Admissions Metrics
A Red Herring in Educator Preparation?

Amy Lynn Dee
Brenda M. Morton
George Fox University

Introduction

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) has new accreditation standards. Standard 3.2 focuses on admission standards that indicate high academic achievement. This standard requires that:

> The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, and a group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE: is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017; is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020. (CAEP, 2013 p. 8)

Additionally, the education preparation provider must demonstrate the use of multiple measures as evidence of that achievement. Many graduate level initial licensure programs, such as the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), collect data on state-mandated exams for licensure, but forego other standardized exams reserved for incoming undergraduates or

Amy Lynn Dee and Brenda Morton are associate professors in the School of Education at George Fox University, Newberg, Oregon. E-mail addresses: adee@georgefox.edu & bmorton@georgefox.edu

applicants to terminal degree programs. For that reason, ACT and SAT scores are not exemplars of the MAT demographic, which could cause difficulty in meeting the standard for those programs. Furthermore, many applicants graduated several years prior to applying to licensure programs and GPA data may not adequately reflect the acumen of such candidates. GRE scores have normally been reserved for applicants to degrees other than an MAT, which is more closely related to a fifth year teacher licensure program. In fact, in the state in which the research took place, not one institution requires the GRE for admissions as revealed by an examination of each one for entrance requirements.

While CAEP believes this new standard will result in higher quality candidates, overwhelming research indicates that traditional measures, such as standardized test scores and GPAs, are not accurate predictors of whether or not a potential new educator holds the necessary skills to teach successfully (Riggs & Riggs, 1991). Therefore, educator preparation programs, pressured by accrediting organizations, continue to use them with questionable results. The achievement gap continues to plague society; while changing demographics, curriculum and work culture continue to plague educators. Little has changed over the years. Rather than looking at sociological factors that influence P-12 academic performance, legislators and grassroots organizations have turned to educator preparation as the cause for the failures in American schools as understood through global scholastic comparisons. Not only do such comparisons fail to account for numerous variables such as poverty, access to social services, family structure and culture, but they falsely assert that some sort of overhaul in the higher educational system will solve decades old issues that continue to plague the educational system. Now, in addition to grassroots movements such as National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) along with legislators citing metrics that have no bearing on the real issue, we have CAEP and state licensing agencies following suit.

This study took place at an institution that uses a group assessment model (Byrnes, Kiger, & Shechtman, 2003) in addition to traditional metrics to determine admissions to an MAT educator preparation program. In this practice, faculty review and rate the files and transcripts of potential candidates to determine whether or not the candidate may advance to the group assessment. Shechtman (1992) found it was easier for raters, assessing potential candidates for a teacher education program, to assess candidates holistically. Specifically, Shechtman considered oral communication, human relationships, and leadership skills in his study. A few descriptors for these characteristics were operationalized as follows: "Oral communication: clarity and organization of thought. Human relationships: warmth, friendliness. Leadership: dynamism, alertness" (p.

34). These three characteristics align with the institutional conceptual framework where this research took place. The conceptual framework is presented as: *Think Critically* (verbal), *Promote Justice* (interpersonal), and *Transform Practice* (leadership). Complete candidate files that include passing basic skills scores, an essay, and letters of recommendations are advanced to the six to eight person group assessment. Candidates in this process introduce themselves, discuss an education quote, and engage in an activity where they determine the winners of a fictional scholarship award. During this last activity, candidates are told that there is no "right answer," but if a candidate insists, without rationale, upon awarding the scholarship to the White straight-A female, as opposed to the fictional Puerto Rican father who has gone back to college after earning a GED, low scores are recorded on a rubric for *Promoting Justice*. All faculty are trained to systematize the rating process and scores on the group assessment rubric are archived in the data repository for program approval and accreditation purposes.

In this educator preparation admission model, candidates are far more likely to receive denial letters for low scores on the group assessment than for a low GPA. Interestingly, the diverse fictional characters in the scholarship activity exemplify the candidates we want in our programs and the very candidates CAEP Standard 3.2 will deny.

This research study was conducted to answer the following questions:

1. Is there any relationship between admission GPA and the final clinical practice evaluation for teacher preparation candidates?

2. Is gender a predictor of final evaluation scores?

Literature Review

The literature review focuses on three topics related to the research and the suppositions behind CAEP Standard 3.2. The section on admissions metrics reviews literature on traditional measures that determine entrance to educator preparation programs. Issues of inequity in admissions to higher education, and the difficulty diverse students have with standardized tests follows the literature on admission measures. Finally, the literature review presents a section on relevant measures used for admissions as well as predicting teaching success.

Admissions Metrics

Six decades ago, Magee (1952) made the statement that colleges and universities should "select with care those young aspirants who are

admitted to a teacher education program (p.168) and went on to say that the applicant be examined for general health and physical characteristics suited for the profession. While educator preparation programs generally do not screen for physical characteristics in the year 2014, institutions have extensive policies for effectively selecting and admitting quality candidates (Casey & Childs, 2011; Dejnozka & Smiley, 1983; Mikitovics & Crehan 2002). Selecting candidates with care becomes critical in a time when higher education takes the blame for teachers who fail once they enter the profession, who leave after the first few years of inservice teaching, (Haberman, 2012), or who are subjected to censure for failing to demonstrate adequate student growth on standardized tests (Barile, 2013; Ravitch, 2010).

Academic metrics have long been the primary determinant for admissions to educator preparation programs (Casey & Childs, 2011; Dejnozka & Smiley, 1983; DeLuca, 2012; Nunney, Fiala & Lewis, 1963). Scores from standardized exams such as SAT and ACT along with GPAs offer ease in the comparison of potential candidates. Unfortunately, this practice persists despite broad research demonstrating little, if any, correlation between successful teaching and grades or scores on standardized exams (McNeal & Lawrence, 2009; Ackley, Fallon & Brouwer, 2007; Byrnes, Kiger & Shechtman, 2003). McNeal & Lawrence write, "An analysis of college GPA does not appear to directly correlate with the candidates' ability to pass the Praxis II" (p. 7.). Even though educator preparation institutions have used the GPA for admission to programs for some time, the claims that a high GPA translates into effective teaching remain suspect. The work of Byrnes, Kiger and Shechtman (2003) offers a method to assess each factor and their research indicates that no correlation exists between standard admission metrics and candidate success. Ingles (2010) found similar results in a study of 31 teacher candidates attending a small private teacher preparation program validating the work of previous study.

While some institutions have focused on developing methods and programs to mentor and remediate failing candidates, such as longer field experiences (Kent, 2005) others (Vavrus, 2002) posit that institutions ought to concentrate on selecting candidates with qualities leading to success. Some institutions have elaborate admissions procedures that entail several pieces of evidence that suggest future success in the program and field of teaching (Kosnik, Brown, & Beck, 2005). Kosnik, Brown and Beck have also found that prior academic success may indicate success in an educator preparation program, contradicting older research by Riggs and Riggs (1991) who found little connection between GPA and program performance. Additionally, some researchers (Pohan & Ward, 2011) question the use of the standardized exams required for

licensure as predictors of successful teaching. In their study of 68 teacher candidates, Byrnes, Kiger, & Shechtuman (2003) found that group interviews were a more accurate predictor of student performance in the teacher preparation program than academic criteria such as a GPA.

With accrediting organizations and governmental representatives applying increased pressure on educator preparation providers to "fix" the failures within the public education system, institutions must define those qualities in potential candidates that lead to genuine and lasting success in the teaching field. Leading researchers have identified qualities they deem necessary for success, and those indicators range from cognitive abilities to character traits (Byrnes, Kiger, & Shechtman, 2003; Caskey, Peterson, & Temple, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 2000). Defining exact measures of a range of qualities indicative of success remains problematic in the admissions process for many institutions and "admissions mistakes" are often carried through a program by well-meaning supervisors who, as Magee (1952) said some 60 years ago, are hesitant to fail preservice candidates. What was true long ago holds true today, but in this current climate, we have no room for mediocrity in education programs and thus, we must choose both the metrics and candidates with care.

Inequity

In the United States, teachers generally hold a bachelor's degree and often a master's degree. According to The United States Census Bureau, as of March, 2011, only 30.4% of adults aged 25 or older had completed a bachelor's degree (2012). This figure demonstrates the limited population from which teacher education preparation institutions can draw. Given the limited population, further restrictions set forth by accrediting agencies may very well reduce the availability of trained educators, thus unwittingly perpetuating academic failure and the achievement gap. In addition, CAEP may overlook the value of a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university by requiring a GRE for an educator preparation program at the MAT level. Unlike the M.Ed., the MAT mimics a fifth-year teacher licensure program and many candidates come directly into an MAT program after completing a bachelor's degree in a content area, thus never taking the GRE. These programs were established for candidates who held a bachelor's degree but did not complete education courses as an undergraduate student. Because the courses are similar to those in an undergraduate program, many consider the MAT as a professional preparation program as opposed to an academic master's degree.

Research indicates that generally, standardized exam metrics mar-

ginalize under-represented populations due to the fact the exams reflect the majority culture (Lomas, West, Harmon, Viator, & Madaus, 1995). The study done by Bennett, McWhorter, and Kuykendall (2006) found the Professional Assessment for Beginning Teachers test (PRAXIS I) to be an "inequitable admissions tool" (p. 531). Furthermore, a longitudinal study analyzing 2001-2008 graduates from a teacher preparation program revealed that over one third of the students who graduated were "not working as certified teachers based solely on the fact that they have not passed the PRAXIS II exam in their content areas" (McNeal & Lawrence, 2009, p. 7). These students are all African Americans who all graduated from an NCATE approved, as well as a state approved, teacher education program (McNeal & Lawrence, 2009).

Current practice of admitting candidates perpetuates the widening gap between P-12 student demographics and educator demographics. For example, Darling-Hammond (2012) claims that in Oregon alone, the gap between Oregon's minority students and minority teachers jumped from 15.2% to 27.26% between 2001-2011. According to the American Psychological Association (2007), standardized testing becomes a barrier to admissions and program completion because "when test results are used inappropriately or as a single measure of performance, they can have unintended adverse consequences" (para 1). The move to place greater emphasis on standardized exams exacerbates the problem of low recruitment of minority candidates into teacher education programs (Zapata, 1988). In a qualitative study by Bennett, McWhorter, and Kuykendall (2006) involving 44 non-White candidates, the researchers determined "Praxis I as it is currently used in most settings, is an inequitable TEP admission tool…" (p. 567). The subjects in the study disclosed ways in which the standardized exams served as a barrier to teaching.

An extensive study conducted by Educational Testing Service revealed substantial differences between White candidate performance and Black candidate performance on Praxis I and II exams (Nettles, Scatton, Steinberg, & Tyler, 2011). Furthermore, the study maintains that the gaps mirror that between White and Black test-takers of the SAT and GRE (2011). While this study focused on the discrepancy between Black and White students, it must be noted that Latino students also struggle with standardized exams. Contreas (2005) conducted an in-depth study using Student Descriptive Questionnaire data from the College Entrance Examination Board, comparing 10 years of SAT scores. The study supports previous research concerning low test scores from the Latino population; the study also offers a possible connection between low scores, first generation status, and parental education levels. Contreas found that 70% of Mexican American test takers with

first-generation status in 2003 had parental education levels that are consistently lower than other ethnic groups, suggesting that lack of experience with higher education in the home contributes to a difficulty with standardized exams.

Relevant Measures

As noted earlier, in their study of 68 teacher candidates, Byrnes, Kiger, and Shechtman (2003) found that group assessments were a more accurate predictor of student performance in the teacher preparation program than academic criteria such as the GPA. Their study focused on the use of 90-minute sessions to evaluate candidates' ability to express themselves clearly, their interpersonal skills, and their ability for leadership. Shechtman (1992) found that the group assessment procedure effectively predicted teacher success in Israel as far as five years after graduation from a teacher preparation program. Haberman (1995) used structured interviews to select beginning teachers of which all determinants centered on personal and professional qualities. Haberman pairs both an interview with observation in the selection of beginning teachers as opposed to GPA or standardized tests. This practices results in less than a 5% error rate in the selection process.

Smith and Pratt (1996) studied one teacher preparation institution that sought applications procedures that would yield the strongest candidates at admission, and describe what they have found to be an effective and best predictor of occupational success: biodata. In their graduate admissions process, applicants are required to construct a personal statement (biodata) in which they describe the reasons they wish to pursue a teaching profession. This statement includes background and life experiences relevant to the teaching field. In addition to the personal statement, each candidate received an academic score that includes points for completing a bachelor's degree and master's degree, and scores from the personal statement to create a total score. They found that the practice of considering both the academic and personal statement in the final admissions decision resulted in an effective admission metric. The practice of written profiles was also found to be effective by Kosnik, Brown and Beck (2005). They found that reading and evaluating written profiles assisted their teacher preparation program in selecting high quality students with attributes identified in effective teachers and with the potential for continued growth throughout the program.

In a study of 174 preservice teachers, Krebs and Torrez (2011) found that teacher candidates identified the following characteristics necessary for success: motivation/initiative, professionalism, teacher dispositions,

personal characteristics, and knowledge. The researchers note that the characteristic of knowledge was the least mentioned during the study. The case study done by Hochstetler (2014) confirmed the importance of dispositions in teaching success. Those included collaboration, honesty/integrity, respect, emotional maturity, reflection, flexibility and responsibility. Hillman, Rothermel, and Scarano (2006), in recognition of the importance of dispositions, created an instrument, reviewed by faculty, that was field-tested to assess the dispositions of teacher candidates. They created a 44-item survey, grouped in seven categories: " (a) responsibility for learning, (b) interpersonal skills, (c) professionalism, (d) effective use of time and resources, (e) communication skills, (f) higher level thinking skills, and (g) collaborative skills" (237). Their research supports the importance of dispositions in teaching success. Furthermore, Rike, and Sharp (2008) asked 125 school principals to rank dispositions of teachers, centered on values, attitudes and beliefs. In addition, an extensive study conducted by Yu-Chu (2006) concluded that in fact, it was positive personal traits that determined a preservice teacher's ability to master teaching skills.

Given the research that supports GPA and standardized tests as irrelevant to determine teaching success and inequitable for diverse candidates, this research examines the correlation between GPA scores and the success of teacher licensure candidates in the clinical practice portion of their program. The purpose of the study is to demonstrate that CAEP Standard 3.2 lacks a focus on qualities and dispositions candidates must possess to teach effectively and relies solely on metrics gleaned from standardized exams and GPAs. The data from one NCATE accredited institution in the Pacific Northwest along with the existing literature gives cause for additional criticisms of the ability of CAEP Standard 3.2 to increase candidate quality in the area of effective teaching.

Method

Research was conducted to explore relationships between admission GPA, gender, and the final clinical practice evaluation for teacher preparation candidates. We tried to establish whether or not a clear relationship existed between data on admitted student GPAs and their final clinical practice evaluations, which are completed by the cooperating teacher. To answer this question, an analysis was conducted on candidates admitted into a teacher preparation program from 2011 to 2013. The final evaluation completed by the cooperating teacher serves as the assessment to which we compared candidates' GPA, because the scores come from experts working in the field as opposed to professors who taught the preservice teachers.

Context and Participants

This study was conducted at a nationally accredited private educator preparation program having completed their second accreditation visit in 2013. The institution admits candidates into three different formats of an MAT program as well as supporting a smaller undergraduate teacher preparation program. The state protocol for program approval mirrors that of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

The teacher preparation program uses a group assessment process (Byrnes, Kiger, & Shechtman, 2003), in addition to traditional metrics, with candidates applying to the MAT initial licensure programs. Faculty review and rate the files of potential candidates to determine whether or not the candidate may advance to the group assessment. At this point, the files contain transcripts, the GPA, letters of recommendation and an essay on an educational topic. Unless substantial concerns surface in the essay or letters of recommendation, candidates are invited to the group assessment. The group assessment takes place in the evening and candidates come to hear a brief introduction to the program and then break into small groups of six to eight candidates. Once in the small groups, faculty watch candidates discuss the meaning of an educational quote and engage in a scholarship activity in which they determine awards for fictional applicants from diverse backgrounds. Candidates are assessed against a rubric with the following conceptual framework categories: *Think Critically*, *Promote Justice*, and *Transform Practice*. The conceptual framework provides the foundation for candidate admissions and program evaluation. Candidates are far more likely to receive denial letters for low scores on the group assessment than for a low GPA.

Our institution, where we both teach in initial licensure programs, has received national accreditation twice, most recently in 2013. In addition to teaching classes, one of us serves as the Director of Accreditation and Assessment, and one serves as the Director of Strategic Partnerships and Clinical Practices. These positions require extensive knowledge of accreditation standards and an understanding of the qualities district partners desire in preservice teachers doing clinical practice in their schools.

The study included all students admitted to the Master of Arts in Teaching program in two formats on two campuses, with completed program portfolios from 2011-2013. All participants began and successfully completed a teacher preparation program during this date range. This date range was purposely chosen as it represents the implementation of our student data management system, allowing for ease of access. This yielded an N=355. Participants represent a broad spectrum of

demographics in terms of age and gender, but mirrors the population of the Pacific Northwest locale in which the study takes place.

Procedure

Employing our student data management system, all student GPAs were acquired for students admitted into two specific MAT program formats. These two formats were chosen because they had complete program information in the data management system. This provided 355 data points to study. Next, the final clinical practice evaluations were acquired for each of the 355 students in the sample. The final clinical practice evaluation was chosen because it provides final scores received by each student in their field placements, as evaluated by their cooperating teacher. Gender information was also included to see if there was any statistical significance between genders and the two variables.

Results

This research examines whether or not the GPA upon admission to a teacher preparation institution correlates with the success of teacher licensure candidates in the clinical practice portion of their program. We also wanted to know if gender influenced final evaluations. Specifically, we asked the following questions:

1. Is there any connection between the admission GPA and the final clinical practice evaluation for teacher preparation candidates?

2. Is gender a predictor of final evaluation scores?

To organize the data, students who entered the program with a GPA at or above 3.0 were put into one group, and those who entered with a GPA below 3.0 were put into the other group. The measure used to compare the two groups was the final clinical practice evaluation. The independent samples *t*-test was conducted to explore a relationship between GPA at admission and the final clinical evaluation score. Following the t-test, we conducted a multiple regression analysis to explore the relationship between gender, GPA at admission and the clinical practice evaluation. Finally, a regression analysis was conducted to explore GPA and gender.

Of the 355 participants, 123 were male and 223 were female. The median GPA for the sample was 3.28, with the lowest GPA at 2.0. Of the 355 in the sample, 94 had a GPA lower than a 3.0. Females outscore males on the final teaching evaluation with female (M=88) and males

(M=87). We found generally that the GPA plays no role in teaching performance as measured by the final clinical evaluation scored by inservice cooperating teachers. We also found that males with higher GPAs outscored their counterparts with lower GPAs on the same final evaluation.

To answer the primary research question, a t-test was used to analyze the difference between the means of the two groups: students in the program who entered with a GPA above 3.0 and those with a GPA below 3.0 in terms of their final clinical practice evaluations. This resulted in a *p*-value of 0.34, resulting in no significant difference.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate gender and entrance GPA on final evaluation scores. With GPA and gender as predictors and final teaching performance evaluations as the criterion, we found that the GPA for females (M=3.34) showed no relationship to their teaching performance with a p=.80. The analysis for male GPA (M=3.20), however, did show significance with p=.10.

A regression analysis revealed that if both male and female students had the same admission GPA, males tend to have slightly lower teaching performance scores compared to their female counterparts. Controlling for GPA, being male was associated with lower teaching performance scores by 2.5%. The mean final teaching performance scores for females (M=88) and males (M=86), regardless of admission GPA. The difference between the genders was found to be significant with p=.03.

A regression analysis considered the teaching performance scores of males with GPA's over a 3.0 compared to males with GPAs below 3.0. Males who had a higher GPA tended to outperform their lower-GPA counterparts in their overall teaching performance with a final p=.10. Disaggregating further, females with an admission GPA above 3.0 were found to have a mean of (M=88) on their final teaching evaluation compared to (M=87) for males. Analyzing GPAs under a 3.0, the mean for females was (M=88) and (M=85) for males.

Discussion and Implications

In recognition of the potential repercussions that come with CAEP Standard 3.2, we initiated a study to investigate any relationship between candidates' GPAs and their final evaluation scores for their clinical practice. CAEP Standard 3.2 requires that a cohort of candidates enter a program with a GPA of 3.0 or above. Our institution uses a rigorous rubric based on Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards to assess success in the clinical practice portion of the program. The collection of the GPAs of 35 teacher candidates

over a period of three years compared with the final evaluations of the candidates provided data on the relationship between the two metrics. Consistent with cited research, in this study there was no relationship between the lowest GPAs and the same students' final clinical practice evaluations against InTASC standards.

Accrediting agencies, state legislators, and grassroots organizations concerned with educational quality in the United States have placed the blame for the nation's achievement gap squarely in the laps of educator preparation institutions. Historically, this misdirected blame for the achievement gap came about after the report *A Nation at Risk* (1983), but the interesting factors missing from the implied cause of undesirable P-12 student achievement rates include the sociological, economic and emotional factors which inservice teachers have no control such as family dynamics, global and local economic factors, school culture, and availability of solid curriculum and teaching supplies.

Reasoning that simply increasing entrance requirements as an answer to P-12 student achievement represents faulty logic. It is unreasonable to hold educator preparation programs responsible for preparing teachers who are able to, 15 years after graduating with a degree and teaching license, respond to current social and economic factors in the work place when the employer has not provided exceptional supplementary training. Nor does a teacher preparation program have control over large class size, missing supplies and curriculum, poor local school leadership, or lack of family support. Education in the United States certainly has room for improvement, but a myopic focus on teacher preparation in higher education fails to account for myriad of factors outside the realm of educator preparation.

Notwithstanding the unconvincing mandate for simply raising GPA standards or requiring higher scores on standardized tests, CAEP Standard 3.2 increases the likelihood that the gap between student demographics and teacher demographics will widen. So long as admission remains a barrier, our P-12 students miss the opportunity to learn from diverse teachers.

> What are the implications of this notable cancellation of teacher diversity in our schools? One of them is the minority and language diverse K-12 students will be without the education role models they need. (Flippo, 2003, p. 43)

National cut scores chosen by accrediting agencies represents the purest form of institutionalized racism.

> As long as our country is focused on "passing the test" and not on individual strengths, assessments of the harder to assess areas, higher

> level thinking, and the need for diversity in all of our programs, we will remain shamed. We are a nation of considerable diversity, yet without real respect for it: a nation that has allowed the cancellation of diversity in our colleges, schools, and the lives of our children. (Flippo, 2003, p. 44)

Diverse candidates are marginalized by the admissions process (McNeal & Lawrence, 2009), and we believe continued use of academic metrics as the primary factor in admissions will perpetuate the inequity.

Understanding of the possible implications of the new CAEP Standard 3.2 moves beyond the inequities for applicants to the inequities for programs themselves. The ramifications for educator preparation programs warrant consideration. Current MAT candidates enter programs with an undergraduate degree. The requirement of an exam such as the GRE to obtain a teaching license may support the assertion that the bachelor degree holds limited value and that nationally recognized college and university accrediting agencies do not assure quality. We feel the devaluation of a baccalaureate degree can discredit institutions of higher education across the nation. To reach compliance on Standard 3.2, MAT programs that function much like fifth year programs, cannot accept a graduate from an accredited university with a transcript that demonstrates mastery as readiness to enter an educator preparation program. The requirement of a GRE score, or scores from standardized exams used for admission to a baccalaureate degree program, are now required data for collection by programs.

Interestingly, candidates who enter programs via community colleges may not have SAT or ACT scores, but rather an associate degree denoting successful completion of a core academic program. Contreas (2005) writes, "Because the majority of Latino college students do not attend 4-year universities, a great deal remains unknown about the Latino college-going population, as the SAT is not necessary for admission to 2-year colleges" (p. 199). Given that the very candidates we want to successfully complete our programs are excluded at entry, Standard 3.2 represents an exclusive end as we have ample literature that demonstrates the required metrics do not lead to exceptional teacher or P-12 student learning.

Believing that educator preparation programs exercise diligence and discernment in their own admissions processes that reflect stakeholder interest, we have eight suggestions for all programs, particularly those nationally accredited, which uphold the spirit of our professional organizations, but honor the qualities of the candidates that may have greater impact on student success than ineffectual measures:

(1) Educator preparation providers should document diligence in accepting candidates into programs and keep evidence of admissions decisions.

(2) Articulate the dispositions and qualities desired and necessary for program success.

(3) Engage community partners in determining measurable dispositions and qualities.

(4) Determine multiple measures for those dispositions and qualities.

(5) Track candidates through the programs according those dispositions and triangulate with other assessments that demonstrate classroom success.

(6) Conduct research on candidate classroom performance in relation to admissions data.

(7) Work with states and school districts to compare retention rates and performance evaluations to sociological variables and school professional development opportunities. And

(8) Collaborate with other educator preparation programs to advance the voice of professional programs locally and nationally.

Conclusion

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation has created the Next Generation of Educator Preparation Accreditation Standards. The new CAEP requirements will influence the admission standards and practices of all educator preparation providers moving to national accreditation. This paper presents rationale for further research and focus on redirecting such attempts at reforms as CAEP Standard 3.2, because we see them as unnecessary, inequitable and lacking a focus on qualities and dispositions candidates must possess. Even if the standards are "aspirational" when it comes to the accreditation process, they place an unwarranted burden upon many institutions that produce exceptional teachers. The mandate in the standard will not bring about educational change or equity in education. We ask that CAEP support a standard that recognizes a diverse collection of data that serves as evidence of high quality candidates.

Given the research in the area of standardized testing for educators, the current study, and accepted professional practice in educator preparation, we conclude that grassroots organizations, governmental agencies

and accrediting bodies can present standards that represent inaccurate assertions about education that perpetuate institutional bias and racism. We call for more equitable practices in admissions and recognition that educator preparation programs in accredited universities are invested in admitting those candidates we believe will elevate P-12 education in the United States. We also recognize the need for more research on admissions using GRE scores for MAT programs and how that might impact career choices of those who want to teach. Finally, educator preparation programs must assert a louder voice when a political or professional organization speaks with authority about multifaceted issues without maintaining the credibility and value of teacher preparation in higher education.

References

Ackley, B. C., Fallon, M. A., & Brouwer, N. (2007). Intake assessments for alternative teacher education: Moving from legitimation towards predictive validity. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 32*(6), 657-665. doi: 10.1080/02602930601117134

American Psychological Association. (2007). *Appropriate use of high-stakes testing in our nation's schools*. Retrieved Janaury 23, 2014 from http://www.apa.org/pubs/info/brochures/testing.aspx

Barile, F. G. (2013). Making enemies out of educators: The legal and social consequences of disclosing New York City teacher data reports. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal*, *1*, 125-142.

Bennett, C. I., McWhorter, L. M., & Kuykendall, J. A. (2006). Will I ever teach? Latino and African American students' perspectives on PRAXIS I. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(3), 531-575.

Byrnes, D. A., Kiger, G., & Z. Shechtman (2003). Evaluating the use of group interviews to select students into teacher-education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education. 54*, 163. doi: 10.1177/0022487102250310.

Casey, C., & Childs, R. (2011). Teacher education admission criteria as a measure of preparedness for teaching. *Canadian Journal of Education, 34*(2), 3-20.

Caskey, M. M., Peterson, K. D., & Temple, J. B. (2001). Complex admission selection procedures for a graduate preservice teacher education program. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 28*(4), 7-21.

Contreas, F. E. (2005). Access, achievement, and social capital. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 4*(3), 197-214.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP Accreditation Standards*. Retrieved from http://caepnet.org/caep-accreditation-standards/

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Supporting educator quality in Oregon*. A report presented to the Oregon Department of Education, November 2, 2012.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 166-173. doi: 10.1177/0022487100051003002

Dejnozka, E. L., & Smiley, L. R. (1983). Selective admissions criteria in graduate teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(1), 24-27.

DeLuca, C. (2012). Selecting inclusive teacher candidates: Validity and reliability issues in admission policy and practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 39*(4), 7-31.

Flippo, R. (2003). Canceling diversity: High-stakes teacher testing and the real crisis. *Multicultural Perspectives, 5*(4), 42-45.

Haberman, M. (2012). The myth of the fully qualified, bright, young teacher. *American Behavioral Scientist, 56*(7), 926-940.

Haberman, M. (1995). Selecting 'star' teachers for children and youth in urban poverty. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(10), 777-781.

Hillman, S. I., Rothermel, D., & Scarano, G. (2006). The Assessment of Preservice Teachers' Dispositions. *Teacher Educator, 41*(4), 234-246. doi:10.1080/08878730609555386

Hochstetler, S. (2014). The critical role of dispositions: What's missing in measurements of English teacher candidate effectiveness. *Clearing House, 87*(1), 9-14. doi:10.1080/00098655.2013.813433

Ingles, S. A. (2010). *A study of the group assessment procedure for the selection of teacher education candidates at a small, private university in the midwest* (Order No. 3419232). Available from ProQuest Education Journals. (756747643). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/756747643?accountid=11085

Council of Chief School Officers. (2011). *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_A_Resource_for_State_Dialogue_(April_2011).html

Kent, A. M. (2005). Acknowledging the need facing teacher preparation programs: Responding to make a difference. *Education, 125*(3), 343-348.

Kosnik, C., Brown, R., & Beck, C. (2005). The preservice admissions process: What qualities do future teachers need and how can they be identified in applicants? *New Educator, 1*(2), 101-123. doi:10.1080/15476880590932210

Krebs, M. M., & Torrez, C. A. (2011). I love kids! Doesn't that mean I will be a successful preservice teacher? *Curriculum & Teaching Dialogue, 13*(1/2), 69-81.

Lomas, R. G., West, M. M., Harmon, M. C., Viator, K. A., Madeus, G. F. (1995). The impact of mandated standardized testing on minority students. *Journal of Negro Education, 64*(2), 171-185.

Magee, R. M. (1952). Selection of candidates for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 3*(3), 168-172.

McNeal, K., & Lawrence, S. (2009). *Teachers from the "Neighborhood": Standardized testing as a barrier to certification of minority candidates*. http://www.aera-ultr.org/content/2009_eYearbook.pdf#page=5

Mikitovics, A., & Crehan, K. D. (2002). Pre-professional skills test scores as college of education cdmission *Criteria. Journal Of Educational Research, 95*(4), 215.

Nettles, M. T., Scatton, L. H., Steinberg, J. H., & Tyler, L. L. (2011). *New Jersey performance and passing rate differences of African American and White*

prospective teachers on PraxisTM examinations (Research Report No. ERS RR-11-08). Retrieved from the Educational Testing Service website: http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-11-08.pdf

Nunney, D. N., Fiala, F. F., & Lewis, M. G. (1963). Teacher selection in the western states. *Journal of Teacher Education, 14*, 417. doi: 10.1177/002248716301400412.

Pohan, C. A., & Ward, M. J. (2011). Testing candidates' basic reading skills to ensure teacher quality: Promising practice or problematic policy? *Action in Teacher Education, 33*(3), 246-253.

Ravitch, D. (2010). Stop the madness. *Education Review, 23*(1), 27-34.

Riggs, I. M., & Riggs, M. L. (1991). Predictors of student success in a teacher education program: What is valid, what is not. *Action in Teacher Education, 12*(4), 41-46.

Rike, C. J., & Sharp, L. (2008). Assessing preservice teachers' dispositions: A critical dimension of professional preparation. *Childhood Education, 84*(3), 150-153.

Shechtman, Z. (1992). Interrater reliability of a single group assessment procedure administered in several educational settings. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 6*, 31-39.

Smith, H. A., & Pratt, D. (1996). The use of biodata in admissions to teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 47*(1), 43-52. doi: 10.1177/002248719604700 1008

United States Census Bureau. (2012). http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/education/cb12-33.html