cross-section of the state's local districts. By December 31, 1981, the Board shall submit to the Legislature a summary of the pilot program, its strengths and weaknesses and the Board's recommendation as to whether a job availability list should be established as a permanent basis for the entire state.

B. The Teacher Register shall be maintained at the state offices of the Department, and be open to public inspection during regular office hours. Copies of the Teacher Register shall be provided to local school boards upon request.

C. On or before May 15 of each calendar year, the Department shall revise and update the Teacher Register.

D. The Board may prescribe any requirements, as it deems proper, for the preparation and revision of the Teacher Register and the job availability list, and for providing copies thereof to the requesting local school boards. Provided, a local board of education shall not be charged in excess of actual duplicating costs, without labor services, for copies of the Teacher Register or job availability list.

**SECTION 13. Teachers' Curriculum Examination Revolving Fund <sup>52</sup>**

There is hereby created in the State Treasury a revolving fund for the State Board of Education, to be designated the "Teachers' Curriculum Examination Revolving Fund". The fund shall consist of curriculum examination fees paid to the Board pursuant to statutory authority. The revolving fund shall be a continuing fund not subject to fiscal year limitations and shall be under the control and management of the administrative authority of the State Board of Education. Expenditures from said fund shall be made to maintain the curriculum examination process as set out in Section 9 of this act and without legislative appropriation. Warrants for expenditure shall be drawn by the State Treasurer on claims signed by an authorized employee or employees of the State Board of Education and approved by the Director of State Finance.

**SECTION 14. Citizens Commission on Education Function—Membership—Reports—Assistance** <sup>53</sup>

There is hereby created the Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education, which shall have the primary function of meeting the requirements specified in the agreement between the National Conference of State Legislatures and the State Legislative Council providing for the Oklahoma Legislature School Finance Project. The Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education shall be composed of twenty-seven (27) members.

One member of the Citizens Commission shall be the Chancellor of the State Regents for Higher Education, or his designee; and one member of the Citizens Commission shall be the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, or his designee. Thirteen (13) members of the Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education shall be appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Oklahoma State Senate no later than July 1, 1980, one of whom shall be designated by the President Pro Tempore to serve as the Vice Chairman of the Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education. Twelve (12) members of the Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives no later than July 1, 1980, one of whom shall be designated by the Speaker to serve as Chairman of the Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education. The Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education shall commence on July 1, 1980, and shall complete its work by December 31, 1981. Progress reports shall be issued by the Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate as are necessary, and a final report shall be issued by the Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate no later than January 1, 1982. The Oklahoma State Department of Education and all local school districts in Oklahoma are hereby directed to assist in providing information to the Oklahoma Citizens Commission on Education in the performance of the Commission's work throughout the project.

**SECTION 15.** 70 O.S.1971, Section 1-116, as amended by Section 1, Chapter 193, O.S.L.1973 (70 O.S.Supp.1979, Section 1-116), is amended to read as follows:

**§ 1-116. Positions in school system—Definitions**

As used in this act:

1. **Teacher:** Any person who is employed to serve as district superintendent, county superintendent, principal, supervisor, counselor, librarian, school nurse or classroom teacher, or in any other instructional, supervisory, or administrative capacity, is defined as a teacher. Such person shall not be deemed qualified unless he or she holds a valid certificate or license, issued by and in accordance with the rules and regulations of the State Board of Education, to perform the particular services for which he or she is employed.
2. **Superintendent:** A district superintendent of schools shall be the executive officer of the board of education and the administrative head of the school system of a district maintaining an accredited high school, provided he holds an administrator's certificate recognized by the State Board of Education.
3. **Principal:** A principal shall be any person other than a district superintendent of schools having supervisory or administrative authority over any school or school building having two or more teachers. A teaching principal shall be a principal who devotes at least one-half the time school is in session to classroom teaching. Provided, teaching principals shall not be required to hold administrative certificates.

4. For purposes of complying with the State Aid Law and other statutes which apportion money on the basis of teaching units or the number of teachers employed or qualified, all persons holding proper certificates or licenses and connected in any capacity with the instruction of pupils shall be designated as "teachers."

5. **Entry-year Teacher:** An entry-year teacher is any licensed teacher who is employed in a local school to serve as a classroom teacher under the guidance and assistance of a teacher consultant and an entry-year assistance committee. Any such person shall have completed the program of the college or school of education of the accredited institution of higher learning from which the person has been graduated.

6. **Student Teacher:** A student teacher is any student who is enrolled in an institution of higher learning approved by the State Board of Education for teacher training and who is jointly assigned by such institution of higher learning and a school district's board of education to perform practice teaching under the direction of a regularly employed and certified teacher. A student teacher, while serving a nonsalaried internship under the supervision of a certified teacher, shall be accorded the same protection of the laws as that accorded the certified teacher.

7. A school nurse employed full time by a board of education shall be a registered nurse licensed by the Oklahoma State Board of Nurse Registration and Nursing Education, and certified the same as a teacher by the State Department of Education. Provided that any person who is employed as a full-time nurse in any school district in Oklahoma, but who is not registered on the effective date of this act, may continue to serve in the same capacity, however such person shall, under rules and regulations adopted by the State Board of Education, attend classes in nursing and prepare to become registered.

A school nurse employed by a board of education shall be accorded the same protection of laws and all other benefits accorded a certified teacher.

**SECTION 16.** 70 O.S.1971, Section 6-125, is amended to read as follows:

**§ 6-125. Professional Standards Board—Functions and responsibilities**

The Professional Standards Board shall provide leadership for the improvement of teacher education and standards for the certification and licensing of teachers and other educational personnel in Oklahoma and shall serve in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Education in all matters of professional standards, licensing and certification. The Professional Standards Board is charged with such responsibilities as reviewing approved programs of teacher education and of recommending new programs, reviewing current certificate and licensing requirements and recommending standards for new certificates, encouraging studies and research designed to improve teacher education, including continuing education of teachers, and making recommendations to the State Board of Education.

**SECTION 17. Persons subject to licensure and certification procedures** <sup>54</sup>

All students graduating from an accredited institution of higher education approved by the State Board of Education for the preparation of educational personnel after January 31, 1982, shall be subject to the certification and licensing procedures established in Sections 4 through 11 of this act. All students graduating from an accredited college of education prior to February 1, 1982, shall be subject to the certification requirements in effect before the effective date of this act.



**SECTION 18. Cooperative programs** <sup>55</sup>

Nothing in this act shall prohibit two or more school districts from establishing, cooperatively, programs to carry out the provisions of this act, subject to rules and regulations of the Board.

**SECTION 19. Adoption of rules, regulations and curriculum examinations** <sup>56</sup>

In developing all rules and regulations as required by this act, the Board shall not adopt said rules and regulations until such time as each has been submitted to the Professional Standards Board for review and recommendations, nor shall it adopt curriculum examinations until such time as they have been reviewed by the Professional Standards Board in format and in general content. The Board shall consider said recommendations before approving rules, regulations and curriculum examinations.

**SECTION 20. Emergencies—Investigation and evaluation** <sup>57</sup>

The State Board of Education is authorized to investigate and evaluate emergency situations which may exist in individual school districts that prohibit compliance with the provisions or intent of this act. If it is determined by the State Board of Education that an emergency exists, said Board may give special consideration on an individual case basis.

**SECTION 21. Codification**

Sections 3 through 14 and 17 through 20 of this act shall be codified in the Oklahoma Statutes as Sections 6-150 through 6-165 of Title 70, unless there is created a duplication in numbering.

**SECTION 22. Severability**

The provisions of this act are severable and if any part or provision hereof shall be held void the decision of the court so holding shall not affect or impair any of the remaining parts or provisions of this act.

Approved June 10, 1980. Emergency.

2  
VITA

Jean Agnes Luckowski

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: OKLAHOMA HOUSE BILL 1706: A CASE STUDY OF CONSERVATIVE  
EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Major Field: Curriculum and Instruction

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, June 25, 1952,  
the daughter of John and Teresa (Landoll) Luckowski.

Education: Graduated from Mount Saint Mary High School, Okla-  
homa City, Oklahoma, May, 1970; received the Bachelor of  
Arts degree in Social Studies Education from the Univer-  
sity of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, May, 1974; received  
the Master of Arts degree in History from the University  
of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, July, 1979; completed the  
requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Okla-  
homa State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, May, 1983.

Professional Experience: Classroom teacher, secondary social  
studies, Darrouzett High School, Darrouzett, Texas, 1976-  
1978; classroom teacher, secondary social studies, Edmond  
Mid-High School, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1978-1980; graduate  
teaching assistant, educational foundations and secondary  
social studies, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater,  
Oklahoma, 1980-1983.

Professional Organizations: Organization of American Histori-  
ans, American Educational Research Association.