34

The Place of Classroom Management and Standards in Teacher Education

Laura M. Stough
Texas A&M University

INTRODUCTION

The value of classroom management knowledge for teachers has been consistently supported through the research literature (Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Shinn, Walker, & Stoner, 2002; Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993) and management strategies have been referred to as "the most valuable skills set a teacher can have" (Landau, 2001, p. 4). A number of studies have found that classroom management is a primary area in which beginning teachers feel underprepared (Halford, 1998; Houston & Williamson, 1993; Pigge & Marso, 1997; Veenman, 1984). Specifically, according to a survey of 103 recent graduates of an accredited teacher preparation program, teachers most desire additional training on how to motivate students and address chronic and severe misbehaviors, and pragmatic classroom management ideas (Barrett & Davis, 1995). Experienced teachers express similar dissatisfaction with their preparation in this area: A Merrett and Wheldall (1993) survey of 176 experienced teachers found that 72% felt that their preparation in the area of classroom management was inadequate. School administrators also view classroom management strategies as an essential teacher skill (Ralph, Kesten, Lang, & Smith, 1998) and often report that beginning teachers display limitations in the area of classroom management. Jones (2005), in this volume, provides a comprehensive overview of research of the perceptions of beginning and experienced teachers, as well as that of administrators, on the need for increased teacher preparation in the area of classroom management.

Although there is a solid extant research base on the perceptions of teachers about their training (or lack thereof) in classroom management, these studies are retrospective in nature and thus dependent on teacher's memories about these programs. Few studies have directly examined the content of teacher preparation programs. In addition, as studies have demonstrated that teachers' beliefs and perceptions change over time as a result of their experiences in the classroom (Martin & Shoho, 2000; Pigge & Marso, 1997), issues identified as critical by teachers during their first years of teaching may become either less or more salient as time passes. Despite these limitations, novice and experienced teachers consistently report that their

training in classroom management was inadequate or impractical, and that they require further preparation in this area.

THE PLACE OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT IN TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Direct evaluations of teacher education programs and of the extent to which classroom management content is, in fact, part of these programs substantiate the reported perceptions of teachers and administrators. The few studies of the presence of classroom management content in teacher preparation programs have spanned across 20 years yet concur in their reports of the scarcity of classroom management content in teacher training programs. In an early study, Rickman and Hollowell (1981) suggested that the lack of classroom management content in teacher training programs was the subsequent cause of problems that student teachers experienced in their placements. In a 1989 survey, over 80% of 1,388 teachers indicated that their university program did not offer an undergraduate course that focused on classroom management strategies at all (Clapp, 1989). Similarly, Jones (1989) suggested that most teachers during the 1980s did not receive systematic training in any model of classroom discipline.

Wesley and Vocke (1992) have conducted the most direct evaluation of classroom management content in teacher preparation. These researchers examined the catalogs of 111 universities offering teacher preparation programs and then more closely analyzed the content of secondary programs. After searching for courses containing titles with the words *discipline*, *control*, *behavior*, or *management*, they found that only 36.9% of the programs offered a separate course that specifically focused on classroom management techniques (Wesley & Vocke, 1992). In addition, in an in-depth examination of 27 teacher preparation programs at the secondary level, they found that only 16% of these programs offered classroom management as a separate course. Even more striking, when classroom management content was covered within another course, rather than as a stand-alone course, this content was allotted merely an average of 13% of the total course time. It should be noted that in 1992, when the Wesley and Vocke study was completed, coursework in pedagogy typically was more extensive than is the case currently.

In another study on the existence of content in classroom management in teacher preparation programs, Blum (1994) surveyed the 467 existing colleges and universities that were then accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Results received from 266 of these institutions found that, although 51% of these institutions offered a specific course on classroom management and discipline at the undergraduate level, only 43% of preservice teachers at these institutions were required to take such a course. Although Blum reports that a higher number of universities included classroom management content than did Wesley and Vocke, this number should be interpreted with caution, as these are data were reported by the teacher preparation programs themselves.

Christiansen (1996) examined the self-study reports of 42 teacher preparation programs that had submitted their programs for accreditation by NCATE. In an examination of the knowledge bases that these programs reported they used to prepare their teachers, Christiansen tabulated 83 different knowledge-based instructional models described by these programs. Despite the diversity of these models, not one of these programs identified "classroom management," "discipline," or "behavior," as a knowledge base that they included as part of their training, although one institution did include "Glasser Circle" as a model. Christiansen notes in her summary that "one must conclude there are many different ways to design teacher education programs based on a selected knowledge-research base" (p. 49); however, the lack of identification of classroom management as a primary research base is both noteworthy and puzzling.

Banks (2003) conducted a survey of faculty who taught classroom management at 52 Texas universities. She found that the most commonly used theoretical models in these programs were (a) Glasser (84%), (b) Canter (82%), (c) Dreikurs (58%), (d) neo-Skinnerian (57%), and (e) Curwin/Mendler (51%), followed by eight other models. These rankings of models varied depending on whether the faculty member responding taught primary or secondary teacher education courses. In addition, faculty members reported using an incredible variety of 45 different textbooks to teach their classes. Glasser's books, however, were reported as chosen more often by those training secondary-level teachers.

Landau (2001) observed, after an informal examination of the Web sites of 20 teacher education programs, that only one of these programs included a course specifically titled "Classroom Management" as part of its required coursework for preservice teachers. Somewhat humorously, Landau remarked, "I began to draw the conclusion that the term 'Classroom Management' is coded or couched in euphemisms" (p. 5). In a similar attempt to locate classroom management in the top 50 schools of education rated by the 2004 *U.S. News and World Report*, I also found the task to be baffling (Stough, Williams-Diehm, & Montague, 2004). Required coursework included titles such as "Creating Community in the Classroom," "Curriculum and Management," and "Classroom Discourse and Interaction" that *might* contain classroom management content but would necessitate a translation by the course instructor in order to be certain. In 22 of these programs I could find no allusion to a course in classroom management whatsoever.[1]

Note that most of the preceeding studies searched for the existence of an entire course devoted to classroom management. Emmer and Stough (2001) similarly have implied that when classroom management content is part of a teacher training program, it is taught as a stand-alone course. In actuality, researchers have not systematically examined whether other methods of teaching classroom management content are used in teacher preparation programs. Landau's (2001) review suggested that classroom management may be taught as a seminar or as content embedded within other courses. Kher, Lacina-Gifford, and Yandell (2000) stated that classroom management "is usually addressed as a small part of Educational Psychology or peripherally as part of discipline techniques in Child Development courses" (p. 2), but the extent to which this embedded model is used to teach the content is not given. It may be that given the increase in the requirement of field-based experiences, as well as the movement to decrease the amount of coursework required in teacher preparation, the content of classroom management has become diffused and less likely to be delivered in a stand-alone course. Again, further direct examination of teacher preparation programs is needed to substantiate these suppositions.

Who Teaches Classroom Management Courses?

Landau (2001) noted that when classroom management and discipline coursework is included in teacher preparation programs, it is often offered through departments of special education. Such a distinction is logical as, when one works with students with special educational needs, mastery of classroom management skills becomes particularly essential. This is not to imply, however, that general education teachers do not need a high level of training in classroom management. The movement to include more special education students in regular education classrooms has increased the number of children who may not be prepared to meet the behavioral expectations of the general education classroom (Bender & Mathes, 1995). Even

[1]As a side note, and in acknowledgement of participatory guilt in using obscure titles for coursework, I confess that for several years my own course was called "Dynamics and Management in Multicultural/Inclusionary Learning Environments." It is now much more straightforwardly titled "Classroom Management and Behavioral Interventions."

when teachers do receive adequate preparation in classroom management, it has been noted that the inclusion of children with emotional or behavioral disorders in the general education classroom will tax the most competent of classroom teachers (Kauffman, Lloyd, Baker, & Riedel, 1995).

Several researchers (e.g., Kilgore & Griffin, 1998; Gilberts & Lignugaris-Kraft, 1997) affirm that the emphasis of preservice preparation programs for special educators is different than that of general educators. They suggest that special education programs tend to prepare teachers in how to address individual behavioral needs and small-group management. In contrast, they view general education programs as emphasizing subject matter while underpreparing students in the domains of classroom management and discipline. Again, as an area of expertise for special educators may be in the instruction of students with behavioral disorders, it is reasonable that special education coursework stress content on classroom behavior. However, as pointed out by Landau (2001) and given the author's own knowledge of the field of special education teacher preparation, it is often the case that these courses focus on individual behavior analysis and interventions, rather than a more global approach to classroom management and the prevention of problem behaviors.

A final area in which we might expect to see training in classroom management is as part of inservice training for experienced teachers. Barrett and Davis (1995) found in their survey of classroom teacher inservice needs that teachers ranked dealing with problem behaviors and classroom management as two of their top three inservice needs. Popular inservice training programs include Canter's Assertive Discipline program, Harry Wong's The First Days of School, and Sprick's CHAMPs program. However, there has been little to no research on the effectiveness of these programs and the extent to which they influence teacher behavior nor on their effects on teacher behavior on a long-term basis.

TEXTBOOKS ON CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Another source of information about how classroom management is incorporated into teacher preparation programs is through inspection of current textbooks that are on the market. Stengel and Tom (1996) suggested that the presence of classroom management and discipline as primary content areas is consistent across methods textbooks. Hoy's (2000) review of content in educational psychology textbooks published since 1983 listed classroom management content as a common topic in teacher preparation texts. Emmer and Stough (2001) similarly observed that whereas 20 to 30 years ago little information about classroom management could be found in educational psychology textbooks, current texts usually contain a chapter or two about classroom management.

Textbooks that have classroom management as their primary focus address the topic with some variation. A few texts use different models of classroom management as an organizing feature, such as Charles' (2002) *Building Classroom Discipline*. Other textbooks such as Emmer, Evertson, and Worsham's (2003) *Classroom Management for Secondary Teachers* or Jones and Jones' (2004) *Comprehensive Classroom Management* focus on a functional approach to management, in which proactive and procedural knowledge, such as how to write rules or organize a classroom, is stressed. A few textbooks take a behavioral approach, such as Alberto and Troutman's (2006) *Applied Behavior Analysis for Teachers*, and detail how to implement individual behavioral interventions, rather than presenting an overview of classroom management. In the author's own review of 23 different classroom management textbooks designed for use in teacher preparation programs, most did not address educational concerns such as including students with disabilities, cultural diversity, bullying, or school violence to any significant degree. Admittedly, these topics do not yet have as extensive a research base

as does more established research in classroom management. However, given the changes in student demographics in the United States over the last decade and the consistent concern the public expresses about school safety (Rose & Gallup, 2004), authors should consider giving more weight to these topics in their classroom management textbooks.

Despite the apparent surfeit of classroom management textbooks, there is evidence that faculty would like more information in this area. Scales (1994) surveyed 175 college and university faculty involved in teacher preparation for middle schools. Faculty rated the extent to which they believed they needed additional resources in each of 11 topic areas, including classroom management. Fifty-nine percent of these faculty members reported that new resources, including texts, in the area of classroom management were "very much needed" and ranked classroom management as the third most important area in which they desired more resources. Classroom management textbooks and resources that these faculty reported as currently using included (a) *Control Theory and Quality Schools* by William Glasser, (b) *Positive Discipline: A Pocketful of Ideas* by William Purkey, (c) *Assertive Discipline for Parents* by Lee Canter, (d) *Classroom Management for Elementary Teachers* by Carolyn Evertson and Ed Emmer, and (e) *Discipline with Dignity* by Richard Curwin and Allen Mendler. However, although faculty reported that they needed additional resources in the area classroom management, Scales pointed out that in actuality "this is not because few resources exist: Our respondents named 58 resources" (1994, p. 64), implying that even though much has been written about classroom management and discipline, the field is not satiated.

The Design of Classroom Management Courses

Despite the value with which teachers hold it, training in classroom management has never been a requirement of teacher preparation programs to the same degree as has, for example, coursework in reading instruction. It is also not clear what is the best way to teach classroom management content to future teachers. Jones (1996) pointed out that "little work has been done to determine the most effective methods of educating teachers in classroom management" (p. 515). Teacher preparation programs may have inadvertently contributed to the concerns and frustrations expressed by teachers and administrators in the area of classroom management by failing to provide pertinent coursework and relevant experiences for preservice teachers.

In addition, most teacher education programs in U.S. colleges and universities appear to be doing little to prepare teachers to cope with the issue of school violence (Nims & Wilson, 1998). It is suggested that maladaptive behaviors are rooted, in part, in early aggressive behaviors occurring in classrooms that are poorly managed (Greer-Chase, Rhodes, & Kellam, 2002). Thus, a lack of training in classroom management may have an impact that transcends that of the immediate classroom climate.

Given that classroom management is essential to include in the preparation of teachers, that teachers and administrators want more of it, and that the public believes that student behavior is one of the most important issues confronting education, why are teacher preparation programs as a whole doing such a spotty job of addressing the topic? This disjunction might be illuminated if current educational standards for teacher preparation and assessment are examined more closely.

STANDARDS AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT CONTENT

Education in the United States has been undeniably shaped by a standards-based reform, which shows no sign of losing momentum. In fact, Roth (1996) stated, "The standards based movement is so pervasive and powerful that it appropriately may be termed the *Era of Standards*" (p. 242).

Although much of the educational dialogue has focused on student outcomes, the movement also has affected the various standards that pertain to teacher quality and preparation.

The qualifications of teachers are given an assortment of labels. The terms *accreditation*, *certification*, and *licensing* are often used interchangeably, but actually indicate different levels of teacher preparation (Oakes, 1999; Roth, 1996). Each of these levels of preparation has its own rubric of standards that indicate teacher qualifications. Some states issue "licenses" whereas others issue what they term "certificates" and this mixing of terminology adds to the confusion. To clarify, the state-based process by which teachers are legally approved for a teaching position is properly described as *licensing*. Licensing normally occurs on the state level and suggests that a teacher possesses a minimal level of competence needed to practice in that state. State licensing does not usually make a distinction between experienced teachers and those who demonstrate beginning or entry level skills in teaching, and states may legally issue probationary or emergency licenses to individuals who have not received teacher training of any type. In contrast, the term *certification*, when used appropriately, denotes that an individual teacher has met predetermined standards that have been recognized by a professional organization. Certification can be described as a type of professional peer approbation, such as Board certification among medical doctors (Oakes, 1999). *Accreditation* is given to a college, university, or other training program that has been reviewed and judged qualified to grant teacher certification, again given the standards of a professional organization that evaluates training programs. Finally, teacher *appraisal* is the process by which a local education agency, usually the school district, assesses teacher performance, most typically through the direct observation of teaching performance. Standards on the local level are often derived or used wholesale from a state-developed teacher appraisal system; however, the method and extent to which these appraisals are used to evaluate teachers widely varies from state to state and even among school districts within the same state.

The extent to which classroom management standards are part of an accreditation, licensing, or certification process is variable. In the following section, the role of classroom management at these different levels of standards is examined.

Accreditation

As mentioned earlier, accreditation is a formal recognition that an educational program of work receives from a professional body. NCATE is the largest accreditation body for programs of teacher preparation and consists of a coalition of 33 national education associations (NCATE, 2005a) that developed the standards that NCATE uses to evaluate teacher preparation programs. Most of the association members of NCATE include professional education bodies, such as the National Education Association and the American Association for Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), but also include 19 different professional specialty associations as well, such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Colleges and other institutions that have teacher training programs are eligible for NCATE accreditation. Participation in the NCATE accreditation process is voluntary and requires that the college or institution develop a portfolio of its program, followed by a weeklong site visit by reviewers from NCATE's professional specialty associations, to determine the fidelity of the program. Depending on the program, these standards are differentially selected so that they correspond to the teacher preparation program being reviewed. For example, an early childhood program would be reviewed by NCATE using standards from the National Association for the Education of Young Children, whereas a mathematics program would use standards developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. The NCATE standards were revised in 1987 so that teacher education programs were required to focus on teacher knowledge about

teaching and learning (Hoy, 2000) and the number of teacher preparation programs that apply for accreditation has steadily increased since the last decade. As of 2005, NCATE recorded that it had accredited teacher preparation programs in 602 colleges of education (2005a) in the United States.

A second federally recognized accreditation body for teacher education is the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). TEAC was created in 1997 and, as is NCATE, is a nonprofit organization that accredits teacher education programs. TEAC is composed of 19 affiliate organizations that are nonvoting members of the organization, most of which are state associations that represent independent colleges and universities (TEAC, 2005). At present, only 13 programs have been accredited by TEAC, although 91 programs have satisfied TEAC's eligibility requirements and are identified by TEAC as having "candidate status" (TEAC, 2005). For standards, TEAC uses a program's evidence for quality principles including (a) evidence of candidate learning, (b) evidence that the assessment of candidate learning is valid, and (c) evidence of the program's continuous improvement and quality control. Unlike NCATE, TEAC standards are determined by the program itself, with the constraint that the program standards meet TEAC's overall principles.

Before 1990, there was little coordination between the approval processes that states used to accredit teacher preparation programs and accreditation by professional organizations: Colleges and universities thus had to meet the accreditation demands of two entirely separate systems. At present, NCATE has partnerships with 49 states as well as the districts of Columbia and Puerto Rico and conducts joint reviews of colleges of education (NCATE, 2005a). These partnerships integrate state and national professional teacher preparation standards and thus reduce the expense and duplication of effort that occur when states and NCATE conduct two separate reviews of a particular preparation program (NCATE, 2005a). These partnerships take several forms: 24 states have their programs reviewed by professional associations whose standards have been adopted by NCATE, whereas 25 states and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico use state standards that have been aligned with NCATE standards. Despite this apparent high level of collaboration with NCATE on the national level, most states do not require that their schools of education be accredited. Darling-Hammond and Rustique-Forrester (1997) pointed out that "states routinely approve all of their teacher education programs, including those that lack qualified faculty and are out of touch with new knowledge about teaching" (1997, p.1).

The specific standards that NCATE uses to accredit teacher preparation programs are performance based and focus on (1) candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions; (2) assessment system and unit evaluation; (3) field experiences and clinical practice; (4) diversity; (5) faculty qualifications, performance, and development; and (6) unit governance and resources. Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions, includes the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and dispositions required of all teacher candidates, and also delineates how teachers should be able to assess and analyze student learning. It is under Standard 1 that specific standards for classroom management would most likely be mentioned. However, classroom management is referred to only indirectly as follows: "Teacher candidates . . . are able to create learning environments encouraging positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation" (NCATE, 2002, p. 18). In fact, neither NCATE nor TEAC directly refers to classroom management as a required standard for the teacher preparation programs that they accredit.

Specialty Area Standards. NCATE has a Special Areas Studies Board (SASB) that approves program standards that have been developed in 20 program areas (NCATE, 2005b). These include content area standards, developed by the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, as well as those developed by professional organizations such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association of

School Psychologists. Some states require that teacher education institutions address the standards of a specialty area program as part of the NCATE accreditation process. These standards are then incorporated into the NCATE accreditation review process along with the Core Standards. Standards that are part of the content areas focus almost entirely on standards for achievement in the content area and do not address classroom management practices to any degree.

However, of interest are the standards used by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC, 2003). Of all of the NCATE program standards, the CEC standards include classroom management and discipline to the greatest degree, including those included as part of the NCATE Core Standards. No other standards reviewed as part of the preparation for this chapter included a focus on classroom management and discipline to a similar extent. These standards, entitled "What Every Special Educator Should Know," include a list of 10 Standard Domain Areas that are aligned with the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards. Standard 5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions, includes the classroom management procedures and knowledge that special educators should know. The descriptions under this standard relating to classroom management consist of three types: (1) classroom management strategies, (2) behavioral interventions that are typically used for more severe behavioral interventions, and (3) techniques to teach social skills. Although it may be argued that these are all skills inherent in good classroom management practices, the latter two standards, behavioral interventions and social skills, are areas that are not addressed in standards from any other source.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)

INTASC is a consortium of 34 state education agencies and 8 professional educational organizations that examine the preparation and licensing of teachers. INTASC is one of several programs sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO, 2004). INTASC developed model core standards for beginning teachers in 1992. In 1994, NCATE aligned its unit and program standards with the principles of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) (Darling-Hammond & Rustique-Forrester, 1999). These INTASC standards defined the knowledge and skills required of beginning teachers. Although these standards are designed for use in licensing beginning teachers, they were designed also to be compatible with the standards used by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) in certifying experienced teachers.

At present, INTASC has developed standards in the following areas: arts education, elementary education, English language arts, foreign languages, math, science, social studies, and special education. All of these areas plainly focus exclusively on content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. INTASC also has developed what it refers to as "core standards" that outline the knowledge, disposition, and performances expected of all beginning teachers, regardless of their area of expertise. These core standards consist of 10 principles that detail the "knowledge, skills and dispositions that every teacher should display." Principle 5 of the INTASC principles most directly overlaps with content in classroom management. This principle reads, "The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation." The corresponding knowledge, skills, and performance areas detail concepts commonly considered a part of classroom management knowledge and skills, including how to structure group work, promote intrinsic motivation, and create a "smoothly functioning learning community." Two of the 14 details under Principle 5 are clearly classroom management standards: Under the knowledge detail, the standard "The teacher understands the principles of effective classroom management and can use a range of strategies to promote positive relationships, cooperation, and purposeful learning in the classroom" is most clearly

one that emphasizes classroom management. The second performance detail "The teacher organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, activities, and attention to provide active and equitable engagement of students in productive tasks," is also usually considered essential classroom management knowledge.

The CCSSO is sponsoring a second initiative through INTASC to establish the Center for Improving Teacher Quality (CTQ). The center has the mission to develop models for improving teacher preparation, licensing, and the professional development of both general and special educators. Its May 2001 document, "Model Standards for Licensing General and Special Education Teachers of Students with Disabilities: A Resource for State Dialog," holds the premise that all teachers must have knowledge and skills drawn from the field of special education (CCSSO, 2001). These standards elaborate on the previously established INTASC standards by including knowledge and skills that relate to students with special educational needs. This draft document adds eight additional aspect statements to INTASC's Standard 5 that emphasize specialized management issues and tasks that all teachers of students with disabilities should know. Most specifically, Standard 5.05 states that all teachers should "tailor classroom management and grouping to individual needs using constructive behavior management strategies, a variety of grouping options, and positive behavioral support strategies." In addition, the standard for special education teachers stresses the need for teachers to be able to conduct functional behavioral assessments, implement behavioral support plans, and know how to use behavioral intervention plans for students with challenging behaviors. Finally, the standard details that special education teachers should support students with disabilities in taking an active role in their IEP planning process. Plainly, these standards emphasize classroom management and student behavior to a greater degree than do the general INTASC standards. However, the question should be raised of whether these are management standards that all teachers, whether or not they work with students with special needs, should master.

INTASC has recently taken the position that the state's process for approving teacher preparation should be designed so that preparation programs are aligned with teacher licensing standards. From 2000 to 2002, INTASC coordinated a collaborative effort of eight states to draft model standards that would be compatible with the INTASC core standards with the objective of using these standards for the state's review of teacher preparation programs (CCSSO, 2004). These standards were slated to be publicized by the fall of 2003 but apparently are still in the final stages of editing.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) sets professional-caliber standards for experienced teachers and administers certification to recognize educators who demonstrate a high level of teaching competence (NBPTS, 2004a). The NBPTS was founded in 1987, in part to assess and certify teachers who met rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know. NBPTS certification is voluntary and yet rigorous. Candidate teachers must have at least 3 years of teaching experience. Teachers submit a teaching portfolio that includes videotapes of classroom teaching, a student work sample, and a written commentary from the teacher that describes, analyzes, and represents reflections on the teacher's instruction. Over 40,000 teachers across the United States have earned NBPTS certification to date and the number is predicted to grow exponentially (NBPTS, 2005). Several national education organizations endorse National Board certification and some states allow reciprocal licensing of teachers who hold NBPTS certification. Other states base their decision to license teachers who hold a NBPTS from another state primarily on the validity of the NBPTS certificate (NASDTEC, 2002).

The NBPTS uses five propositions that define teaching effectiveness: (1) Teachers are committed to students and their learning, (2) Teachers know the subject they teach and how to

teach those subjects to students, (3) Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring students learning, (4) Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience, and (5) Teachers are members of learning communities (NBPTS, 2004a). Of these propositions, Proposition 3 most clearly intersects with classroom management and includes the description "Accomplished teachers have developed systems for overseeing their classrooms so that students and teacher alike can focus on learning, not on controlling disruptive behavior." Other than this statement, the core NBPTS propositions and their descriptions do not refer to classroom management directly. However, the standards detailed within specific subjects or childhood age groups do address management to a greater degree. For example, Standard III in the Middle Childhood Generalist Standards (2004b) is entitled "Learning Environment" and details "Accomplished teachers establish a caring, inclusive, stimulating, and safe school community where students can take intellectual risks, practice democracy, and work both collaboratively and independently." Similarly, in the Early Childhood Generalist (2004b) standards, Proposition 3 includes "Teachers are Responsible for Managing and Monitoring Student Learning," which includes that "teachers must create, enrich and alter the organizational structures in which they work with young people." However, these standards apply only to the specialty area or age group for which they are written.

State Licensing Standards

Licensing has traditionally been and continues to be part of the role of the states in the United States. In addition, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 gives states considerable flexibility in determining how they may license teachers. Thirty-four states collaborate to some degree with INTASC to set *beginning* teacher standards, and this collaboration currently represents the largest degree of consensus across the states regarding what beginning teachers should know. The remaining 16 state standards vary widely, and the development of these standards, at present, is in considerable flux as states consider how they will respond to the guidelines of NCLB. Criteria for *experienced* teachers among the states reflect much less of a consensus, despite the increasing number of teachers who are becoming National Board Certified. As the licensing and standards for experienced teachers must also fall under the guidelines of NCLB, these standards are similarly being widely considered by the states.

No Child Left Behind Act. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 requires that each state establish its own set of standards for the content areas of reading, math, and science. As such, NCLB emphasizes that it is not the intention for the government to establish national standards for student outcome measures; rather, it holds states accountable for establishing their own standards. Among its provisions, NCLB includes standards regarding teacher qualifications and acknowledges that teacher quality is a determining factor in student achievement (NCLB, 2001). NCLB outlines a list of minimum requirements related to content knowledge and teaching skills that a highly qualified teacher should master, but again, allows for each state to develop its individual definition of "highly qualified," as long as it is consistent with NCLB requirements. These minimum requirements for teachers state that they should hold (a) a bachelor's degree, (b) full state certification and licensure as defined by the state, and (c) demonstrated competency, as defined by the state, in each core academic subject he or she teaches. These core academic subjects are listed as English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography. General pedagogical knowledge, such as that of methods and classroom management, is not referred to by NCLB.

As of August 2005, only 25 states had developed a definition of "highly qualified teacher" and only 12 states had defined "subject matter competence" in a way that met the requirements of NCLB (Education Commission of the States, 2005). NCLB does distinguish between what

beginning teachers should know and what is required of experienced teachers. Beginning teachers are required to pass a state-designed test to establish their competence. As of 2005, 44 of the states had designed such a test (Education Commission of the States, 2005). In addition, experienced teachers must either meet the same requirements as used for a new teacher or demonstrate competency based on a separate system designed by the state. The states, under NCLB, may create a "high, objective, uniform state standard of evaluation" (HOUSSE) for teachers but as of January 2004 only 33 states had done so (Azondegan, 2004). HOUSSE criteria focus primarily on subject matter knowledge and do not refer to any competency related to classroom management. However, states may choose to set criteria that include classroom management under the general description of "teaching skills." Given these standards, the extent to which classroom management is included may vary greatly state to state, particularly as the criteria for certification and licensure is also at the discretion of the state.

Within NCLB there are several other standards that might overlap with teacher knowledge and skills in the area of classroom management. Title IV of NCLB is the "Safe Schools" component and provides support to prevent violence and drug, alcohol, and tobacco use in and around schools. The Gun-Free Schools Act includes a provision to expel students who bring firearms to school. Finally, the Unsafe School Choice Option requires that states implement a policy that students be given the right to attend "safe public schools" and be allowed to transfer out of a school if the state identifies it as unsafe. States have been more responsive in designing criteria that meet these "safe schools" standards than they have the "highly qualified teacher" definition and, as of August 2005, all but one of the states had complied (Education Commission of the United States, 2004; 2005). Interestingly, none of the Title IV components refers to teacher training in the prevention of school violence or discipline.

Although NCLB stresses the need for standards as the primary method to reform education in the United States, it underemphasizes general pedagogy and the importance of teacher preparation in classroom management. Despite a stated emphasis on scientifically based research, it makes no reference, neither directly nor indirectly, to one of the areas in which some of the most valid and replicable educational research has been conducted, that of classroom management.

National Assessments of Teacher Knowledge

Tests of teacher knowledge should be mentioned in this chapter, as assessments are often reflective of preparation standards. The most widely used tests of teacher knowledge, the Praxis Series, administered by the Educational Testing Service, are currently required in 39 of the states that use tests as part of their teacher licensure process (Education Testing Service, 2005). As the exam is not overseen by a given state, scores on the Praxis exams may be used for licensure requirements in different states. The Praxis Series consists of three parts: Praxis I: Academic Skills Assessments, is used to test the basic knowledge of teacher candidates; Praxis II: Subject Assessments, measures candidates' knowledge of the subject they will teach, as well as general and subject-specific pedagogical skills and knowledge; and Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments, which assess the skills of teachers in classroom settings. Praxis III was developed for use in state licensing decisions and is used with experienced teachers (ETS, 2005). The Praxis II includes a measure of what it refers to as the Principles of Learning and Teaching, which does test some classroom management knowledge. Praxis III consists of 19 assessment criteria in four domains: (1) Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning (planning to teach); (2) Creating an Environment for Student Learning (the classroom environment); (3) Teaching for Student Learning (instruction); and (4) Teacher Professionalism (professional responsibilities). Of these four domains, the second and third areas test for classroom management competencies, particularly those that refer to "Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior" and "Using instructional time effectively."

The CCSSO is also in the process of designing a test for teachers, but for licensing purposes. INTASC recommends that a prospective teacher pass three licensing tests before receiving a permanent license: (1) a content knowledge test, (2) a teaching knowledge test, and (3) an assessment of actual teaching (CCSSO, 2004). The Test of Teaching Knowledge (TTK) has been developed by INTASC to assess a prospective teacher's ability to meet the INTASC core standards. Presumably the TTK will address the need for the states to produce the second of the three required licensing tests, a test of teacher knowledge. The TTK is still being field-tested so the content is unavailable; however, given the INTASC standards that detail classroom management, it is probable that the TTK will include items on classroom management.

Interestingly, assessments used to evaluate student teachers often include items that address classroom management skills. In a 1996 study by Koziol, Minnick, and Sherman, student teacher evaluations used by the teacher preparation programs at 11 Holmes Group research universities were examined. They found that 28% of the assessment items on these student teaching assessments related to managing the activity in the classroom, which was by far the largest conceptual group of any of the assessment items. Whether state-level assessments similarly focus on classroom management competencies to a similar degree would be an interesting topic for a future investigation.

Lack of Standards That Address Classroom Management Competencies

Given the previous overview of standards used in accreditation, certification, and licensing, the extent to which knowledge and skills of classroom management is included in these standards appears exceedingly limited. We know from public surveys, analyses of teacher's concerns, and studies of teacher effectiveness that classroom management is of paramount importance in assuring success in the classroom. Why then is classroom management, with perhaps the exception of the CEC standards, given such minimal attention? I suggest here several informed possibilities.

First, the standards movement in the last 10 years has emphasized teacher knowledge of content and pedagogical content knowledge, not general pedagogical knowledge. In some cases, policy makers and states have advocated for a decrease in the number of general pedagogy courses that prospective teachers must take and some have even questioned whether these courses are effective at all. Thus, the teacher is seen primarily as a content specialist while pedagogy and educational methods are deemphasized. Classroom management being neither fish nor fowl—not representing content knowledge nor pedagogical content knowledge—is consequently overlooked.

Second, despite the existence of a solid and concrete research base in the area of classroom management, new research in the area has diminished considerably in the last 15 years. In an analysis of discipline-related content in the elementary education literature from 1989–1998, Hardman and Smith (2000) found that less than 1% of articles across 13 journals focused to any degree on classroom discipline. Evertson and Weinstein (2005), in their introduction to this volume, point out that only 2 or 3 of the over 1,500 sessions at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association deal with classroom management. Without a strong presence in the research literature and academic discourse over the last decade—the same decade that has seen the rise in standards-based criteria in education—classroom management content had few champions participating in the development of standards. Third, classroom management has been one of many victims of the minimalization of teacher education coursework. Houston and Williams on (1992) pointed out that the cap of 18 semester hours of professional education imposed by the Texas legislature in 1987 decreased classroom management courses along with other methods. Meeting the need for classroom management content is more difficult in these states where professional teacher preparation has become

increasingly limited. Schwartz (1997) has also found that many states have placed limits on semester hours or academic credits to eliminate parts of the teacher preparation curriculum deemed unnecessary, such as methods courses. She notes that in most states less time is devoted to training teachers than to training other professionals such as pharmacists, nurses, accountants, or other professionals.

Fourth, there is a disjunction between teacher preparation and area-specific standards and state-level criteria. As summarized earlier, it is only under Principle 5 that the INTASC standards directly address classroom management. However, in state-level assessments used for evaluating teaching in the classroom, it is evident that classroom management is *strongly* represented as a desired teacher skill. Thus, it is where standards take on their most incarnate form, in the authentic evaluation of teacher performance, that we see classroom management competencies expressed most strongly. It is clear that work needs to be done to align current standards with teacher assessments being used at the state level. Perhaps this work will also influence the extent to which classroom management appears in standards at different levels.

With regard to the lack of classroom management content in teacher preparation programs, perhaps we are observing the natural result of the lack of standards in the area of classroom management. That is to say, mention of classroom management is sparse in national standards, and correspondingly, the extent to which this content is part of training programs is sparse. In contrast, the specialty standards used by NCATE that were developed by the Council for Exceptional Children, as well as those developed by recent efforts of INTASC for all educators who work with students with disabilities, stand out as those that contain the most classroom management content. As noted earlier, coursework in classroom or behavioral management appears often as part of special education programs, which may well be the field's response to the frequent appearance of classroom management in these standards. Greer-Chase, Rhodes, and Kellam (2002) have suggested that teacher training programs incorporate classroom management as a mandatory component of teacher preparation. Similarly, classroom management should be an essential part of accreditation, licensing, and certification standards and teachers should be adequately prepared in response to these standards. A teacher in Whitney, Golez, Nagel, and Nieto's (2002) study stated the situation succinctly, "If you don't have the management, you can't teach" (p. 73). Teachers who are not prepared in the area of classroom management not only cannot teach, they should not teach. However, it is up to those of us who prepare teachers to ensure that the essential skill of classroom management becomes a fundamental part of the training program of all teachers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to thank Lynn Boyer, Council for Exceptional Children, for her review of an early draft of this chapter.

REFERENCES

Alberto, P. A., & Troutman, A. C. (2006). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Azondegan, J. (2004, January). Initial findings and major questions about HOUSSE). Retrieved August 8, 2005 from www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/99/68/4968.pdf

Banks, M. K. (2003). Classroom management preparation in Texas colleges and universities. *International Journal of Reality Therapy, 23*(2), 48–51.

Barrett, E. R., & Davis, S. (1995). Perceptions of beginning teachers' inservice needs in classroom management. *Teacher Education and Practice, 2*(1), 22–27.

Bender, W. N., & Mathes, M. Y. (1995). Students with ADHD in the inclusive classroom: A hierarchical approach to strategy selection. *Intervention in School and Clinic 30*(4), 226–232.

Blum, H. (1994). The pre-service teacher's educational training in classroom discipline: A national survey of teacher education programs. Unpublished dissertation, Temple University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. (p. 2348 DAI-A 55/08 Dissertation Abstracts International 313 Pages AAT No. 9434650).

Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. (1976). *Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Charles, C. M. (2002) *Building classroom discipline* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Christiansen, D. (1996). The professional knowledge-research base for teacher education. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 38–52). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Clapp, B. (1989). The discipline challenge. *Instructor, 99*, 32–34.

Council of Chief State School Officers (2001, May). Model standards for licensing general and special education teachers of students with disabilities: A resource for state dialog. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2004). *Test of teaching knowledge*. Retrieved March 19, 2004, from http://www.ccsso.org/projects/Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium.

Council for Exceptional Children. (2003). *What every special educator must know: Ethics, standards, and guidelines for special educators* (5th Ed.). Upper Saddle River: NJ: Pearson Education.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Rustique-Forrester, E. (1997). Investing in quality teaching: State-level strategies. *Perspective*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Education Commission of the States. (2004). *ECS Report to the Nation: State Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Denver, CO: Author.

Education Commission of the States (2005). Retrieved August 8, 2005, from http://nclb2.esc.org/NCLBSURVEY/NCLB.aspx

Education Testing Service. (2005). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved August 8, 2005, from http://www.ets.org/praxis/prxfaq.html

Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., & Worsham, M. E. (2003). *Classroom management for secondary teachers* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Emmer, E. T., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology and teacher education. *Educational Psychologist, 36*(2), 103–112.

Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. (2006). (Eds.). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C. Evertson & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gilberts, G. H., & Lignugaris-Kraft, B. (1997). Classroom management and instruction competencies for preparing elementary and special education teachers. *Teaching* and *Teacher Education, 13*(16), 597–610.

Greer-Chase, M., Rhodes, W. A., & Kellam, S. G. (2002). Why the prevention of aggressive disruptive behaviors in middle school must begin in elementary school. *Clearing House, 75*(5), 242–247.

Hardman, E. L., & Smith, S. W. (2000, April). *Analysis of discipline-related content in the elementary education literature*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Halford, J. (1998). Easing the way for new teachers. *Educational Leadership, 55*(5), 33–36.

Houston, W. R., & Williamson, J. (1993). Perceptions of their preparation by 42 Texas elementary school teachers compared with their responses as student teachers. *Teacher Education and Practice*, *8*(2), 27–42.

Hoy, A. W. (2000). Educational psychology in teacher education. *Educational Psychologist, 4*, 257–270.

Jones, V. (1989). Classroom management: Clarifying theory and improving practice. *Education, 109*, 330–339.

Jones, V. (1996). Classroom management. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 503–521). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Jones, V. (2006). How do teachers learn to be effective classroom managers? In C. Evertson & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jones, V., & Jones, L. (2004). *Comprehensive classroom management* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Kauffman, J. M., Lloyd, J. W., Baker, J., & Riedel, T. M. (1995). Inclusion of all students with emotional or behavioral disorders? Let's think again. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(7), 542–546.

Kher, N., Lacina-Gifford, L. J., & Yandell, S. (2000, April). *Preservice teachers' knowledge of effective classroom management strategies: Defiant behavior.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kilgore, K. L., & Griffin, C. C. (1998). Beginning special educators: Problems of practice and the influence of school context. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 21*(3), 155–173.

Koziol, S., Minnick, B., & Sherman, M. (1996). What student teaching evaluation instruments tell us about emphases in teacher education programs. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 10*(1), 53–74.

Landau, B. M. (2001, April). *Teaching classroom management: A stand-alone necessity for preparing new teachers.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Conference, Seattle, WA.

Martin, N. K., & Shoho, A. R. (2000, February). *Teacher experience, training and age: The influence of teacher characteristics on classroom management style.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas, TX.

Merrett, F., & Wheldall, K. (1993). How do teachers learn to manage classroom behavior? A study of teachers' opinions about their initial training with special reference to classroom behavior management. *Educational Studies, 19*(3), 91–107.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (2002). *NASDTEC's report on how the states respond to NBPTS-Certified Teachers.* Paper retrieved July 2, 2004, from http://www.nasdtec.org/papers/NBPTS_Report.rtf

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2004a). *What teachers should know and be able to do: The five core propositions of the national board.* Retrieved October 28, 2004, from http://www.nbpts.org/about/coreprops.cfm

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2004b). *Standards and National Board certification.* Retrieved October 28, 2004, from http://www.nbpts.org/standards/stds.cfm

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2005). NBPTS quick facts. Retrieved August 8, 2005 from http://www.nbpts.org/pdf/quickfacts.pdf

National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). *Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education.* Washington DC: Author.

National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Educators. (2005a). *About NCATE.* Retrieved August 8, 2005, from http://www.ncate.org

National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2005b). *Standards.* Retrieved August 8, 2005, from http://www.ncate.org/public/standards.asp

Nims, D. R., & Wilson, R. W. (1998, February). *Violence prevention preparation: A survey of colleges of education and departments of teacher education.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. *Public Law 107-110, the No Child Left Behind Act.* Retrieved October 28, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html

Oakes, T. J. (1999). A guide to organizations involved with licensing and certification of teachers and accreditation of teacher education programs. *ERIC Digest,* 1–5, ED437367.

Pigge, F. L., & Marso, R. N. (1997). A seven year longitudinal multi-factor assessment of teaching concerns development through preparation and early years of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(2), 225–235.

Ralph, E. G., Kesten, C., Lang, H., & Smith, D. (1998). Hiring new teachers: What do school districts look for? *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(1), 47–56.

Rickman, L. W., & Hollowell, J. (1981). Some causes of student teacher failure. *Improving College and University Teaching, 29*(4), 176–179.

Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (2004). The 36th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(1), 41–52.

Roth, R. A. (1996). Standards for certification, licensure, and accreditation. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 242–278). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Scales, P. C. (1994). Strengthening middle grade teacher preparation programs, *Middle School Journal, 26*(1), 59–65.

Schwartz, H. (1997). The changing nature of teacher education. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp 3–13). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Shinn, M. R., Walker, H. M., & Stoner, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Interventions for academic and behavior problems: Preventive and remedial approaches.* Silver Springs, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Stengel, B. S., & Tom, A. R. (1996). Changes and choices in teaching methods. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers* (pp. 593–619). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stough, L. M., Williams-Diehm K., & Montague, M. (2004, November). *Classroom management content in teacher preparation programs.* Paper presented at the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, Albuquerque, NM.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council. (2005). *Teacher education accreditation conucil.* Retrieved August 8, 2005, from http://www.teac.org/

U.S. News and World Report. (2004). *Top education schools.* Retrieved April 20, 2004, from http:///www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings/edu/brief/edurank_brief.php

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54*(2), 143–178.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research, 63*, 249–294.

Wesley, D. A., & Vocke, D. E. (1992, February). *Classroom discipline and teacher education.* Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators annual meeting, Orlando, FL.

Whitney, L., Golez, F., Nagel, G., & Nieto, C. (2002). Listening to voices of practicing teachers to examine the effectiveness of a teacher education program. *Action in Teacher Education, 23*(4), 69–76.