

12-2009

Teacher Recertification: A Historical Analysis of the Illinois Process

Nancy Brodbeck

Southern Illinois University Carbondale, nbrodbeck@wl.k12.il.us

Follow this and additional works at: <http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Brodbeck, Nancy, "Teacher Recertification: A Historical Analysis of the Illinois Process" (2009). *Dissertations*. 67.
<http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/dissertations/67>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

TEACHER RECERTIFICATION:
HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF
THE ILLINOIS PROCESS

Nancy Negley Brodbeck

B.S., Illinois State University, 1978

M.S. in Educ., Illinois State University, 1983

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree

Department of Higher Education and Educational Administration
In the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
December 2009

DISSERTATION APPROVAL
TEACHER RECERTIFICATION: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS
OF THE ILLINOIS PROCESS

By

Nancy Negley Brodbeck

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
In the Field of Educational Administration

Approved by:

Brad Colwell

Patrick Dilley

Judith Green

Elizabeth Lewin

Alejandro Cáceres

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
October 26, 2009

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Nancy Negley Brodbeck, for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Educational Administration, presented on October 26, 2009, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: TEACHER RECERTIFICATION: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ILLINOIS PROCESS

MAJOR PROFESSORS: Brad Colwell, Ph.D., J.D., and Patrick Dilley, Ph.D.

License renewal and recertification have long been standard practice in service professions. Ten years ago, a new law called for policy revision and mandated that Illinois teachers acquire continuing professional development to maintain certification. This study provides a historical perspective of the Illinois teacher recertification process, exploring its genesis and its metamorphosis. The nine stakeholders interviewed in this study represent different levels of responsibility in state education agencies, ranging from state- to local-level involvements. An online search of each of the fifty states' department of education websites yielded certification information or contact information to state certification divisions. Each state's certificate renewal requirements were secured and printed, and when not available online, were solicited through telephone contact and received by mail.

A review of literature led to the comparison of certificate renewal to that of other professional relicensure practices. The American Medical Association and the American Bar Association were researched to determine what types of continuing education are required to maintain licensure in the fields of medicine and law.

Telephone interviews were conducted with nine people, six of whom

helped design and write the Illinois *Certificate Renewal Manual* (Illinois State Board of Education & Illinois State Teachers Certification Board, 2000). The other three interviews were conducted with representatives of those responsible for implementing and overseeing the teacher recertification process at the regional and local levels. Study participants were selected from urban, suburban, and rural areas from northern, southern, and central Illinois.

Two dominant themes emerged from the interviews. First, the initial recertification plan was time consuming. Teachers were spending considerable time with paperwork, which took time away from instructional preparation. Second, the process was labor intensive, involving layers of increased bureaucracy, reporting, and record keeping.

The research completed in this study confirms the need for change to the initial recertification process that occurred in 2004. Although these changes were viewed positively by teachers and the state agencies responsible for monitoring the process, they lessened the connection between classroom instruction and relevant professional development activities. Implications for administrative roles in teacher recertification are noted, and recommendations for a best practice model of teacher recertification are suggested.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

If 50 is the new 30, my mid-life crisis began rather early. Some may believe that is what overcame me when I chose to enroll at SIUC to pursue my dream while living and working full-time in Macon County, three-and-a-half hours north of Carbondale. Yet, with the support and encouragement of Dr. Randy Dunn, someone with whom I had worked when we were both in the early stages of our careers, I was convinced the crazy logistics were manageable and my dream could be achieved. So, this journey, which did indeed include crisis, began.

Undoubtedly, someone inadvertently and unintentionally will be omitted from this listing of those who deserve my gratitude. I will begin with Dr. Brad Colwell, a respected and knowledgeable teacher, quite separate from those who are merely instructors. He has been attentive, supportive, gracious, and extremely patient with me. I appreciate his astute direction and the time he committed to my needs. Dr. Patrick Dilley, Dr. Kelly McKerrow, and Dr. Randy Dunn all served to inspire, challenge, and cajole me throughout this endeavor. Their guidance, coupled with the acceptance and friendships established through the cohort, is greatly appreciated. Without the cohort, and especially Dr. Christie Magoulias and Dr. Tami Kampwerth, pursuing this degree would not have been nearly as pleasant.

My father, Jim Negley, who became ill and passed away soon after prospectus approval, and my mother, Hilda, provided me with the aptitude and stamina to multi-task and achieve. Both of my parents nurtured my curiosity, my

desire, and my passions, rarely if ever refusing me an opportunity. Whatever I accomplish is a result of their efforts, examples, and model. My sister, Norma St. Clair, and two brothers, Tim and Carl Negley, endured their big sister's bossy nature and allowed me to practice teaching strategies on them long before any formal training occurred. They helped me determine a career path early in life. My sons, Jake and John, who grew into men in the time it has taken me to get to this point, continue to keep me humble and remind me that when they whined, I cut them no slack. I thank them for their honesty and their less-than-subtle ways of reminding me that only the weak make excuses.

My friends and colleagues in the Warrensburg-Latham school system endured my transformation from teacher to administrator and continue to provide insight, inspiration, and acceptance. I am fortunate to be a part of such a dedicated staff. My friends, specifically Bev, Cindy, Jeanette, June, Randy, Carol, Jackie, Jane, Pam, and Trish, provided me with necessary diversion to keep me involved in life outside of academia. Additionally, I must recognize the doctors in Decatur and St. Louis who took me apart and put me back together again so that I could finish this journey. When I wanted to give up on so much, they pushed me physically, emotionally, and spiritually. Theirs truly are the hands of God.

My husband, Steve, has worked as hard as I have to achieve this goal. He has spent many hours alone while I drove into the distance or shut myself in my office to research and write. He accompanied me to countless high school activities well after our sons graduated just so we could have some time together while en route. He has sacrificed without complaint. His constant support,

unconditional love, and unwavering faith give me purpose.

The last seven years have been a testament to the individual and collective strengths in the Brodbeck clan. New challenges are inevitable and welcome, but I have learned we have few limitations as a family, anything is possible with perseverance, and miracles do happen. What more could anyone hope to know?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
<i>Chapter</i>	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction to Problem	1
Illinois Recertification	3
Levels of Certification in the Illinois Process	3
Recertification Plan Design	4
Recertification Implementation	5
Purposes of Study	6
Research Questions	7
Professional Significance of Study	7
Researcher Background	8
Methodological Overview	10
Samples and Research Participants	12
Sample	12
Interviews	12
Data Collection	13
Documents	13
Interviews	14

Data Analysis	15
Documents	15
Interviews	16
Verification of Interpretation	18
Limitations and Delimitations of the Study	18
Definition of Key Terms	19
Summary	20
2. HISTORY OF THE ILLINOIS RECERTIFICATION PROCESS	22
Changes in Illinois Certification	23
Overview of the Law	24
Developing the Illinois Recertification Plan	25
Crafters of the Plan	28
Interviews with Stakeholders	31
Overview of Stakeholders' Views	31
Student Achievement	32
Professional Development	32
Teacher Evaluation	33
Interviews	34
Recertification Implementation	39
Role of ISBE	39
Role of the LPDC	41
Role of the ROE	43
Reactions and Recurring Themes	44

	Paperwork	45
	Time	47
	Professional Development	48
	Changes to the Recertification Process	49
	Summary	51
3.	COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL STATE RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	52
	State Recertification Procedures	52
	Renewal Cycles	52
	Recertification Validation	54
	Professional Development	54
	Definition	54
	Continuing Education	55
	Professional Growth Plans	57
	States Serving as Models for Illinois	59
	Monitoring the Recertification Process	61
	Tables	62
	Recertification Monitoring through Local Control	62
	Recertification Monitoring by State Agencies	63
	Recertification with Tiered Reporting Systems	64
	Recertification Monitoring by Other Agencies	65
	Summary	66
4.	RELICENSURE PROCEDURES FOR OTHER PROFESSIONS	68

Review of Professional Recertification Effort	69
Recertification Model	71
Continuing Legal Education for Lawyers	72
Continuing Medical Education	74
Medical Practitioners	74
Illinois Requirements for Relicensure	75
Licensure Compared to Certification	76
Nurses	77
Technical Trade and Skill Occupations	78
Summary	80
5. RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND	
RECOMMENDATIONS	82
Purposes of Study	83
Discussion of Research Questions	84
Law Practice	85
Medical Practice	86
Conclusions	89
Planning and Support	89
Purpose	91
Implications of Study	92
Recommendations for Further Study	93
REFERENCES	95

APPENDICES

A. Illinois Administrative Code, Section 25 102

B. Interview Protocol 104

C. Interview Participants 105

D. States' Certification Requirements 106

E. Letter of Information 107

F. Consent Letter for Participation and Audiotaping 108

G. 91st General Assembly - Summary of SB0556 109

H. Appeal Form 112

VITA 113

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Recertification Monitored through Local Control	63
2. Recertification Monitored through State Department or Board of Education	64
3. Recertification Monitored through State, Regional, and/or Local Agencies	65
4. Recertification Monitored through Other Agencies	66

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The persistent call for education reform has generated policy change on several levels (Mikulecky & Baber, 2005). The organization and curriculum of schools have undergone change due to public monitoring, as has the process through which teachers maintain certification or licensure. Hanes and Rowls (1984) reported that as many as 40 states, including Illinois, called for recertification of practicing teachers in an attempt to strengthen the quality of education and public opinion about the teaching profession in general. State teacher-certification boards responded by identifying and developing specific procedures for practicing teachers to follow to maintain certification. This study was conducted to review the Illinois teacher recertification process and chronicle its implementation.

Introduction to the Problem

Renewing and maintaining teaching certification is often contingent on the acquisition of continued professional development. Hanes and Rowls (1984) pointed out that most states have required some effort toward re-licensure for many years. With the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), state efforts have intensified to prove to public constituents that school districts are striving to increase student achievement, and that effort is enhanced through employing teachers designated as “highly qualified.”

Certified teachers must meet both federal and state requirements to be

classified as “highly qualified.” Federal requirements of NCLB include proof of full certification and completion of a bachelor’s degree (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). In addition, the certificate holder must have accomplished one of the following criteria: (a) majored in the core subject area of certification, (b) passed a state exam in the core subject area, (c) achieved an advanced degree in the core subject area, or (d) received an advanced certificate in every core subject the certificate holder teaches (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).

An alternate route to demonstrating “highly qualified” status is provided through an option known as HOUSSE, which stands for High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (Appendix A). This process, designed for teachers who have more than one year of teaching experience, allows for that experience to count toward content expertise. HOUSSE permits teachers who may not have majored or tested in a core subject area to use teaching experience to satisfy up to 50% of the federal requirement for achieving “highly qualified” status. To comply with NCLB, all school districts were to offer assurance of teacher quality through HOUSSE by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. Individual states were charged with establishing a state definition of “highly qualified” and allowed to determine specific certification requirements (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The intent of the recertification efforts in most states is to provide a guarantee that those teachers labeled “highly qualified” continue to seek improvement through acquisition of professional development (Walsh & Snyder, 2004).

Illinois Recertification

A review of literature shows that teacher quality has a greater impact on student achievement than any other factor (Ballou & Podgursky, 1998; Brewer, 2003). Recognizing continued public concern about teacher quality, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board (ISTCB) jointly published a manual for certificate renewal in compliance with the Illinois School Code (105 ILCS 5/21-2) that outlines procedures and provides forms to verify individual teacher professional development efforts. As described in the *Certificate Renewal Manual* (ISBE & ISTCB, 2000), the ultimate goal of the recertification effort is to increase student achievement via better-qualified teachers. This publication preceded the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, which further emphasized the need for continuing education among the nation's teachers and mandated proof that the teaching workforce is "highly qualified."

Levels of Certification in the Illinois Process

Three levels of certification are described in the Illinois *Certificate Renewal Manual*: initial, standard, and master. The initial certificate, which is non-renewable, is valid for four years and granted when an individual has completed an accredited teacher education program of study, been recommended by the same, passed the requisite certification examination(s) required by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), and met all other State Board and Illinois State Teacher Certification Board requirements (105 ILCS 21-14).

Next, the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board awards the standard

certificate to those who have completed four years of teaching in Illinois or another state with equivalent certification requirements. The standard certificate is issued to teachers who have taught under the initial teaching certificate and have completed requisite professional development activities necessary for movement to the next level. The standard certificate is renewable and valid for five years. In the five-year validity period, teachers must complete 120 continuing professional development units (CPDUs) to maintain certification. These units can be variously acquired and can include continuing education units (CEUs) and graduate credit. If a teacher acquires a master's degree, the necessary CPDUs are reduced and are again reduced with the acquisition of a doctorate degree (105 ILCS 5/21-14).

Last, the master certificate, which is achieved through completion of National Board certification and is regulated by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), is valid for ten years. This designation is awarded to teachers who complete a prescribed and rigorous reflection process, developing a portfolio that includes sample lesson plans, student work, videotaped instruction, and verification of relevant and appropriate professional development activities (ILCS 5/21-14).

Recertification Plan Design

In 1999, the Illinois Teacher Certification article of the School Code of Illinois (Article 21) was amended to establish Local Professional Development Committees (LPDCs) for the purpose of monitoring professional development activities and coursework that could count toward recertification of both the

standard and master teaching certificates (105 ILCS 5/21-25). The local committees were to be comprised of five members—three union-elected teacher representatives, a school board designee, and an administrative representative. A point system was described for awarding credit for continuing professional development units (CPDUs) or continuing education units (CEUs), and teachers were expected to file professional development plans with their LPDC. In a five-year cycle, teachers were to have accumulated 120 CPDUs among four categories. The Illinois *Certificate Renewal Manual* listed these categories to include (a) acquiring professional development in the subject content area, an area targeted as a state priority, or individual district goals for school improvement; (b) securing further certification; (c) securing an advanced degree; or (d) completion of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards process. Once accumulation of CPDUs was complete, the LPDC had the responsibility of notifying the appropriate Regional Office of Education (ROE) that the requirements had been met.

Recertification Implementation

The Illinois teacher recertification process went into effect in 2000, and teachers began generating individual recertification plans. Schools established LPDCs and began the process of monitoring individual certificate renewal plans. As chairperson of my district's LPDC, I scheduled monthly meetings, which were posted and conducted in compliance with the Illinois Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120). The meetings were scheduled for two hours, and teachers were welcome to attend. Individual questions were addressed, and files were kept on each

certified teacher in the district. Generally, the certification division of the Illinois State Board of Education was contacted following a meeting to secure answers to specific issues that had been discussed during the meetings. Each member of our LPDC put in enough additional time per month to equal another school day, and the only compensation afforded was credit toward recertification. When one member of the LPDC rotated off the committee, it was often difficult to find a replacement because of the time commitment and the responsibility of legal documentation.

The Illinois process of recertification did not endure a complete five-year cycle before being revised by the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois State Teachers Certification Board. Changes were made to the process to maintain compliance with the “highly qualified” designation outlined by NCLB. In 2003, the ISBE published criteria for meeting the NCLB definition of “highly qualified.” In January 2004, new guidelines were established for maintaining initial, standard, and master certificates, and LPDCs were rendered optional in the process (Appendix A). Currently, teachers record continuing education units (CEUs), continuing professional development units (CPDUs), or coursework on a password-protected link on the Illinois State Board of Education website. Regional offices of education serve as the monitoring agency, checking for compliance and renewing teacher certificates (105 ILCS 5/21-24).

Purposes of Study

This study reviews states’ policies for teacher recertification and specifically investigates the history of the Illinois recertification process. The

purposes of this study are to explore how Illinois approached teacher recertification and to identify changes to the process and how they evolved. Further, a comparison to other professions' license renewal procedures is included, focusing specifically on the professions of medicine and law. The objective is to arrive at a best practice model of teacher recertification that will better serve Illinois educators while allowing teachers to maintain highly qualified status in compliance with NCLB.

Research Questions

1. What differences exist in teacher recertification requirements among states?
2. How do teacher recertification procedures compare with other professional recertification policies?
3. What modifications can be made to the Illinois teacher recertification process to refine and enhance it, allowing for emergent best practice that ensures a more highly qualified teacher workforce?

Professional Significance of the Study

Researchers have concluded that teachers who engage in continued professional development efforts following initial certification have a positive impact on student achievement (Bohen, 2001; Brewer, 2003; Johnson, 2001; Lasley, Bainbridge, & Barnett, 2002). Since 2001 and the implementation of NCLB, most states require that teachers demonstrate evidence of continued professional development to maintain certification. Illinois requires that practicing

teachers renew certification by following a prescribed timeline and meeting specific criteria (ISBE & ISTCB, 2000). The guidelines provide a framework for renewal, which is met by participating in professional development activities, using HOUSSE, or securing college credit.

A review of literature indicates that initial teacher certification has been extensively researched and chronicled; however, very little literature addresses teacher recertification or certificate renewal. The intent of this study is to investigate the recertification efforts that exist among states and to explore the effectiveness of the Illinois process in comparison. In recognizing similarities and differences among state efforts, a better understanding of relevant recertification activities will emerge. The research is significant because the study will promote better understanding of the recertification process by comparing individual state practices. Currently, each state has guidelines regarding acquisition of recertification, but some states allow the process to be more independently crafted by individual teachers, while others require school district specific activity. The existing variations further confuse the concept of recertification. Finally, this study will arrive at a definition of recertification and suggest best practices that can better serve Illinois teachers.

Researcher Background

Having served as the first LPDC chairperson in my school district, I feel it is important to recognize that as a researcher, it is possible that I might harbor biases toward the recertification process. In late 1999, the district superintendent, with input from the district teachers' union president, asked me to attend a

meeting that outlined the changes to the Illinois certification process. The meeting was held at the regional Illinois Education Association (IEA) office in Decatur and led by representatives from the IEA and ISBE. A skeletal outline of the various components of the pending law was provided with the promise of more to follow in the coming months. An overview of the new law was presented, and drafts of projected required forms were provided and discussed. The meeting lasted approximately two hours, and no further meetings were scheduled. I left the meeting feeling somewhat confused by the intent of the changes, overwhelmed by the magnitude of the described change process, and fearful that teacher buy-in would be limited and difficult to obtain. Over the next few months, I learned that my fears were shared by many within the local IEA region.

By February 2000, our district LPDC was established, consisting of four teachers and one administrator. The committee elected me as chair, and I served in that capacity until January 2003. The LPDC was charged with securing and approving professional development plans from all district certified teachers, collecting and filing claims for credit toward recertification, and approving or denying those claims based on guidelines and charts detailed in the Illinois State *Certificate Renewal Manual*. The paperwork was cumbersome, and our monthly meetings lasted a minimum of two hours. I spent additional time assisting skeptical teachers in formulating their plans, spending preparation periods recording and filing paperwork from the meetings, and fielding telephone calls from other school districts' LPDC chairs. Even our regional IEA Uniserv director

referred questions to me at times, and eventually he asked me to train LPDC chairs from across central Illinois regarding how to manage the paperwork. I felt as though I had another full-time job.

I resigned from the LPDC so that I could begin taking graduate classes in 2003. My successor had only to fulfill her duties for a year before LPDCs were rendered optional, and the recertification process was significantly altered. I was curious as to why changes were made to the process so quickly after introduction and wondered if the practice of recertification would endure. My experience with the inaugural process is what led me to investigate the genesis of the Illinois effort to maintain teacher certification, assuring appropriate, meaningful professional development and how it compares to other state recertification practices.

Methodological Overview

A mixed-method qualitative and quantitative research design was selected to address my concerns. Qualitative research methods allow for a systematic approach to understanding qualities and the essential nature of a phenomenon. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Daniel Muijs (2004) defined quantitative research as a process through which the breadth of a subject can be explored numerically. He explained a non-experimental approach to quantitative research that employs survey data to compile statistics that will lead to a more in-depth study served through qualitative study. This “mixed methods” approach is often used in education research to show what exists and why it exists as it does (Muijs, 2004, p. 9). This

study employs this kind of research design to extrapolate a best practice model for teacher recertification. Investigation of established procedures in other states will allow for possible modifications to the Illinois process, making it more meaningful and relevant.

This particular research design was also selected because the approach combines policy, content, and historical analysis. The impact of policy is based on the interpretation of the organization, institution, or agency that oversees its implementation. As found by Pasteur (2001), contextual factors such as history and political climate can have a profound impact on policy; consequently, the context of a policy can be changed over time. Marshall and Rossman (1995) contended that a historical analysis is particularly useful to establish a background and frame of reference prior to interviewing. The research plan includes the history of the Illinois recertification effort through interviews with key stakeholders who crafted the Illinois policy. It also contains a review of other professional relicensure practices to provide a basis for comparison among careers generally regarded as professional. Reviewing the statutes, regulations, and pertinent documents used for recertification provided an avenue for comparison to Illinois requirements for certificate renewal. Forms used for reporting professional development were reviewed, noting specific requirements for completion and the amount of time allowed for the recertification cycle. Content analysis becomes relevant to understanding policy because it provides a method of determining patterns, which enables researchers to determine emergent trends and patterns that may develop over the life of a policy. Such

analysis allows for repeated study of policy by providing a systematic and replicable technique for further investigation of documents associated with policy.

Samples and Research Participants

Sample

Since each state requires teacher recertification or licensure renewal, the sample for this study includes all fifty states. Statutes and documentation forms from each state were obtained through an internet search and telephone contacts. These statutes provide a basis for comparison to the Illinois recertification expectations and serve as a genesis for interview questions.

Interviews

Purposive sampling is defined by Patton (1990) as often opportunistic, meaning it enables the researcher to maintain flexibility and follow new leads during fieldwork. It is often used in qualitative research to achieve perspective and understanding. Merriam and Associates (2002) and Schram (2003) each described the purposely selected research participant as the vehicle through which to make meaning from relevant experience. The purposive sampling for this qualitative study included nine stakeholders from specific agencies who were involved in crafting the Illinois teacher recertification policy. Each was selected because of his or her role in designing and promoting the plan. The interview protocol (Appendix B) includes six open-ended questions regarding the rationale for the development of the Illinois recertification process.

Interviews were conducted with collaborating agencies, among which were specific members of the Illinois State Board of Education, the Illinois

Education Association, the Illinois Federation of Teachers, the Illinois Principals Association, and the Illinois Association of School Administrators (Appendix C). Members of Local Professional Development Committees (LPDCs) and personnel from Regional Offices of Education (ROEs) were included among those interviewed because changes involving the responsibilities of both agencies were made prior to completion of the first five-year cycle. The varied experiences that each entity shared concerning implementation of recertification procedures serves to highlight the necessity of change to the initial process. Those interviews provided a historical overview of the Illinois teacher recertification initiative.

Data Collection

Documents

An internet search was conducted to access certification divisions of state departments of education. From those sites, policies governing teacher recertification were printed and reviewed, as were any relevant documents that teachers are to complete for verification of continued professional development. All state departments of education or state boards of education were linked and accessible through the website for the United States Department of Education (<http://www.ed.gov/index.jhtml>). Most states have certification policies available online, and all sites include telephone numbers and contacts for certification divisions. When necessary, telephone contact was made to request recertification materials. These materials were reviewed to provide a basis for interview questions, allowing for comparisons of the implemented Illinois process

to procedures followed in other states.

One table was designed (Appendix D) which listed each state and consisted of several columns with headings for various recertification requirements. Some states were found to require only continued professional development, while others required portfolio collections of lesson plans and teaching artifacts, while still others included a combination of both. The information was grouped and categorized according to recertification cycles, required hours of professional development, and documentation processes. Other tables were then generated, further sorting the states' requirements by the agencies, committees, or commissions responsible for recertification approval.

Interviews

Upon review of the various states' mandates pertaining to recertification issues, interviews with key policymakers in the Illinois effort were sought. The nine subjects for interviews were selected because of their roles in the agencies commissioned to design and develop the Illinois recertification guidelines. As described by Marshall and Rossman (1995), the selected participants are among those "... considered to be the influential, the prominent, and the well-informed people in an organization or community" (p. 83).

Twelve interviews were requested, and nine were conducted. All participants were informed of the purpose of the study during initial contact by telephone, at which time an interview time was scheduled for a later date. A letter was sent to each of the 12 stakeholders following the first telephone contact, requesting permission to interview each participant (Appendices E, F). An

interview protocol (Appendix B) was established to gather relevant information regarding the history, the development, and the implementation of the Illinois recertification or licensure renewal.

The interview protocol was designed in compliance with guidelines provided through the Human Subjects Committee of Southern Illinois University-Carbondale. The interview protocol includes six open-ended questions regarding the rationale for the development of the Illinois recertification process. Telephone contact with the ISBE Certification Division generated names of potential interview participants. Additional names were acquired through the interview process when a stakeholder mentioned someone he or she felt played a critical role in the development of the final recertification plan. Although actual names of interviewed participants will not be used, due to the nature of their positions, it may be possible to determine identity based on individual responses.

Data Analysis

Documents

An analysis of rules and requirements for certificate renewal was conducted by categorizing similarities and differences among states with mandated and established teacher recertification requirements. States were listed alphabetically with teacher recertification requirements charted. Color coding was used to highlight the length of recertification validity, professional development requirements to maintain standard certification, and the monitoring agents to which certified teachers reported. This information was then listed and organized further into four tables that arranged the requirements according to the

monitoring agencies.

The analysis generated lists and categories of activities that are allowed for achieving recertification. The categories were analyzed for similarities and differences among procedures. Stemler (2001) said that this type of content analysis is a method of sifting through various types of data systematically. Both a table and a narrative format were employed to describe the findings. Doing so ensured dependability of the study, which Lincoln and Guba (1985) referred to as an “overlap method.” Data reduction is the process Miles and Huberman (1994) described as “simplifying, abstracting, and transforming” (p. 10). Using these data reduction processes provided for the emergence of specific similarities and differences in the states’ individual efforts toward teacher recertification and put the Illinois process into perspective.

Interviews

Document analysis enabled the researcher to develop specific interview questions regarding the motivation behind the Illinois teacher recertification procedures. Nine stakeholders were interviewed by telephone and asked leading questions about the history of the Illinois process. Interviews lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. Analyzing the interviews was continuous throughout the research process, providing reflection on the data and allowing for more in-depth interpretation. The interviews were tape recorded with each subject’s permission, and the researcher took notes throughout the conversation, noting such nuances as vocal inflection, pauses, and interjected laughter or sighs. A summary of the notes was typed immediately following each interview. Reading through the

notes allowed further reflection, and listening to the taped interviews provided deeper insight into the stakeholders' experiences in the development and/or implementation of the recertification process.

The tapes were transcribed into scripts by a hired legal transcriptionist. Once the tapes were returned to the researcher, they were secured in a locked cabinet in the researcher's office. Each subject was allowed the opportunity to review the transcribed interviews and elaborate, making changes or adding further information when deemed necessary. Such member-checking provides both credibility and dependability. The corrections and additions were returned within two weeks, at which time another draft of the transcript was sent to the stakeholder for final approval. The edited transcripts were reviewed, and the content was compared to the field notes and summaries of each interview.

Responses to the posed interview questions were broken down into subcategories to create an analytic comparison. This information was then subjected to a content analysis, which Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) defined as a process of analyzing communication into categories. Field notes from reading and re-reading the transcripts allowed for the emergence of themes and salient topics, furthering the possibility for probing specific aspects of the process. Responses were broken down into subcategories using Weft Qualitative Analysis software to create what Neuman (1997) referred to as an analytic comparison, using methods of agreement and methods of comparison. The software generated a list of frequently used terms and phrases, yielding salient themes and sub-themes that were further categorized and reviewed.

The resulting interpretation is based upon data related through the interviews by the participants and their perceptions of the prescribed recertification effort. In addition, a literature review of professional re-licensure allowed for comparison of the teacher recertification process to those required of doctors and lawyers. Through this analysis process, the various pieces of information began to fit together to provide the rich, thick description necessary to make meaning (Merriam, 2002).

Verification of Interpretation

Because of the subjective nature of any qualitative study, it is imperative that collected data is transparent and described so that the study can be replicated. Lincoln and Guba (1981) promoted the use of an audit trail that provides the process of detailing how results are determined. The researcher can construct this trail through collection and processing of field notes, audiotape transcriptions, and reflective journals containing reviews and summaries. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) describe member-checking, the process of allowing participants to review summaries of their responses, as an effective method of providing trustworthiness and accuracy. Each interviewed stakeholder reviewed the audiotape transcriptions and approved the final revision, granting permission for those opinions to be included in the researcher's study.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The Illinois recertification process was amended twice in the first five-year cycle. As a political process, it is subject to continued change, which poses a limitation of the study. According to NCLB and the U.S. Department of Education,

all states must adhere to HOUSSE (Tracy & Walsh, 2004) in an effort to ensure teacher quality. In compliance with HOUSSE, each state has latitude in interpretation, thereby developing individual routes to the recertification effort. Consequently, attempts at replication of this study may have different outcomes at a later time because recertification will be viewed as a continuation of an established practice.

Definition of Key Terms

Several key terms and acronyms must be defined in order to fully understand the purpose and intent of this study.

CEU – Continuing Education Unit – training that traditionally generates one credit per ten clock hours of class time.

CPDU – Continued Professional Development Unit – in-service training geared toward accumulating points for re-certification.

HOUSSE – High, Objective, Uniform State Standard of Evaluation – a process through which teachers can demonstrate subject matter competency through a combination of professional development, content knowledge, and proven teaching experience. This route to highly qualified status is an alternative to demonstrating competency through testing, college major, or graduate degree.

ISBE – Illinois State Board of Education – the agency that interprets education policy and monitors district implementation.

LPDC – Local Professional Development Committee – a now defunct district committee established by statute to monitor individual re-certification efforts.

NCLB – No Child Left Behind – a federally mandated bill enacted in 2001 to reform education.

Professional staff development – any activity designed to improve teaching.

Recertification – the process of renewing teacher certification through documentation.

Re-licensure – the process of re-licensing various professional careers.

Rtl – Response to Intervention – a mandated initiative to increase student achievement to be in compliance with NCLB.

SIP – School Improvement Plan – a school building’s plan to improve instruction, assessment, and student achievement.

Teacher – Prekindergarten-12 certificated classroom instructor.

Summary

This study reviews state policies for teacher recertification to gain insight into recertification procedures. It also investigates the history of the Illinois recertification effort. The purpose of the study is to reflect on identified patterns and emergent themes, allowing for suggested changes to the Illinois recertification process that could make it more meaningful and productive. The objective is to arrive at a best-practice model of recertification that allows teachers to maintain highly qualified status in compliance with NCLB.

The challenge of improving teacher quality is greater than ever and, according to Geoff Camphire (2001), arguably one of the most significant issues in current education topics. Thomas Brewer (2003) agreed, saying of NCLB, “The

one feature in this gigantic act we are most interested in emphasizes and defines teacher quality as a major factor in improving student achievement” (p. 270). This study is intended to address the various policies implemented throughout the states to recertify teachers. The study will serve as an investigation into the policies established to ensure that quality teaching is occurring in public classrooms and attempt to arrive at what constitutes a best practice in recertification efforts to be in compliance with NCLB. The research will involve interviews, relevant data, and policy review.

Qualitative research methods allow for a systematic approach to understanding qualities and the essential nature of a phenomenon (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Miles & Huberman, 1994). This study employs a mixed-methods qualitative design to extrapolate a best-practice model for teacher recertification. Through investigation of established procedures in other states and determining the relevance and success of those procedures, suggestions will be made as to what can be modified in the Illinois process to make it more meaningful and relevant.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORY OF ILLINOIS RECERTIFICATION PROCESS

The quality and condition of education is generally believed to be contingent on the capabilities of teachers to adequately instruct students (Black, 2002; Bohlen, 2001). Teacher certification is a topic that has generated much interest and discussion in the public sector (Tracy & Walsh, 2004). An outgrowth of that interest is an awareness and concern regarding how teachers maintain certification once it has been acquired.

The federal government responded by passing the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (PL 107-110; 115 STAT.1425), a comprehensive plan to ensure national education reform, which emphasizes teacher quality as a major component in increasing student performance and achievement. Shen and Poppink (2003) proposed that NCLB serves to satisfy a national agenda to professionalize teaching. Their research showed that the teaching workforce has become less professionalized in recent years, indicating that 14 percent of the nation's teachers had no certification for their primary teaching assignment in the 1999-2000 school year, which was up from five-and-a-half percent six years earlier.

In response, most states developed teacher recertification procedures to adhere to the policy framework outlined in NCLB (Southgate et al., 2001). Despite individual state's efforts to increase standards and strengthen teacher certification, Michael Poliakoff (2002) reported that a 2002 poll of subscribers to

The American School Board Journal found that 24% of those responding wanted to change their state's teacher certification system. As a result of the NCLB mandate, individual states began changing the certification process and added recertification requirements. Walsh and Snyder (2004) found that many of the states' efforts were half-hearted attempts at elaborately crafted plans, which did little more than extend the status quo; they stated, "Most states share neither the urgency nor the single-minded focus of the U. S. Congress in seeking to address the lost academic standards required of the American teachers" (p. 2). Citing an increased public awareness of teacher quality, Congress responded to a national impatience with slow state reform and called for significant revision to states' certification procedures (Tracy & Walsh, 2004).

Changes in Illinois Certification

When I began my teaching career, I presented entitlement cards issued by Illinois State University to the Regional Office of Education (ROE) serving the school district where I was employed, paid a nominal fee, and received my teaching certificates through the mail. For the next two decades, renewal of my certificates required paying a fee and securing a stamp from the ROE, which provided proof of payment. It was not necessary to travel to the ROE to complete the process. An agent from that office scheduled a visit to each of the area schools; teachers left their certificates in the central office with payment and retrieved them at the end of that particular school day. It was a simple routine that guaranteed continued validity of my certificate. There was no differentiation among certificates regardless of the status or seniority of the certificate holder.

In 1988, changes were made to teacher certification rules, but the changes only pertained to those seeking initial certification. As a result of the legislated changes, prospective teachers were required to pass a basic skills test in order to become certified, demonstrating adequate preparation for teaching (105 ILCS 5/21-1a). The test covers reading, writing, grammar, and math plus specific content knowledge in the subject area for which the candidate has prepared. For the next dozen years, this was the only alteration to the certification process, and the practice of recertification continued to involve only paying a fee to the ROE.

Overview of the Law

The onset of the 21st century brought about major change to teacher recertification. In Illinois, Senate Bill 556 (Appendix G) was passed on July 1, 1999, calling for a teacher recertification process that would guarantee teacher quality among veteran teachers. This bill was enacted statutorily and amended the School Code of Illinois through P. A. 91-102, which stated, “The State Board of Education, in consultation with the State Certification Board, shall design and implement a system of examinations and various other criteria which shall be required prior to the issuance of Initial Teaching Certificates and Standard Teaching Certificates” (105 ILCS 5/21-1g).

The specific prescribed rules and guidelines for changing teacher recertification were politically motivated, and the decisions regarding need for change came from outside the education community without solicitation or input from the Illinois State Board of Education (Personal communication, August 8,

2007). The legislated mandate included a directive for ISBE, which was charged with reporting additional recommendations to the Governor and the Illinois General Assembly regarding adjustments to the certification system. The agency was allowed a two-year time frame for revamping the system and recertification process (105 ILCS 5/21-1h).

The “various other criteria” stipulated in the public act became the focus of the recertification process since the testing portion of the initial certification process was established and implemented. The State Superintendent of Schools, as presiding officer for ISBE, scheduled meetings throughout July 1999 with individuals involved in passing the teacher recertification mandate. He met with the joint chairmen of the House Education Committee to further clarify the intent of the legislation. Following that discussion, input was solicited from the chairman of the Illinois Business Roundtable, the agency which was believed to have successfully lobbied for the change (Personal communication, August 2007). The outgrowth of those discussions led to a list of vested organizations and agencies which were contacted and asked for representation in the process of developing a recertification plan. The stage was set to begin assembling the people who would eventually establish guidelines for the “various other criteria” that Illinois teachers must satisfy to remain certified.

Developing the Illinois Recertification Plan:

The Infamous One-Night Meeting

The ISBE responded to the recertification mandate by convening a group of stakeholders that included representation from various education

organizations and agencies that had not been consulted when the legislation was drafted. The State Superintendent of Schools solicited participation and input for the development of the plan from within ISBE as well as the Illinois Education Association (IEA), the Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT), the Illinois Principals' Association (IPA), and the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA). Representatives from the Illinois Business Roundtable (IBRT) and the Illinois General Assembly were also included in the discussions. Each organization or agency provided at least one representative who was asked to attend a meeting in August 1999 at the State Superintendent's request. According to those meeting participants who were interviewed for this study, this meeting lasted for more than 12 hours but was the only face-to-face meeting held for the purpose of generating a plan. Further meetings were held within the organizations and agencies with sub-committees, but the primary group of stakeholders did not meet again to discuss the final product. No practicing teachers and no personnel from Regional Offices of Education were included on the State Superintendent's committee.

The recertification plan this group developed in that single face-to-face meeting was refined in sub-committee meetings, outlined in a *Certificate Renewal Manual* that was jointly produced by the ISBE and the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board and published in October 2000. Requirements for recertification were prescribed in the manual with specific guidelines provided for how to develop a certificate renewal plan, a timeline for completion of the plan, and how to submit the plan for approval. The manual included professional

development options, as well as activities such as committee work, teacher mentoring, and supervision of student teachers that could be counted toward certificate renewal. Each activity or option was assigned point values, and the manual also included forms that were to be used for plan development, documentation, and submission procedures.

In order to maintain teacher certification, teachers were to develop a certificate renewal plan, which was to include three personal goals for improvement, professional development activities that addressed those goals, proof of involvement in relevant professional development activities, and reflections on how improvement had been achieved. Professional development activities were awarded point values, and in a five-year renewal cycle, teachers were expected to amass 120 professional development units that related directly to their goals. Once a local professional development committee (LPDC) approved a teacher's plan, documentation of relevant professional development was to be submitted to a district committee that maintained records and submitted completed renewal plans to the regional office of education for recertification approval.

Rules and regulations were specified regarding LPDCs, which were to oversee teacher compliance. Each school district's committee was to collect evidence from teachers of professional development acquisition and recommend certificate renewal or non-renewal to the regional superintendent of schools. If the regional superintendent concurred with the non-renewal decision, recommendation for non-renewal was passed on to the State Teacher

Certification Board (STCB), which convened a hearing to review the submission. If the STCB concurred with the LPDC and ROE decision, the certificate holder was notified within seven days. At every level of reporting, an appeals system was designed to allow the certificate holder to amend or clarify the plan (Appendix H). The final avenue for appeal was a court of administrative review (ISBE & ISTCB, 2000).

Crafters of the Plan

Discussions about recertification began among outside forces prior to the Illinois State Superintendent of School's term in office during the late 1990s. The initial call for change to the Illinois teacher recertification process was not an ISBE initiative; instead, it came from business agencies and labor organizations that have a peripheral connection to education. Such groups contended that by increasing certification requirements, schools would produce a more skilled workforce. Their lobbying efforts were successful, and significant momentum was established, calling for changes to the teacher certification system. The topic grew in importance when legislation was passed in July 1999, requiring all teachers to renew certificates through a professional development process (P.A. 91-102).

This researcher conducted interviews with individuals who were tapped by the Illinois State Superintendent of Schools to serve on a committee charged with the development of the teacher recertification plan. The aforementioned agencies, ISBE, IEA, IFT, IBRT, IPA, IASA, and the House and Senate joint education committees, each had at least one representative seated on the

committee, but none of the interviewed participants were certain of the exact number present at the August 1999 meeting. Only two groups were not represented in the interview pool. Representatives from the Illinois General Assembly and the IBRT were approached, but neither responded to requests for interviews.

Interview questions were posed regarding the roles of specific stakeholders and their involvement in crafting the plan, what other models of recertification or re-licensure were considered, if any, and how those stakeholders felt about the final product. Twelve interviews were requested, and nine were conducted. Wherever possible, pseudonyms have been used to protect the identities of those involved in developing the plan.

The state superintendent considered the Illinois Business Roundtable (IBRT) to be “the significant driver of educational policy in those days,” so he contacted that agency as a first step in building the required committee. The organization’s website indicates that it represents manufacturing and is a politically active and influential group (<http://www.illinoisbusinessroundtable.com>). According to the superintendent, representatives from the Illinois Business Roundtable worked with him to convene a representative group to fill what had been a vacuum in education policy leadership. He also enlisted the help of the House Education Committee co-chairs, and together they assembled a representative group of stakeholders.

The superintendent’s recollection is of one meeting that he described simplistically. “This was the coolest thing. I got all the stakeholders together in

Springfield, and we met from 3:00 in the afternoon until about 3:30 in the morning. We were all together in one big room, and we'd move out and discuss, then reconvene. Some trickled off, but most stayed. That's when we actually hammered out an agreement. It was all about compromise. It was a plan and something that everyone could agree on."

Continuing, the superintendent went on to say that the evening involved "a lot of horse-trading." Factions such as the IBRT and the legislators wanted a rigorous process for teachers to complete, involving professional development that was tied to the state learning standards. He said that the union representation from the Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT) and the Illinois Education Association (IEA) wanted minimal requirements with fewer rigors. A highly charged political debate ensued between the two factions. The superintendent recalled, "It was old-fashioned bargaining with some raised voices and hot tempers, but we worked it out because we focused on a clear outcome that could improve teaching and learning."

The superintendent said that the committee had access to certification regulations from all fifty states, which was supplied by the IEA, but he said that in the end, the Illinois plan was not based on what was being done in other states. A suggestion was made to review other professional approaches to re-licensure, but the superintendent stated that the group decided to maintain focus on teachers. He said the consensus among group members was that looking at other professions' models for re-licensure could take time away from their mission and possibly confuse the restructuring process. The group determined

that this one evening offered the only chance to create something that teachers would buy into, and this meeting was the one shot afforded to accomplish the task.

Ultimately, the superintendent said that members of ISBE were “not terribly happy with the plan” because the feeling was that it was not rigorous enough. However, the committee believed that it was a manageable process that teachers could understand and support. He remarked of the plan, “It was developed by people willing to compromise in the interest of the greater good. It doesn’t reflect the animosity of the special interest groups that are unwilling to compromise.... The process isn’t perfect, but it works. It’s good. Oh, you could make it better, but it’s working. I was, I am, really proud of the process.”

Interviews With Stakeholders

In this section, I will relay responses to the interview questions from those stakeholders who were involved in the initial meeting. Included are unsolicited comments that insinuate the flavor and tone of the meeting, providing insight into the special interests and independent agendas that were supported by the representative organizations. The following accounts are relayed in order according to scheduled interviews, which is not an indication of weighted clout among the stakeholders.

Overview of Stakeholders’ Views

Interviews with the education leaders involved in developing the Illinois plan elicited emergent and recurring themes. The stakeholders included in this study agreed that student achievement was paramount and contingent on

teacher quality. Professional development in most cases was arbitrarily acquired and often meaningless. And the teacher evaluation process in Illinois was more commonly designed by individual districts to assess classroom management rather than classroom instruction.

Student Achievement

Those involved with designing the Illinois plan agreed that the overarching intent of the teacher recertification process was and continues to be that of improving teaching and learning. The consensus among the interviewed stakeholders was that there was a lack of trust in teachers' efforts to improve instruction through their own selected professional development activities; consequently, some kind of re-tooling of teaching was believed inevitable. As stakeholders acknowledged and reinforced by many of the studies used in this research effort, it is generally believed that teachers who actively engage in continued professional development activities successfully increase and positively impact student achievement.

Professional Development

In almost every interview, professional development was regarded as problematic. The professional development opportunities that school districts provided were perceived to be disconnected to specific school improvement efforts, and, more often than not, the training was a "one-shot" exposure to an educational topic. Rarely was further training provided, and even more seldom was any kind of check for implementation of what had been presented. As one stakeholder remarked, "The intent of the [Illinois] plan is to improve student

achievement by encouraging teachers to seek relevant professional development and to become better versed in addressing the state priority areas targeted by ISBE for school improvement.”

Other stakeholders reiterated the same opinion, citing that some teachers had not taken coursework or done anything to enhance or improve their instructional delivery in as many as 20 years prior to 2000. What resulted from the change in requirements for recertification was more focused professional development offered by local, regional, and state providers that encouraged teachers to think about what they needed to do to become more aware and knowledgeable of educational best practices. As a result of the teacher recertification initiative, professional development activities offered by local school districts are more often tailored to address specific district improvement goals and individual teacher needs.

Teacher Evaluation

Improved teacher quality is the desired outcome of the NCLB mandate to ensure a highly qualified teacher workforce, yet teacher evaluation is not connected to the Illinois recertification process. Those interviewed for this study were not able to address the evaluation process because, unlike certification and recertification, it is not uniformly monitored or designed at the state level. Individual districts have the authority to design and implement a teacher evaluation tool, and although specific areas are suggested, there is great latitude in how those areas are assessed.

The two agencies involved in the design of the recertification process

whose memberships are directly responsible for teacher evaluation indicated that their position was that recertification should not be tied to teacher evaluation. They held that administrators should not be directly responsible for overseeing any part of the teacher recertification process but that their focus should continue to be on evaluation of classroom management and instructional methods. Both agencies were opposed to monitoring teacher performance based on a professional development plan. More of this will be discussed later in the interview summary with the Illinois Principals Association's representative.

Interviews

Sandra Adair represented the Illinois Federation of Teachers on the convened committee. She echoed the State Superintendent of School's belief that the business community called for change in teacher recertification, put together legislation, and introduced it as a bill. She remarked that "... there was just this terrible distrust of teachers making special decisions that involved themselves," which is what led to the proposed legislation by the Illinois Business Roundtable.

Her recollection of the process varied only slightly from the superintendent's in that she recalled meeting in Springfield several times before the meeting with the co-chairs of the House Education Committee. She credits the "business community" for bringing the stakeholders together several times until there was some agreement regarding a recertification plan. The earlier meetings were held several days in a row for the purpose of looking at other state models of teacher recertification, including the prescribed processes in

Ohio, Minnesota, and Connecticut.

Dr. Patricia Henderson represented the Illinois Education Association. At the time, she served as education policy director in agency relations. Her reflection of those involved in the process of crafting the recertification plan included the same representative group of stakeholders described by the state superintendent and Ms. Adair. She explained the need for the legislation, citing the political temperament of the time:

It really was a time when every state agency was writing standards of what students or kids should know and be able to do, and they were dealing with what teachers should know or be able to do...the climate was such that we were going to get some kind of a recertification, some kind of a re-tooling of teachers, whether we liked it or not. It was the feeling of the Business Roundtable, and it really was the feeling in the General Assembly that something had to be changed in teacher preparation as well as teacher recertification. Teachers had to be able to lose their jobs if they didn't access the number of pieces used and credits and all that sort of stuff. That just literally was the climate.

Dr. Henderson met several times with members of the ISBE teacher certification division prior to the collective meeting of stakeholders. She reported enduring "the venom of the State Board of Education members" as suggested changes were proposed to make the process more "punitive. She recalled hearing remarks from members "...that teachers should be punished..." for creating a public impatience with and a faltering trust in the education system.

Dr. Henderson was responsible for collecting information from all of her counterparts in the National Education Association, asking what each state was doing to assure teacher recertification. At the time, each state was initiating discussion about revising their process, but only a small group of states had well-defined plans in place. Both Dr. Henderson and Ms. Adair indicated that Iowa and Ohio provided models for the Illinois process, but neither state had fully developed processes when Illinois began crafting its own. Others who were interviewed mentioned looking at state recertification policies in California and New York as well.

When asked about comparing teacher recertification to other models of professional re-licensure, Dr. Henderson indicated that she met with certified public accountants, doctors from the American Medical Association, and lawyers from the American Bar Association to learn about their respective requirements for maintaining licensure. She believes that she was the only committee member who probed so extensively into other professional organizations and their re-licensure procedures.

Armed with all of the relevant information, Dr. Henderson recalled her involvement in the Springfield meeting at the ISBE. “We had this marathon negotiation meeting at the State Board of Education. We had two or three nights when we negotiated all night.” Representatives from other agencies echoed this recollection. Dr. Bruce Abbott, who served as executive director of the Illinois Principals Association, recalled that they “kind of circled the wagons and were very nonchalant designing recertification and the whole process.” He reinforced

the opinion that the group was all-inclusive of the driving forces that were demanding change in the process of certification renewal.

Most of the interviewed stakeholders indicated that the IBRT provided the momentum behind the Illinois recertification effort, an organization comprised of 63 businesses, dedicated to creating economic growth within the state (www.illinoisbusinessroundtable.com). The IBRT was heavily involved with the General Assembly and able to wield political clout. According to the State Superintendent, teacher quality was targeted by the organization as a critical component of education reform; thus, they pushed for and became involved in the process of revamping teacher certification and recertification. The organization did not provide input as to how professional development should be acquired or monitored, but they did lobby for the legislation that would eventually mandate the evolution of the process.

Robert Postin worked in the certification division at the ISBE office in Springfield when conversations about changing teacher recertification were started. Prior to the interviewed former state superintendent's term in office, however, nothing substantial materialized from those conversations. Once the superintendent was seated in the late 1990s and legislation was passed to change recertification, Mr. Postin indicated that the Illinois Education Association began data collection in preparation for developing the recertification process. He said that it was not something that the ISBE was concerned about doing at that time. Recognizing, though, that entities such as the IBRT and the IEA were heavily involved, the state superintendent chose to include the IFT and other

vested educational stakeholders. Linda Webster, another ISBE employee working in the certification division, said that the assembled committee represented the full spectrum of educational agencies throughout the state. Mr. Postin concurred, saying, "That was wonderful that the state superintendent had such foresight to involve such a large and representative group."

Other organizations were involved in providing subcommittee input into the development of the recertification process. Two of those were the Illinois Principals Association (IPA) and the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA). Representatives of the two agencies met with committee members several times to stay abreast of the developing plan, but they did not become directly involved in crafting the policy. Sandra Adair remarked that such management groups were invited to assist in the development but only chose to serve as reviewers, not as crafters. Dr. Henderson indicated that both IPA and IASA "were very interested in the process, more so because they knew that if this happened to teachers, it would happen to administrators right along with it. So they were there cuing me on and cuing the folks from IFT with, you know, 'Let's make this reasonable; let's try to make it doable,' because they knew they were next."

Dr. Bruce Abbott, who was executive director of the IPA at the time, admits, "I wasn't really part of that [the meeting]. As far as sitting on a committee that was writing and drafting, doing that, I wasn't there. Did our association have influence? Indeed they did. We had a rather short, but what we thought was an important, agenda. We felt strongly that something needed to be done, so when

the movement started, we certainly supported it.”

Despite interest in and support for teacher recertification, Dr. Abbott indicated that the position of the IPA was that principals should not be responsible for overseeing any part of the teacher recertification process. The Association held that principals should be responsible for evaluating instructional methods and classroom management but not for monitoring performance on a professional development plan. “We felt strongly that individual principals should not be making decisions about a teacher’s certification or right to work.” He said the Association maintained a position that evaluation and recertification should not be tied together and that principals should only be involved with teacher evaluation.

Recertification Implementation

Role of ISBE

The certification division of the ISBE was represented among those who crafted the recertification plan. Robert Postin was the division chair, which placed him among the representative stakeholders. He said that many committee members “came to the table with their own agendas,” and that led to intense bargaining. Once the committee established a framework for the renewal plan, a task force was created to list activities that would indicate acceptable professional development and to define those activities and assign a point value to each. “I don’t know of any other state that has identified activities and created the extensive list that we did.”

Once the task force had completed its assignment, the entire package

was sent to the state certification board for review. After much discussion, Mr. Postin said rules were written and distributed to the IEA, IFT, attorneys for both unions and the State Board, five internal members of the State Board of Education, and representatives from higher education. After a four-week period for public comment, the rules were accepted. Over a year and a half after the state superintendent convened the initial committee and conceived a recertification plan, it was ready for implementation. Mr. Postin said of the process, "It was the longest (process) that I can remember doing" during his term as certification division chair.

Once the state legislature approved the Illinois teacher recertification, the Illinois State Board of Education was charged with sending representatives to each of the educational service regions in the state and holding meetings to explain the process. The ISBE enlisted the help of regional IEA and IFT personnel, and school districts sent representatives who were then responsible for informing local school district teaching staffs of the protocol. As a local union officer, this researcher was among those sent to one of the regional informational meetings. Those in attendance were given the *Certificate Renewal Manual*, and a PowerPoint presentation of the five-year recertification cycle was overviewed. The meeting lasted a little more than two hours and served as the only formal training provided to teachers regarding how to maintain certification. From that meeting, teachers who had been trained were expected to relate the process to individual teaching staffs and work with district superintendents to create a local professional development committee (LPDC).

Role of the LPDC

Once the LPDC was established in a district, its function was to inform and train teachers on the recertification process, including how to file the necessary paperwork and the timeframe in which the filing was to occur, all of which is outlined in the *Certificate Renewal Manual*. The state provided districts with a small stipend, which could be used as the district determined. This researcher recalls that we who were LPDC chairpersons were told in the singular training session conducted jointly by ISBE and IEA that regardless of the size or location of the district, the stipend was the same amount of money.

As chairperson of a small district LPDC, I established regular monthly meetings, posted an agenda in compliance with the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120), and notified the teachers who were to have certification renewal plans on file by June of each year of the five-year cycle. Between meetings, most of the members of the LPDC worked with teachers to develop plans. There was a general feeling of apprehension surrounding the process because it was so much more labor intensive than the previous practice of signing a form and paying a fee for certificate renewal. The new recertification process created a sense of intimidation among teachers.

Interviews conducted with fellow LPDC committee members and chairpersons from other school districts revealed that the concerns of our teachers were not unique. Beverly Price, who also chaired an LPDC, reflected on the confusion that surrounded the implementation of the new process in the first

year. She said her committee spent a great deal of time organizing and filing the various forms that teachers were required to submit. Meetings were lengthy because each submitted plan had to be read and approved. Teachers had to be notified of approval or denial, and then copies were filed in a designated, secure storage area within the district as well as returned to the teacher for reference purposes. Each time a teacher attended a workshop or conference or completed a professional development activity that met specific parameters outlined in the *Certificate Renewal Manual*, a claim for credit had to be filed with the LPDC. Claims for credit also had to be copied, filed, and returned to teachers. Ms. Price recalled using many preparation periods to file paperwork because it was housed in a file in the district office, which was not usually accessible after school hours.

Another frustration for Ms. Price as LPDC chair was that of continued and referential support from regional and state agencies. When a teacher submitted a claim for credit that seemed loosely tied to his or her specific renewal plan, it was difficult to secure help from either the regional office of education or the ISBE. She said, "If I contacted the ROE, I was referred to the ISBE, and when I called Springfield, I was put on hold. That took up a good portion of many of my prep periods, too. I began to feel like my teaching was taking a backseat to this."

Ms. Price also recalled developing additional forms that the LPDC used to respond to teachers regarding their requests. The *Certificate Renewal Manual* included forms for renewal plans, claims for credit, and professional development providers, but nothing was designed for committee record-keeping or notification to teachers regarding the status of their plans or claims. "We spent a lot of

meeting time as a committee just figuring out how to label files and coming up with forms that would keep us aware of how many CPDUs teachers had acquired so we would know when they were done. We spent so much time organizing,” she said.

The role of the LPDC was similar but terrifically expanded in larger school districts. Judy Shelby, who is employed by the IFT but at the time was an assistant director with the Chicago Teachers’ Union, recalls working with building LPDCs in the Chicago Public Schools. Despite recounting some of the same frustrations, she felt that teachers liked the idea that other teachers were reviewing professional development plans and going through the same process. She said it was also beneficial to have an administrator and a community person on the committee so that all who were vested in education could see that teachers were making an effort to secure relevant professional development activities that would enhance their methods and ultimately impact student achievement. This is where Ms. Shelby believed the recertification process proved to be effective.

Role of the ROE

When the state superintendent described the stakeholders involved in developing the teacher recertification plan, regional offices of education were not represented. He stated, “Regional offices were of mixed quality and highly variable. Some were effective, and some were marginal.” He said that their involvement was delayed, and regional offices were included only as professional development providers. What resulted was improved quality of professional

development available from ROEs, and the state superintendent said he was proud of their commitment to the implementation of the process. “By and large,” he said, “the ROEs did an excellent job of becoming preferred providers of professional development.”

Natalie Houser, who oversees certification at an ROE, said that to her knowledge, no one from her specific office was informed of the changes that were made until they were finalized. She indicated that the ROE staff was trained for the renewal process at the same time as local school districts. She said that ROEs across the state were uninvolved in designing the process, but were generally held responsible for implementation. What resulted from that lack of involvement was an inability to field the many questions coming in from LPDCs and individual teachers. She recalled complaints about LPDCs “that just didn’t function well.” She continued, saying,

Everyone was aware that they needed to write this plan and schedule what they were going to do for a five year time line, and when they began these, their positions changed so that what they originally had formulated no longer applied to their current teaching position.

As a result of such change, she said LPDCs were ill equipped to counsel teachers regarding necessary modifications to their plans, so ROE personnel were consulted, and they also were not equipped to assist them.

Reactions and Recurring Themes

Each of the research participants was asked to recall teacher reaction to the recertification initiative. Several themes emerged from their reflections. The

interviewed stakeholders described problems with implementation of the recertification process that included excessive paperwork, the time needed to complete required tasks, and securing relevant and appropriate professional development. The interviewed stakeholders reported these concerns as challenges to the recertification process regardless of district demographics.

Paperwork

One of the most overwhelming aspects of implementing the mandated recertification process was the amount of required record-keeping and the amount of paper that was generated as a result. Individual teachers were required to keep forms as evidence of professional development; LPDCs were required to keep duplicate copies for each of the teachers in a filing system housed somewhere secure within the district; and providers of professional development were required to maintain evaluation forms received from teachers to serve as a form of checks and balances.

Robert Postin said that most connected with the process—either the provider or receiver—felt they were doing two hours' worth of paperwork for each hour of professional development. Others who were interviewed referred to this as “a cumbersome paper load for all involved,” “huge amounts of paperwork,” and “very paper/pencil labor intensive.” Mr. Postin remarked, “They couldn't have done a worse job of making this a paper burden.” Both Mr. Postin and Dr. Bruce Abbott experienced the paper glut at the State Board of Education, and Dr. Abbott remarked, “Keeping records of all the in-service and that sort of thing was mind boggling at the state level.”

The Regional Offices of Education experienced an increase in the amount of paper that was passed from one entity to another as well. Natalie Houser recognized that teachers were struggling to organize all of the necessary documentation, and some could not stay on top of it. “Try to keep that piece of paperwork in a portfolio or somewhere that you won’t need to produce perhaps ever...There’s been a lot of paperwork passed back and forth that almost seems unnecessary.”

Sandra Adair and Judy Shelby worked with LPDCs as trainers, and they both observed that teachers were struggling to maintain personal records, and school districts were not equipped to store the amount of paper that was generated. Ms. Shelby concurred, commenting, “Just the amount of storage space needed for that paperwork is phenomenal.” Districts were expected to secure a central location for storage of LPDC records, and the storage had to be large enough to accommodate individual files for each certified teacher in the school district.

Beverly Price, a former LPDC chair in a neighboring school district, remembered that school districts were allotted a \$200 stipend from the state to be used at the discretion of the individual school district. This amount was the same for every district regardless of size. As Ms. Price recalled, every school district in her county used the stipend to purchase a filing cabinet for storage purposes, adding, “...one that actually locked.”

Dr. Bruce Abbott’s assessment of the process possibly reflects most colorfully the sentiment of all who were interviewed. He remarked, “You start out

to design a horse, and you end up with a camel. That's kind of what happened here with the record-keeping and the paper trail.”

Time

When the research participants were asked to reflect on what aspects of the recertification problem seemed problematic, one of the emergent themes was time consumption. As Dr. Patricia Henderson pointed out, the IEA spent hundreds of hours holding training sessions across the state for those serving on LPDCs. Judy Shelby, an IFT employee, said she, too, spent many hours training teachers in the Chicago Public Schools. She said she logged over 225 visits within the Chicago system, informing teachers of the teacher recertification process and how it would be implemented.

Dr. Patricia Henderson stated,

The worst thing about it was that it was so labor intensive—it was so time consuming.... It was causing us all to be good collectors, and the file cabinets that you all must have bought to store this stuff was not what this deal was about.... It was becoming just too doggone time consuming for the value. The time that these folks are spending on this process is not what you, when we designed this, wanted them to be doing.

The paperwork generated by both teachers and professional development providers required acknowledgement of receipt from LPDCs and detailed notations on files. This process occurred at least monthly in most school districts, and it consumed time for both meetings and appropriate maintenance of the records. As mentioned previously, this researcher spent many preparation

periods in the unit office where the records were kept. Access to the filing cabinet was unavailable before or after school, so time that would usually have been used for instructional preparation was spent with recertification file maintenance.

Professional Development

Even with the time-consuming challenges of documentation and record-keeping, most of the people interviewed indicated that positive changes were resulting. The intent of the recertification mandate was to ensure that certified teachers remained highly qualified through relevant and appropriate professional development activities. Sandra Adair, an IFT employee and director, recognized that teachers were focusing more on professional development and thinking about what they needed to do to become more knowledgeable of best practices in education. As a result of their interests, she saw an increase in professional development opportunities available to teachers from both universities and professional organizations. The problem, however, was that the added expense of tuition or registration fees kept some teachers from securing appropriate professional development.

The state superintendent of schools chronicled an example of inappropriate professional development that received media attention, and he described as his “worst nightmare.” A group of teachers from a suburban school district spent the day at the Arlington Heights horse racing track, and a *Chicago Tribune* photographer spotted them. The photograph appeared in the newspaper and spawned an editorial that portrayed the Illinois teacher recertification effort as a façade for professionalism (Banchero, 2001). In actuality, the teachers were

there as a result of a professional development course in statistics and probability, but the newspaper article was skewed to imply differently. This kind of media attention, according to the superintendent, infuriated the legislators because it made a mockery of the recertification process. The professor for the course and one teacher wrote letters to the editor of the newspaper, and both were published. Nonetheless, the article called into question the relevance and rigor of professional development activities in which teachers were engaging.

Dr. Bruce Abbott, too, saw an increased awareness of the need for appropriate professional development as a positive outgrowth of the recertification process. He said that some teachers who had not been back to school or done anything to enhance their teaching for as long as 20 years were seeking professional development. But, he noted that “as times got tight, professional development was negotiated away at the bargaining table.”

Natalie Houser concurred. She said districts made adjustments in how professional development occurred within districts because they often were not able to pay full training costs for teacher training. This caused a need for districts to provide more in-house opportunities through in-servicing so that conference, workshop, and registration fees did not have to be budgeted.

Changes to the Recertification Process

Due to changes enacted in IDEA 2004, adjustments to the Illinois teacher recertification process were made before the first five-year cycle was completed (28 Ill. Reg. 8556). None of the stakeholders interviewed for this research were involved in the modifications that were made to the original recertification plan.

There was speculation among them that the changes resulted from a continued push from the business community. The two teacher unions were consulted about the changes and asked to comment, but neither had input into the change process according to the interviewed stakeholders from those organizations. Dr. Henderson, Ms. Adair, and Ms. Shelby each noted that their agencies were provided draft copies of the changes after they were made and submitted for public comment; however, they were unaware of what individuals developed those modifications or what process was employed.

In 2004, certificate renewal plans were eliminated, as were claims for credit and LPDC approval. In fact, LPDCs were made optional, and, according to Robert Postin, most school districts opted to disband the committees. Those that continued were charged with reviewing assurance forms and making recommendations for recertification to regional offices of education, which were made directly responsible for the recertification process (105 ILCS 5/21-24).

Other changes to the process included a reduction in the required number of CPDUs for some teachers. The amount of professional development secured became contingent upon the level of education acquired by the teacher; the higher the level of education, the fewer CPDUs required for recertification. Record-keeping, however, was not modified. Individual teachers were charged with keeping their own evidence of completion and assurance forms. The professional development activities were to be recorded on the ISBE certification website, with both providers and participants required to maintain documentation that the registered activity was attended and completed.

The interviewed stakeholders saw some of the changes as beneficial to the process. Robert Postin asserted that by streamlining the process, teachers could focus more on professional development and less on bureaucracy. Sandra Adair noticed that the changes allowed teachers to be treated more like professionals, eliminating some of the “terrible distrust of teachers making special decisions” pertaining to their careers.

Summary

Illinois teacher recertification is a much more involved process than it was a decade ago. Prior to 2000, teachers needed only to pay a fee to be recertified and eligible to teach. With an increased awareness of student achievement and professional accountability, teacher recertification was explored, discussed, developed, and legislated into practice. Those who were responsible for developing the initial plan were pleased with their efforts, but they recognized that change is inevitable and that the process will continue to occur as the culture and climate of education continue to evolve. The primary goal of the Illinois process is the assurance that teachers will be better informed of best practices through relevant and meaningful professional development. To that end, the process has been somewhat successful. As Dr. Abbott summarized, “This process certainly focused people on what we need to do. We have people back doing a lot of professional development, and, as a casual observation, that has to be a good thing.”

CHAPTER THREE

COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL STATE RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The teacher certification regulations mandated by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) were intended to ensure competence among the nation's teacher workforce (Tracy & Walsh, 2004). Previously, earning a requisite college degree in education and meeting state specific criteria for certification enabled newly trained teachers to enter the profession, but once certified, maintaining certification was generally an arbitrarily monitored process. NCLB incorporated guidelines in an attempt to standardize recertification through HOUSSE—High, Objective, Uniform State Standard of Evaluation. This process provided a method of determining 'highly qualified' status among teachers.

Despite the attempt, each state's agency for monitoring certification was allowed to interpret HOUSSE and independently generate regulations. In a review of the 50 states' regulations, this researcher found the individual states' guidelines to be broadly interpreted with extreme differences in states' requirements. This chapter will detail each state's specific criteria teachers must satisfy in order to remain both 'highly qualified' and recertified.

State Recertification Procedures

Renewal Cycles

In most instances, individual states established criteria for teacher recertification, taking latitude with HOUSSE specifications. Typically, states

designed the teacher recertification process to include a renewal cycle that limits validation and requires some form of professional development activity within a prescribed time frame. In addition, most states require a renewal fee for recertification, with the costs ranging from \$10.00 to \$125.00.

The most common renewal cycle for teacher recertification is five years, with 43 states adhering to that time frame. Only Arizona and Tennessee allowed more time, six and ten years respectively, while New Hampshire and Vermont both allowed three-year renewal cycles. Three states prove to be outliers in the recertification process; New Mexico, Texas, and Washington were exceptions to common practices. New Mexico requires nothing more to become recertified than filling out a form and paying a fee, then submitting both to the local district administration for approval. Texas and Washington both allow a lifetime exemption to certificate renewal. The exemption can be met in Texas through an application process and rigorous assessment of teaching practice, designed much like the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards process for master teacher status. In Washington, exemption is based on the date of acquired teacher certification. If certified after September 1, 1987, a teacher must complete 150 hours of professional development every five years.

Alabama, Delaware, Louisiana, and Massachusetts require from three to five years of successful teaching experience. Illinois is the only state, though, that issues an initial teaching certificate, which then becomes a standard certificate upon the fifth year. Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, and Maryland all require verification of continued employment in order to qualify for certification renewal.

The only other states with unique stipulations are Kansas and Indiana. Kansas requires that teachers acquire NBPTS certification, and Indiana mandates that teachers secure a Masters in Education before attempting recertification.

Recertification Validation

All of the states mandating teacher recertification expect teachers to report or validate the activities that enable recertification. All of the states require that the state departments of education be notified of successful recertification, but some states have state-appointed committees that monitor and audit the process. These carry titles such as State Office of Professional Licensing in Arkansas, Georgia's Professional Standards Commission, the State Commission of Teacher Credentialing in California, and the State Licensure Commission in Maine. Each of these agencies is comprised of members representing higher education, teacher unions, private industry, not-for-profit organizations, school administrators, and teachers. These commissions then report to the respective state's department of education, adding another layer to the recertification process.

Professional Development

Definition

All states require proof of recertification. All except New Mexico expect teachers to regularly engage in professional development endeavors to maintain certification in an effort to remain highly qualified. The professional development activities can be acquired through attendance at conferences, workshops, and in-service meetings or through continuing education units or college coursework.

For Illinois teachers, the *Certificate Renewal Manual* allows renewal credit through a combination of accumulated professional development, including college coursework, continued professional development, and continuing education units.

A continued professional development unit (CPDU), sometimes referred to as a license point or a renewal credit, is measured as one clock hour of professional development activity. In most cases, individual districts can determine what constitutes relevant professional development. College coursework is divided into semester hours, and all of the states allow those credit hours to represent multiple professional development units. Continuing education units (CEUs) are often allowed as well and required by some states, but each state that incorporates CEUs into the recertification process defines a CEU specifically. In most licensed professions, one CEU generally reflects ten clock hours of training, which is regulated by the International Association for Continuing Education and Training (IACET). The agency provides educational opportunities for teachers in specific areas such as Advanced Placement training or other nationally recognized curricula. If CEUs are not awarded through an organization such as IACET, many states reserve the right to award credit at their discretion, making the acquisition of CEUs a more subjective avenue toward teacher recertification.

Continuing Education

Many states require proof of a combination of professional development activities for teacher certification renewal. The one form of continuing education

that is universally accepted among states is college coursework. Thirteen states require college credit hours to retain certification. Those units range from three to 15 semester hours within the renewal cycle. Alaska, California, Idaho, Kentucky, and New Jersey require coursework that generates college credit hours rather than professional development or continuing education units for recertification.

Six states allow recertification to be acquired as a combination of coursework and professional development units, indicating that the semester or credit hours can be counted as multiple professional development units. In Illinois, this means that three semester hours of graduate level coursework is the equivalent of 15 CPDUs (ISBE & ISTCB, 2000). States that allow this provide conversion tables on their education websites that explain the equivalencies or provide links or telephone numbers to divisions or agencies that can provide more information.

Another avenue for securing professional development includes continuing education units, or CEUs. As explained previously, CEUs are the most subjective of the methods due to the lack of consistency regarding what constitutes a unit and how the training is provided. Those states with fewer universities and limited access to higher education accept CEUs rather than college coursework or CPDUs. Montana is such an example, requiring 60 CEUs for recertification and no other form of professional development, and Wyoming expects teachers to acquire 75 CEUs. South Carolina requires 120 CEUs for teacher recertification and is the only other state with such limitation. Other states accepting CEUs allow them in combination with college credit or professional

development units.

Professional Growth Plans

When the recertification effort was originally instituted in Illinois, teachers were required to submit a professional growth plan to the local professional development committee (LPDC) for approval at the onset of the five-year cycle. The plan included three components of professional development. Teachers were to secure training in technology, their subject content area, and a targeted topic or focused area that directly related to the employing district's school improvement plan. Once the plan was approved, it was filed, and teachers could begin securing appropriate professional development, submitting claims for credit to the LPDC as they were accumulated. This aspect of teacher recertification was abandoned before the first five-year cycle was completed (105 ILCS 5/21-14), and teachers no longer were required to delineate a plan of professional development activities.

Eleven other states require teachers to prepare professional growth plans, but the plans are monitored differently than they were in Illinois. In most states that require them, professional growth plans are developed and usually submitted to building administrators, but only Maine, Maryland, and New Hampshire require some kind of approval of the plan before starting professional development activities. Nebraska does not require approval of a professional growth plan, but teachers are expected to establish goals, and teacher evaluation is then contingent upon meeting those goals. In each instance of plan approval, evaluation is factored into recertification.

Four states take the professional growth plan a step further. Teachers in Pennsylvania must solicit approval within their school district departments prior to undertaking professional development. The rationale for this practice is that teachers can secure professional development in district-initiated topics and themes that will allow for common instructional practice. Once secured, the teachers record and submit their activity to the state board of education every three years. They receive credit for their efforts only if department approval has first been issued.

In the original Illinois recertification process, teachers were expected to develop a professional development plan and complete 120 hours of professional development as outlined in the Illinois *Certificate Renewal Manual*. Ohio, Vermont, and Virginia teachers have the similar recertification components. In each instance, a plan plus a specific number of professional development units are required. Teachers are eligible for recertification when they have met their own targets. Rhode Island is the only state that mandates a professional growth plan that is not tied to any specific regulations. The plan is jointly developed by the teacher and the building principal, who monitors the progress during the renewal cycle.

Three states, Kansas, Minnesota, and Iowa, further stipulate conditions for professional development recertification activity. Kansas teachers are allowed to reduce the number of professional development hours upon achieving a Master in Education degree. Teachers are required to secure 160 professional development units with a Bachelors degree, but that number drops to 120 once a

Masters is earned. A similar decrease in required units was developed for Illinois when the recertification process was revised. Currently teachers are expected to secure 120 continuing professional development units (CPDUs) with a Bachelors degree, 80 CPDUs with a Masters, and 60 with an earned doctorate, decreasing the requirement by a third with each benchmark (105 ILSC 5/21-14).

Teachers in Minnesota have a more specified recertification process than most states in that they must complete professional development activity in state-targeted areas. All teachers in Minnesota are required to complete 125 clock hours of professional development in a five-year cycle, but in addition to those hours, they must also receive documented training in Response to Intervention (Rtl) training as well as Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS). Both of these initiatives are outgrowths of NCLB, and all states are federally mandated to fully implement Rtl into all public school systems by January 2010.

Iowa, the third of the more specifically designed recertification plans, requires teachers to accumulate six units of professional development credit in a five-year cycle. Four of the six units must be completed through NBPTS, one from Masters-level coursework, and one from the employing district's in-service program. All endeavors must have the district superintendent's approval before securing the units.

States Serving as Models for Illinois

Stakeholders interviewed for this study indicated that there were few states with developed teacher recertification plans in place when Illinois teacher recertification was mandated. California, Connecticut, Minnesota, New York, and

Ohio each had recertification guidelines, but none were as well developed as desired by the committee charged with crafting the Illinois recertification plan.

Connecticut and New York were found to require the most extensive accumulation of professional development within their five-year renewal cycles. New York requires that teachers collect and document 175 professional development units in five years, but there are no specific guidelines provided at the state level regarding the nature of the training. Connecticut has three stipulations for teacher recertification, making it the most rigorous process among those studied. To maintain certification in Connecticut, teachers must provide employment verification and earn 90 CEUs plus 15 semester-hours of graduate-level coursework. One CEU is the equivalent of ten clock hours of seatwork, and 15 semester-hours typically involves 270 clock hours of seatwork. Both forms of professional development usually require additional time for completion of assignments.

California and Ohio both require professional growth plans as well as professional development units. Individual teachers in California develop plans that include personal growth goals and objectives. The 150 professional development units acquired are comprised of activities tied to those goals and objectives.

Ohio's procedure differs in that the professional growth plan is jointly developed by the individual teacher and the building administrator and tied to teacher evaluation. The 180 units of professional development over the five-year recertification cycle are selected based on goals and objectives targeted for

improvement or enrichment of instructional methods or content area knowledge.

Initially, Illinois, too, required teachers to generate a plan, but it was called a professional development plan rather than a professional growth plan. The Illinois plan was to include anticipated professional development that covered three state-targeted areas: special education, technology, and local district school improvement. A total of 120 CPDUs was to be acquired and divided equitably among the three areas. CPDUs could be calculated variously, depending on whether the professional development was defined as graduate coursework, in-service training, or CEUs.

In dropping the professional development plan from the Illinois requirements, the process of teacher recertification became most like that which is followed in Minnesota. Teachers there are expected to renew certification every five years by completing 125 professional development units. The state requires that teachers must receive Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) training within the renewal cycle, but the rest of the selected professional development is at the individual teacher's discretion.

Monitoring the Recertification Process

As noted in the interviews with Illinois stakeholders for this research, record-keeping for teacher recertification is a cumbersome process. Ultimately, all states report recertification completion to the state department or board of education, but not all 50 states warehouse the documentation. Fifteen states monitor the process within employing districts, and those states include higher

incidences of professional growth plans. Twelve states bypass the local level and report directly to the state agencies that oversee education. These states consistently included college credit as a dominant method of achieving recertification.

Eight states, including Illinois, document recertification through the state education agency, but each also submits proof to either the regional or county office of education, bypassing the local level. If a teacher does not satisfy the requirements, the state agency notifies the regional or county office, which then alerts the employing school district of the deficit. Eleven states require that teachers file claims for recertification credit with a state teacher recertification committee or a state licensing board, which sometimes oversees re-licensure of other professions as well.

Tables

The following four tables show the breakdown of information included in this chapter. The states are divided into four categories, based on the monitoring structure in place. The data is disaggregated in this manner because other configurations of the data showed no consistent pattern.

Recertification Monitoring through Local Control

Table 1 includes 14 states that monitor teacher recertification through local control, meaning that each school district is responsible for determining whether the teacher has satisfied the necessary requirements for certificate renewal. Twelve of the 14 states established five-year renewal cycles, which is the most frequent duration. The procedures among those 14 states vary

significantly with no emergent commonalities.

Table 1

Recertification Monitored through Local Control

STATE	RENEWAL CYCLE	REQUIREMENTS
Arizona	6 years	180 units or 12 semester hours or a combination
Idaho	5 years	6 semester hours
Kansas	5 years	Achieved NBPTS certification or 160 units (120 with earned Masters)
Massachusetts	5 years	3 years teaching experience; 150 units
Missouri	5 years	Professional development portfolio
Nebraska	5 years	6 semester hours
New Jersey	5 years	Professional improvement plan
New Mexico	annual	Registration form
North Carolina	5 years	10 semester hours or 15 renewal units
Ohio	5 years	Professional growth plan plus 180 units
Oregon	5 years	Professional growth plan plus 6 semester hours
Rhode Island	5 years	Professional growth plan
South Carolina	5 years	120 units
South Dakota	5 years	3 semester hours plus 45 CEUs
Wisconsin	5 years	Professional growth plan plus 75 units or 5 CEUs

Recertification Monitoring by State Agencies

Table 2 shows the 12 states where state departments of education or boards of education monitor teacher recertification. Teachers report recertification efforts directly to the state agency rather than to their local school building or district. Since the local level is bypassed, Alaska and Connecticut require employment verification, and Alabama and Delaware require proof of teaching experience. Pennsylvania involves the local level by requiring proof that reported in-service training was department approved. All twelve states had five-year renewal cycles.

Table 2

Recertification Monitored through State Department or Board of Education

STATE	RENEWAL CYCLE	REQUIREMENTS
Alabama	5 years	3 years of experience plus 50 units or 3 semester hours or 5 CEUs or NBPTS certification
Alaska	5 years	Employment verification and 6 semester hours
Connecticut	5 years	Employment verification and 90 CEUs plus 15 semester hours
Delaware	5 years	3 years experience 90 units
Florida	5 years	6 semester hours or 120 units
Hawaii*	5 years	Professional growth plan
Michigan	5 years	6 semester hours or 18 CEUs
Mississippi	5 years	3 semester hours or 5 CEUs
Nevada	5 years	6 units
New York	5 years	175 units
Oklahoma	5 years	Proof of experience
North Dakota	5 years	4 clock hours of professional development
Pennsylvania	5 years	6 semester hours or department approved in-service training
Utah	5 years	95 units
Washington**	5 years	150 professional development units

* Hawaii is one school district with only one board of education for the entire state.

**Washington allows teachers certified before September 1, 1987, a lifetime exemption to certificate renewal.

Recertification with Tiered Reporting Systems

States that have a tiered reporting recertification system are reflected in Table 3. Nine states are monitored either regionally or locally with approval or denial reported to the state board or department of education, which in turn, determines final status of teacher recertification. With the exception of Tennessee, which has a ten-year renewal cycle, the other eight states have five-year cycles. There is no consistency among the nine states regarding recertification requirements.

Table 3

Recertification Monitored through State, Regional and/or Local Agencies

STATE	RENEWAL CYCLE	REQUIREMENTS
Colorado	5 years	6 semester hours
Illinois	5 years	120 units
Iowa	5 years	6 units
Kentucky	5 years	Approved graduate hours
Maryland	5 years	Employment verification and 6 semester hours plus professional growth plan
Tennessee	10 years	Earned Masters plus 90 units
Vermont	3 years	Professional growth plan plus 3 units
Virginia	5 years	Professional growth plan plus 180 units
West Virginia	5 years	Earned masters plus semester hours in content area

Recertification Monitored by Other Agencies

Table 4 shows the 11 states that monitor teacher recertification through other agencies, some of which also monitor re-licensure of other professions. Again, only one state deviates from the five-year renewal cycle; New Hampshire requires teachers to renew certification every three years. The one commonality that the 11 states share is that the requirements for recertification are more consistent than among the other tabled groupings. More complex combinations or more units of professional development is required for recertification in each of the states listed.

Table 4

Recertification Monitored by Other Agencies

STATE	CYCLE	REQUIREMENTS	AGENCY
Arkansas	5 years	Teaching experience, professional development and college coursework	State Office of Professional Licensure
California	5 years	Professional growth plan plus 150 units	State Committee of Teaching Credentialing
Georgia	5 years	6 semester hours or 10 CEUs plus professional growth plan	Professional Standards Committee
Indiana	5 years	Earned Masters plus 36 units	Division of Professional Standards
Louisiana	5 years	150 units	Teacher Certification and Higher Education
Maine	5 years	Professional growth plan	State Licensure Commissioner
Minnesota	5 years	125 units	Minnesota Board of Teaching
Montana	5 years	60 units	Office of Public Instruction
New Hampshire	3 years	Professional growth plan	Bureau of Credentialing
Texas	5 years	150 units	State Board for Education Certification
Wyoming	5 years	75 units or 5 CEUs	Professional Teaching Standards Board

Summary

Interviews conducted with stakeholders who helped to craft the Illinois recertification plan indicated that California, Iowa, New York, and Ohio teacher recertification requirements provided models for the Illinois process that was first approved and implemented. In researching the various state requirements, the Illinois process appears similar to each of those models, yet it maintains its own

identity through the amount of professional development required and the methods allowed for attainment. The crafters of the Illinois teacher recertification process exercised the same right to interpret the NCLB mandate as other states and allowed local districts discretionary latitude in designing and accepting professional development activities that satisfy the requirements to remain a “highly qualified” teacher. Despite the changes made to the Illinois recertification plan regarding local oversight of teacher progress, the Illinois process is not far removed from those state recertification efforts that served as models.

CHAPTER FOUR

RE-LICENSURE PROCEDURES FOR OTHER PROFESSIONS

Teachers are not held in the same esteem that they once were because their status has eroded, and their professionalism has been called into question (Nieto, 2009). The quality and condition of education is thought to be contingent on the capabilities of teachers to adequately instruct students (Black, 2002; Bohlen, 2001), and with increased media attention to education reform, how teachers are trained and certified has come under scrutiny. Teacher certification is a topic that has generated much interest and discussion in recent years. Tellez (2003) cited a “growing distrust of teacher education,” which emphasizes a growing need for “national policy emerging as a dominant influence” (p. 14). Lasley et al. (2002) determined that teaching has not been self-regulating and is more heavily affected by political crosscurrents than any other licensed profession. They stated that the proliferation of policies does nothing more than to confuse teachers, lowering the standards for teaching and teaching certification.

Recognizing an increased awareness regarding the condition of public education, the federal government responded by passing the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (PL 107-110; 115 STAT.1425), a comprehensive plan to ensure national education reform. The law includes language regarding teacher certification, but it also addresses the need for periodic and continued recertification efforts. In response to the law, most states have developed

recertification procedures to adhere to the policy framework outlined in NCLB (Southgate et al., 2001).

Brewer (2003) called NCLB a “mammoth act,” which features an emphasis on defining teacher quality as a major component in increasing student performance and achievement. This is significant because Rotherham and Mead (2003) pointed out that effective teaching requires more than content knowledge. As Tracy and Walsh (2004) found, 94% of the teaching force at that time was certified in their subject areas, less than half of all secondary teachers held majors in the subjects they taught. Kaplan and Owings (2003) concluded, “The professional certification system reflects both low standards and high barriers to professionalizing teaching” (p. 687).

Review of Professional Recertification Effort

In 1997, then-State Superintendent of Education, Dr. Max McGee, commissioned a collaboration of the Illinois State Board of Education, the Illinois Education Association, and the Illinois Federation of Teachers to design a teacher licensure renewal system that would promote an increased quality of teaching through professional development activities (Bradley, Beckwith, & Price, 2001). In February 2000, Illinois House Bill 542 (PA 90-548) was passed into law, which described a three-tiered system of licensing teachers based on the design of the participating agencies. An Initial Teaching Certificate is the first level of licensure and is valid for four years. The second level, or Standard Teaching Certificate, is issued next and is valid for five years. The third, or Master Teacher Certificate, attainable through the National Board of Professional Teaching

Standards (NBPTS), is valid for ten years. The intent of the law is to improve student achievement by encouraging teachers to seek relevant professional development and to become better versed in addressing the state priority areas targeted by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) for school improvement (Bradley et al., 2001). A more in-depth description of the history and process of recertification is included in Chapter Two.

Despite state efforts to increase standards and strengthen teacher certification, substandard certification regulations continue to exist. Where states did attempt to impose academic standards for recertification, they were often found to be ambiguous and inconsistent. Walsh and Snyder (2004) found that many of the state efforts were minimal and designed only to satisfy the mandate rather than serve as a means to ensure high-quality classroom instruction. They stated, "Most states share neither the urgency nor the single-minded focus of the U. S. Congress in seeking to address the lost academic standards required of American teachers" (p. 2).

Johnson (2001) described teaching as an "unstaged" career in that there are uniform roles, responsibilities, and rewards. She stated that teachers are "cautious professionals" who rarely transfer expert practices from one generation of teachers to another. Johnson portrayed teachers as having a disregard for education policy, and she cautioned that policy implementation is difficult in education because new initiatives are often not taken seriously. Until teachers themselves feel the need to guarantee their professionalism through recertification efforts, Johnson contended that the public will maintain the notion

that “anyone can teach.”

Such attitudes further complicate efforts to be in compliance with state and federal mandates, such as NCLB, that address recertification of teachers. With passage and bipartisan support of NCLB, Congress continued to pressure states into devising more rigorous state certification processes for teachers and mandated recertification as well. The law signals a national impatience with slow state reform efforts, something Michael Poliakoff (2002) substantiated. He reported that a 2002 poll of subscribers to *The American School Board Journal* found that 24% of those responding “... favored scrapping their state’s current certification system, and 59 percent wanted to transform it by opening it up to ‘nontraditional’ candidates” (p. 3).

Recertification Model

Teacher recertification involves a process that is an expectation of other professions. It is reflective of re-licensure and certification models used by other regulated professions, such as law and medicine, both of which require practitioners to acquire continuing education to maintain licensure or certification. Each profession has specific regulatory agencies in place to monitor and grant credit. Peer review has been the rule in authorizing or certifying practice in both professions. Certification and recertification of those seeking the rank of “professional” have included review and approval by agencies representing those already practicing within the professional field. The Council on Licensure, Enforcement and Regulation (CLEAR) provides a framework for developing regulatory models, allowing the government the opportunity to regulate

“professions where there is a potential to harm the public’s health, safety, and/or welfare if the profession is practiced by unqualified professionals (CLEAR, 2006). Regulatory agencies are recognized and organized in compliance with the Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. These agencies oversee and monitor the competency level of professional members, assuring their clientele of licensure, certification, and some general level of expertise.

Continuing Legal Education for Lawyers

The legal profession requires continuing education to maintain licensure. According to one stakeholder interviewed for this study, the American Bar Association (ABA) was a key provider in the development of the Illinois teacher recertification plan. Individual states have the authority to determine the criteria for licensure to practice law with that state (Barker, 2001). State bar associations have the responsibility of regulating the legal profession, allowing licensure of practitioners as well as restricting such licensure (Bishop, 2002). Attorneys are self-regulated and have established rules governing the profession. These rules are enforced by state authorities, following rule enforcement procedures formulated by practicing lawyers to include competency, ethics, and licensure. State supreme courts, state legislatures, and state bar associations monitor this activity.

All states require that lawyers must pass the Bar Examination in order to become a licensed lawyer; however, not all states require that practicing lawyers secure mandatory continuing legal education (American Bar Association, 2004). In fact, nine states do not require anything beyond initial licensure. The 41 states

that do have a continuing legal education expectation show no uniformity in requirements. The number of credit hours required ranges from a minimum of ten to a maximum of 45. Barker (2001) found that inconsistent re-licensure among states disallows for maximum client service, especially if a particular legal situation involves crossing state boundaries. Due to varied state licensure expectations, legal representation must sometimes involve more than one legal firm.

Such complications exist despite a statement for the ABA referred to as Arden House III, which was drafted in 1987 at the National Conference on the Continuing Education of the Bar (ABA, 2004) and advocates adoption of minimum continuing legal education (MCLE). The statement promotes uniform standards to expand licensure and accommodate particular legal situations. In 2004, the model was amended to include MCLE on racial and ethical diversity because the ABA philosophy is that diverse education opportunities are necessary to address the needs of a diverse professional population.

The ABA recommendation for continuing legal education for maintaining licensure in each state includes the following: (a) completing 15 hours of annual continuing legal education or (b) completing any approved legal education activity, such as self-study, teaching, writing for legal publications, or participating in legal based activity using computer resources (ABA, 2004). Despite the ABA recommendations, not all states have complied with the guidelines because completion of the activities is an expectation rather than a requirement. As a result, the law profession is less uniformly monitored and regulated than other

licensed professions.

The Illinois requirement for legal re-licensure deviates slightly from the ABA recommendation. Lawyers must complete 24 hours of continuing legal education every two years with four of those hours targeted to address professionalism, legal ethics, mental health or illness issues, or diversity (American Bar Association, 2008). The reporting date for completion is June 30 at the end of the second year. In other states, the annual reporting date for completion of continuing education is flexible and can be set at the end of the calendar year, the end of the state bar fiscal year, or by using the attorney's birth date. If completion of continuing education is not reported and documented by the designated time, a reinstatement fee is assessed.

Continuing Medical Education

Medical Practitioners

Traditionally, physicians around the world follow a uniform route to medical licensure (Southgate et al., 2001). Most undergo performance evaluation followed by tests that demonstrate clinical competence as it relates to performance. The licensure is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. Once initial licensure is achieved, continuing medical education is required annually to maintain the license (AMA, 2006). Certification in specific fields of medicine is based upon successful completion of clinical assessments designed within a policy framework prescribed by a regulatory agency such as the AMA (Southgate et al., 2001).

Physicians and all clinicians practicing medicine undergo re-licensure at

regular intervals. The medical profession is regulated by 62 professional boards representing different types of medical practices across the nation, and each requires continued medical education, ranging from a minimum of seven credits to 200 credits per renewal cycle for license re-registration (American Medical Association, 2009). State regulatory agencies have the authority to designate specific fields of medicine in which to acquire continuing medical education and can require rotational compliance of attaining recertification. Licensing jurisdiction is allowable on a state-by-state basis; therefore, licensed practitioners may need to become certified for specific procedures in order to perform certain tasks when crossing state boundaries.

More regulatory statutes have been imposed upon doctors over the past 20 years to appease the public concern regarding fraudulent medical practice (American Medical Association, 2005). The goal of the American Medical Association is to encourage individual states to adopt licensure and re-licensure procedures that move toward uniformity nationwide, thereby eliminating lengthy delays due to checking credentials. The intent is to reassure consumers that medical standards are defined and consistently met.

Illinois Requirements for Re-licensure

Licensure re-registration in Illinois can be successfully completed through several efforts. State policies vary in number of credits required for re-licensure, but the agencies granting approval or those that monitor credit acquisition are national agencies and/or organizations rather than state subsidiaries (American Medical Association, 2009). All 62 boards authorized to grant credit are listed on

the American Medical Association's website, and forms for claiming credit are available for download through linked sites.

Illinois is one of seven states that requires physicians to secure 150 credits in a three-year re-registration renewal cycle. Only one state, Washington, requires more credits for re-registration, but the cycle is one year longer, so the average per year remains at 50. Activities for securing credits are standardized nation-wide and include serving on medical review boards, securing another medical degree or certification, publishing an article as a lead author, designing a medical poster for a published article, or teaching. Each is assigned a multiplier that generates credits, which can be counted once during a renewal cycle. Once the credit is documented, it is submitted to the American Board of Medical Specialties, which reviews the credits and confers re-licensure registration (American Medical Association, 2009).

Licensure Compared to Certification

Licensing is different from certification in that licensing indicates that all basic requirements are met. Certifying is the process of guaranteeing specialization through enhanced and specified training (Juul, Skully, & Scheiber, 2003). In the United States, physicians are required to be licensed but not certified, making certification a voluntary process (AMA, 2006). Some insurance companies, however, have made physician certification in addition to licensure a required condition for reimbursement of medical costs (Juul et al., 2003). Consequently, many healthcare industries are making certification a condition of employment, creating the need for physicians to take the voluntary steps to

become certified in addition to being licensed. A comparison of the doctor's practice to specific standards is conducted to determine if he or she qualifies for additional certification beyond basic licensure. Typically, certification in any medical specialty area is valid for six years and can be achieved by passing both a written and an oral examination (AMA, 2006). Juul et al. (2003) stated that the public wants verification that physicians are indeed specialists, and certification beyond licensure ensures their expertise.

Nurses

Another medical field that requires initial licensure and continuing medical education for specific certification is that of nursing. Again, unlike licensure, certification is voluntary and not required, but it provides assurance of specialization and denotes professional skill in particular practices (McClain, Richardson, & Wyatt, 2004). The number of states that require continuing medical education for re-licensure of nurses is increasing, but just as for medical doctors, the number of continuing education units varies among states (Jackson, 2004). Certification is acquired through completion of a formal process that includes training, clinical experience, and demonstrated competence in meeting established performance standards (Jackson, 2004). Once certification beyond licensure is achieved, recertification is encouraged to maintain public assurance that certified nurses continue to update skills and specialized knowledge. Two regulatory boards oversee this process: the Pediatric Nursing Certification Board and the American Nurses Credentialing Center (McClain et al., 2004).

According to Shirey (2005), director of cardiovascular services at

Deaconess Hospital in Evansville, Indiana, “Specialty nursing certification is considered THE standard by which the public recognizes quality nursing care” (p. 246). She also states that certification provides validation of nursing knowledge, which is of greatest benefit to patients and families. This is a shared notion with McClain et al. (2004), who report that certified nurses secure higher patient satisfaction ratings. In fact, their research indicated that healthcare industry employers prefer to hire certified nurses because they out-perform non-certified nurses.

Jackson (2005) found that nurses seek specific certifications to demonstrate accountability. McClain et al. (2004) concurred, but their findings also indicated that more tangible benefits exist. Career advancement, recognition, and increased salaries were among the incentives, but also mentioned as significant were being regarded by peers as experts, more self-confidence, personal growth, and satisfaction. Shirey (2005) believed that the emphasis on professional certification significantly elevates public opinion of nursing through distinctive practice.

Technical Trade and Skill Occupations

Many occupations, ranging from complex technical trades to skilled laborers, require continuing education to maintain certification or licensure. Those that require a college degree for initial licensing are regulated much like the practices of law and medicine with similar requirements for continuing education. Engineering, like medicine and law, is regulated by commissions or boards in specific jurisdictions. The National Society of Professional Engineers

(NSPE) endorses specialized certification of engineers and provides continuing education opportunities to maintain licensure. Each jurisdiction dictates the continuing education units required to complete the re-licensure process and the time frame in which it must occur (NSPE, 2006).

Certified public accountants (CPAs) must also maintain certification through periodic renewal. Each individual state has jurisdiction over CPAs, and continuing education requirements vary among states, with Illinois requiring accumulation of 120 hours over a three-year time period (Illinois CPA Society, 2006). Credit can be earned through activities such as attending training seminars, publishing articles and books, or presenting at workshops (Board of Registration of Public Accountancy, 2007). Fulfilling this quota also entitles national recertification through the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. A renewal fee is then charged, but it is reset during every three-year cycle.

Another regulated industry is real estate. Unlike previously discussed professions, realtors are not required to hold a college degree, but they must be licensed in order to sell real estate through a realty agency. Public Act 093-0957 (2004) established guidelines for both licensure and continuing education to become a certified real estate agent in Illinois. Realtors must complete six hours of continuing education annually and pay a fee to become re-licensed. They may choose from among eleven subject areas, but they may not obtain all six hours in one day. A test is administered upon completion of the clock hours, and re-licensure is granted based upon a passing score and payment of a renewal fee.

The Office of Banks and Real Estate (OBRE) oversees and monitors the process and maintains a registry of licensed professionals.

Summary

Since the early 1900s, occupations such as engineering and medicine required baccalaureate degrees to become a member of the profession. Law required three years of study, and accounting even less (Lipinski, 2005). Teaching was also a career that did not require a college degree early in the 20th century, but some advanced study was preferred (Lannie, 1972). Expectations for each profession grew with the evolution of society and increased technology, necessitating proof that an occupation designated as a professional career is comprised of members who can demonstrate expertise that encompasses knowledge, skill, and practice. As time has passed, Lipinski (2005) noted that each of the mentioned career fields has increased education requirements with the exception of engineering, and each also requires certification or licensure and renewal through continuing education during specific yearly cycles.

The relicensure process of the careers and technical trades highlighted in this chapter serve as a comparison to the teacher recertification process, which has only recently become a requirement of the profession. According to the CLEAR (2006), state governments have the primary responsibility to regulate professions "... where there is a potential to harm the public's health, safety and/or welfare if the profession is practiced by unqualified professionals" (p. 1). Recognizing that education and the teachers who impart it are instrumental to public welfare, it is not surprising that the teaching profession has joined the

ranks of those that require recertification to remain eligible to practice. McClain et al. (2004) point out that “earned certification has helped individuals publicly proclaim their practice competency to employers and consumers” (p. 207). The No Child Left Behind Act, which requires clinical evidence of continuing education and/or professional development for teachers, provides a vehicle, offering educators the opportunity to demonstrate excellence and assure the public that they belong among the most qualified of that which is considered the professional workforce.

CHAPTER FIVE
RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Precise modes and standards of teacher education are often questioned and sometimes disputed; however, acquiring and maintaining certification in the profession suggests a guarantee of quality to the clientele who receive the services. Those best equipped to ensure quality within a profession are those authorized to practice within a field. Review and approval from professional bodies comprised of peers is generally the method by which re-licensure and recertification has occurred in the fields of law and medicine as well as other careers in public service. Within the last decade, the same process has been implemented for recertifying teachers in most of the United States.

This study served to address the configuration of teacher recertification, comparing the process among states. It also considered how teacher recertification compares to re-licensure or recertification of other professions. The research questions that directed the study were designed to lead to refinement of the Illinois teacher recertification system.

To assist the reader, this chapter reviews the purpose, methods, and data of the study. The chapter is organized to include findings and conclusions determined through qualitative and quantitative research methods. Implications for changes to the Illinois teacher recertification process are made, as are suggestions for further study.

Purposes of the Study

The purpose of this research study was to trace the process through which Illinois teacher recertification guidelines were established, using qualitative and quantitative methods to establish an historical perspective and analysis of the Illinois teacher recertification requirement. Teachers, like other licensed professionals, are required to acquire in-service training and relevant professional development to maintain certification as well as federally recognized “highly qualified” status. Interviews with crafters of the initial Illinois recertification plan provided insight into the development of the criteria for recertification and the rationale for the significant revision that was made to the process before the conclusion of the first five-year cycle. Comparing teacher recertification to other professional licensure renewal and other state teacher certification models assisted in identifying an Illinois teacher recertification process that can be modified to promote and ensure highly qualified teachers and instructional excellence with implications for increased student achievement.

The study was conducted using a research design that included interviewing nine educational leaders, seven of whom were involved in crafting the Illinois teacher recertification plan and two more who were directly involved in implementing the plan. In addition, each of the other 49 states’ teacher certification websites were accessed through state departments or boards of education on-line home pages to review professional development requirements and compare the process through which teachers are recertified. Finally, a literature review provided a comparison of the process for recertifying teachers to

those which are used to recertify other licensed professions, focusing on the fields of law and medicine.

Discussion of Research Questions

The three research questions that guided this study focused on teacher recertification procedures, how the overall practice for recertification compares to other professional recertification models, and what changes could be made to the Illinois process to make it more relevant and meaningful for in-service teachers. The findings are discussed according to stakeholders' views, differences that exist among states' efforts, and the salient themes that emerged.

Question 1. What differences exist in teacher recertification requirements among states?

The data collected for this study indicated that all states require some form of teacher recertification; however, the process is widely varied. Each stakeholder interviewed for this study stated that the Illinois teacher recertification plan was developed independently of other states and that it was not designed based on what was being done in other states. In 1999, when the Illinois recertification plan was initially crafted, only a small group of states had well-defined and established teacher certification renewal procedures. Those interviewed for this study said the states reviewed to serve as potential models for Illinois were California, Connecticut, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and New York.

Those states that required professional development or professional growth plans were usually completed and submitted to building principals or administrators, then becoming part of the teacher evaluation process. But only

Illinois required that a committee of peers approve the plan before starting professional development activities. Teacher evaluation was never contingent on any part of the Illinois recertification process, unlike some of the states' plans. Nonetheless, those responsible for crafting the Illinois teacher recertification plan found it to be as comprehensive if not more so as most other states' plans.

Question 2. How do teacher recertification requirements compare with other professional recertification policies?

As previously noted, peer review has been the modus operandi of certifying professionalism. This has been true in such fields as medicine and law as well as in careers that require less education but do require specific and concentrated training, such as engineering and accountancy. Technical trades, including real estate and cosmetology, also require proof of continuing education to remain licensed. The Illinois Education Association (IEA) reviewed medical and legal communities' re-licensure procedures prior to creating the Illinois teacher recertification plan.

Law Practice

The legal profession is less uniformly monitored and regulated than other licensed professions. Like teacher recertification, the process varies among states, and a lawyer is not automatically licensed to practice law simply by passing the Bar Examination. Even though required in each state for initial licensure, the test is only one part of the process in most states, and additional state requirements must be met. Like the teaching profession, each state may determine what constitutes re-licensure.

Once the various components are secured for licensure, the American Bar Association (ABA) recommends continuing legal education to be acquired usually in a six-year cycle, but again, this is not consistent nationwide. In Illinois, lawyers achieve re-licensure by completing 20 hours of continuing legal education (CLE) in the first two years of the six-year cycle and then acquire 24 hours more in the remaining four years. Four of the hours must fit into designated areas of legal topics every two years during the cycle so that 12 hours are specifically targeted. The reporting date for completion of CLE is June 30 of the sixth year (ABA, 2009).

Medical Practice

Medicine is regulated more stringently than law and, as documented earlier, is monitored by various agencies and boards. The licensing process differs from teaching in that licensure and certification are both qualitative and quantitative. Practitioners are required to pass medical examinations to satisfy the quantitative aspect. The qualitative portion is achieved through observation of performance in medical practice. Unlike other professions, medical licensure and certification are recognized internationally. The intent of certifying medical practice is to reassure consumers that standards are defined, and continuing education ensures knowledge of new research and development, thereby demonstrating accountability. Medical practitioners are licensed when all basic requirements are met, but certification and recertification guarantee specialization, which is contextually different from teacher certification and recertification. In teaching, recertification tends to mean that continued education

is occurring but is not specifically focused.

Question 3. What modifications could be made to the Illinois teacher recertification process to refine and enhance it, allowing for emergent best practice that ensures a more highly qualified teacher workforce?

Professions charged with overseeing the welfare of the public need evidence that specific criteria has been met, making those in the profession recognized as certifiably qualified. The practice of professional certification renewal or re-licensure through peer review has been employed in the fields of medicine and law; however, it is new to the field of education. The NCLB mandate requiring teachers to be highly qualified has been in effect for less than ten years. Since the Illinois process was enacted, it has changed significantly.

The original design of the Illinois teacher recertification process was more rigorous than the one currently in place. The professional development plan required included goals and objectives that guided professional development acquisition. Those interviewed for this study reported that teachers liked the idea that their plans were peer reviewed. They also reported that local professional development committees, including a district administrator and a community member, were beneficial. The local professional development committee (LPDC) provided a vehicle through which all who were vested in the education process could see that teachers were making an effort to increase their ability to improve instruction and further student achievement.

With the demise of LPDCs, school districts are no longer vested in the

recertification process. No system is in place to determine if a teacher's professional development efforts are tied to local school district's goals or initiatives. District administrators know only of the professional development activities that are provided through district efforts. The professional development that is secured on an individual basis is not reported locally. There is no method of determining if independently secured professional development is improving the quality of teaching. A best practice model of teacher recertification in Illinois should include:

- A professional growth plan, including goals and objectives for securing specific and targeted professional development and themes accordingly to district school improvement initiatives.
- A monitoring system that is comprised of peer review and provides ongoing observation and feedback, allowing for a community of educators engaged in collaborative learning and lessening the need for layers of bureaucracy.
- Evaluation of instructional methods that hinges on the goals and objectives outlined in individual teachers' professional growth plans. By tying teacher evaluation at least in part to individual plans, principals and/or district administrators can more objectively determine professional growth and measure teacher quality.

In adopting the above recommendations, attempts at professional development would be more focused, creating an environment of differentiated professional learning opportunities that collectively fosters collegiality, promotes

ongoing learning, and sustains capacity-building for significant gains in student achievement. The outcome of a more focused teacher recertification process would satisfy the intent of the No Child Left Behind mandate.

Conclusions

Highly qualified teachers are an expectation of public education. The No Child Left Behind Act requires that states provide assurance that educators continue to hone their expertise throughout their careers. However, the intent of the law is muted through the manner it has been implemented in Illinois. Teachers are allowed to self-select professional development activities as they see fit, with no direction or guidance from district-level personnel. The process becomes one based on assumption: local district administrators assume that teachers are working toward recertification requirements unless they are notified by the Illinois State Board of Education that an employee has not secured adequate documentation of professional development. Teacher recertification, then, has become a process that is required rather than relevant.

Planning and Support

The Illinois teacher recertification process is flawed for several reasons. It was politically generated and engineered by representatives from vested agencies in the public and private sectors without solicitation from the established state educational hierarchy. Stakeholders from within the education community participated in designing the recertification plan out of obligation to satisfy the legislated mandate. They devised a plan they felt to be adequate rather than exceptional because they did not fully understand the motivation of

those outside the education community who instigated the discussions that led to the legislation.

Two further reasons that compromised the success of the process involved planning. First, the skeletal outline of the recertification plan was devised in one marathon committee meeting, and the details were left to individual members who cared enough to work out a process that teachers could understand and fulfill. Those stakeholders who remained committed to the task were rightfully skeptical that their efforts would be successful in either case.

Another reason that rendered the effort suspect resulted from implementing the Illinois teacher recertification process without first creating a supportive infrastructure. An indication of limited support was the singular training session that was provided at regional meetings held throughout the state regarding the functions of LPDCs. This heralded the emergent skepticism among the teaching ranks because those sessions served as their first notice of a change in the recertification process. That skepticism turned into frustration when questions arose and were relayed from LPDCs to regional offices of education and on to the Illinois State Board of Education, ultimately answered with vague responses. ISBE was unprepared and understaffed to address and accommodate the volume of resulting telephone calls and e-mail correspondences.

The Illinois State Board of Education monitors the teacher recertification process. Teachers submit claims for credit online during a five-year cycle. At the end of the five years, teachers are expected to pay a fee to their Regional Office

of Education where a credit check is conducted. No expectation of district or local administrative follow-up is required regarding how acquired professional development or coursework is implemented, so the question remains regarding whether or not teacher quality is improved. Earned recertification has implied teacher competence to the public, but there is no documented proof that the process has improved teaching in Illinois.

Purpose

When changes were made to the Illinois recertification process in 2004, teachers were no longer required to complete and submit professional development plans. The original process required teachers to identify and secure professional development in three focused school improvement areas, all of which were designed to impact student achievement. Increased student achievement generates greater satisfaction with and respect for public education, a desired outcome of NCLB. With the elimination of the professional development plan, teachers can self-select activities that are not specifically targeted or focused to school improvement needs.

Darling-Hammond (2009) describes effective professional development as intensive, focused, collaborative, and connected to both practice and content, ultimately leading to the betterment of instructional practice. In order to be relevant, professional development must be planned, monitored, and evaluated. It should be focused to address specific needs for school improvement that results in increased student achievement. The Illinois recertification process initially included planned professional development that was linked to district

school improvement goals and required local approval. However, when the professional development plan was eliminated from the requirements, two components of efficacy were lost. No formal system of evaluation has ever been part of the process, bringing into question the ability of the Illinois teacher recertification effort to legitimately affect student achievement, which is the intended outcome of NCLB. Including teacher evaluation in the recertification process would make it more meaningful and relevant.

Implications of the Study

These data suggest that education initiatives will not be successful when politically motivated. Each of the interviewed stakeholders for this research believed that the momentum behind how the Illinois teacher recertification plan was to be crafted and implemented came from an organization representing a powerful lobbying effort. The result was a product that was imposed upon teachers and one that could not be effectively managed or implemented as designed.

Of course, legislators listen to their constituents, but it is important to be certain that each is regarded equally. The voice of education has become reactionary rather than pro-active due in part to the many ramifications of No Child Left Behind. Top-down decision-making is generally received poorly by those affected, and if laws regulating education continue to be enacted in this way, successful implementation will be unlikely.

Any new initiative results in increased cost, and in the case of teacher recertification, the cost of securing professional development has been

prohibitive in some schools. Districts and individual teachers were left to their own resources, which have not been sufficient. Exploring the availability of affordable professional development regionally as the cost compares to teacher salary could provide further reason for modification to the recertification process.

Each new unfunded mandate associated with NCLB further burdens financially strapped school districts, forcing them to make reductions in some other area or program. With the diversity and disparity that exists among Illinois school districts, this is more problematic in some areas of the state than others. A 'one-size fits all' method of implementation and regulation does not work in Illinois as it can in more homogenously populated states.

Other topics that affect public education and are addressed by lobby groups need to be carefully weighed. Input from affected education agencies should be solicited before legislation is drafted. If it is not, the same issues may emerge regardless of the need for change, and successful change will be thwarted.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Data collected for this study indicated that differences exist among states in the process of recertifying teachers. Additional research in what forms of professional development have the greatest impact on improved instruction could assist in determining what further modifications are necessary to the Illinois recertification process to make it meaningful to teachers. Stakeholders interviewed for this study suggested a disconnection between acquired professional

development for the purpose of teacher recertification and relevance to teaching assignment. Further study could determine which states' recertification efforts are yielding the most significant gains in student achievement, which is ultimately the goal of the federal mandate.

2. Building principals and district administrators were not included in this research. Surveying district administrators regarding their observations on the effectiveness of the Illinois recertification process as it relates to the improved quality of teaching and instruction could prove relevant. Further study and investigation of the impact of recertification on school improvement from a management perspective could clarify and better focus relevant and meaningful recertification endeavors.
3. Those interviewed for this study reported that teachers were incurring personal expense and financial burden in becoming recertified. This could have a significant impact on the quality of acquired professional development, which in turn impacts student achievement. Researching student achievement as it relates to disparity in funding professional development could provide further insight into achievement gaps.
4. Finally, the quality of professional development is widely varied. Further study is needed in determining what kind of professional development yields desired results as well as the delivery of professional development and through what agency. This, too, is a topic that may require regional investigation. Assuming that a state-wide method of professional development delivery will suffice and meet

the needs of teachers in a state with such delivery is short-sighted and negligent.

REFERENCES

- American Bar Association. (2004). *ABA model rule for continuing legal education with comments*. Retrieved July 10, 2006, from <http://www.abanet.org>
- American Bar Association. (2008). *ABA model rule for continuing legal education with comments*. Retrieved June 15, 2009, from <http://www.abanet.org/cle/mcleview.html>
- American Medical Association. (2009). *Continuing medical education*. Retrieved June 15, 2009, from <http://www.ama-assn.org>
- American Medical Association. (2005). *Getting a license: The basics*. Retrieved July 10, 2006, from <http://www.ama-assn.org>
- Ballou D., & Podgursky, M. (1998, Summer). The case against teacher certification. *Public Interest*, 132, 17-29. Retrieved March 18, 2005, from FirstSearch, 17 pages.
- Banchero, S. (2001, August 14). A day at the races. *The Chicago Tribune*, p. 14.
- Barker, W. T. (2001, August). Extrajurisdictional practice by lawyers. *Business Lawyer*, 56(4), 1501-1569.
- Bishop, L. D. (2002). *Definition, regulation, and licensure of paralegals in the United States*. Retrieved July 10, 2006, from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-12192002-132757/>
- Board of Registration of Public Accountancy. (2007). *Establishment and administration of mandatory professional education for the practice of*

public accountancy. Retrieved June 15, 2009. from <http://www.illinois-cpa-exam.com>

Bohen, D. B. (2001, May). Strengthening teaching through national certification.

Educational Leadership, 58(8). 50-52.

Bradley, C., Beckwith, J., & Price, A. (2001, March). *Illinois educational re-*

certification: Impact on local, regional, and state control. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Finance Association,

Cincinnati, Ohio. 12 pages.

Brewer, T. M. (2003, July/August). The 'grand paradox' in teacher preparation

and certification. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 104, 3-10. Retrieved

March 18, 2005, from FirstSearch, 16 pages.

Camphire, G. (2001, October). Are our teachers good enough? *SEDLetter* (13)2.

Retrieved April 27, 2005, from www.sedl.org/pubs/sedletter/v13n02, 6 pages.

Council on Licensure, Enforcement and Regulation (CLEAR). (2006). Framework

for developing consistent descriptions of regulatory models. Retrieved July 10, 2006, from <http://www.clearhg.org>

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A*

status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad.

Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, National Staff Development Council.

Hanes, M. L., & Rowls, M. D. (1984, October). Teacher recertification: A survey

of the states. *Phi Delta Kappan* 66(2), 123-126.

Illinois Certified Public Accountants Society. (2006). *Continuing professional*

education (CPE) requirements for the Illinois department of financial and professional regulation, AICPA, ICPAS and government auditing standards. Retrieved July 10, 2006, from <http://www.icpas.org>

Illinois State Board of Education and the State Teacher Certification Board.

(2000, October). *Certificate Renewal Manual.*

Jackson, R. (2004, April). In hot pursuit of higher learning. *Nursing Management* 35(4), 13-14.

Johnson, S. M. (2001, January). Can professional certification for teachers reshape teaching as a career? *Phi Delta Kappan* 82(5), 393-399.

Juul, D., Skully, J. H., & Scheiber, S. C. (2003, March). Achieving board certification in psychiatry: A cohort study. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 160(3), 563-565.

Kaplan, L. S., & Owings, W. A. (2003, May). The politics of teacher quality. *Phi Delta Kappan* 84(9), 687-692.

Lannie, V. P. (1972, Summer). Education of teachers in the 19th century. *Notre Dame Journal of Education*, 3(2), 101-125.

Lasley, T. J., Bainbridge, W. L., & Barnett, B. (2002, Fall). Improving teacher quality: Ideological perspectives and policy prescriptions. *The Education Forum* 67(1), 14-25.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1981). *Effective evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

development. *ITE Journal* 75(12), 24-27.

Lipinski, M. E. (2005, December). ASCE Policy 465: The impact on transportation engineering workforce development. *ITE Journal* 75(12): 24-27.

Maher, F., & Tetreault, M. K. (1999, January). Knowledge versus pedagogy: The marginalization of teacher education. *Academe* 85(1). Retrieved June 30, 2006, from FirstSearch. 5 pages.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1995). *Designing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McClain, N., Richardson, B., & Wyatt, J. S. (2004, May/June). A profile of certification for pediatric nurses. *Pediatric Nursing* 30(3), 207-211.

McCrorie, P., & Turner, J. (2001). The assessment of poorly performing doctors: The development of the assessment programs for the general medical council's performance procedures. *Medical Education* 35(1), 2-8.

Merriam, S. B., & Associates. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mikulecky, M. T., & Baber, A. (2005, December). From qualified to highly competent paraprofessionals: How NCLB requirements can catalyze effective program and policy developments. *The Education of the States Policy Brief* 10(4).

Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. Sage: London.

National Society of Professional Engineers. (2006). Licensure and qualifications

- for practice. Retrieved July 10, 2006, from <http://www.nspe.org/govrel>
- Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nieto, S. (2009, February). From surviving to thriving. *Educational Leadership* 65(5): 8-13.
- Pasteur, K. (2001, April 2). *Tools for sustainable livelihoods: Policy Analysis*. Retrieved September 25, 2007 from <http://www.instituteofdevelopmentstudies.org/pdf/policy.doc>
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Poliakoff, M. (2002, Summer). The path to teacher quality from regulation to local responsibility. *Spectrum* 75(3). Retrieved May 5, 2005, from FirstSearch.
- Rotherham, A. J., & Mead, S. (2003, June). Teacher quality: Beyond no child left behind. A response to Kaplan and Owings (2002). *NASSP Bulletin* 87(635). Retrieved May, 9, 2005, from FirstSearch.
- Schram, T. H. (2003). *Conceptualizing qualitative inquiry: Mindwork for fieldwork in education and the social sciences*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Shen, J., & Poppink, S. (2003, Spring). The certification characteristics of the public school teaching force: National, longitudinal, and comparative perspectives. *Educational Horizons*, 81(3), 130-137.
- Shirey, M. R. (2005, July-September). Celebrating certification in nursing: Forces of magnetism in action. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, 29(3), 245-253.

- Southgate, L., Cox, J., David, T., Hatch, D., Howes, A., Johnson, N., Jolly, B., Macdonald, E., McAvoy, P., McCrorie, P., & Turner, J. (2001). The assessment of poorly performing doctors: The development of the assessment programs for the general medical council's performance procedures. *Medical Education, 35*(1), 2-8.
- Stemler, S. (2001). An overview of content analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 7*(17). Retrieved September 15, 2007, from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=17>
- Tellez, K. (2003, Winter). Three themes on standards in teacher education: Legislative expediency, the role of external review, and test bias in the assessment of pedagogical knowledge. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 30*(1). Retrieved May 9, 2005, from FirstSearch.
- Tracy, C. O., & Walsh, K. (2004, Spring). Necessary and insufficient: Resisting a full measure of teacher quality. *NCTQ Reports*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality. Retrieved June 10, 2005, from <http://www.nctq.org>
- U. S. Department of Education. (2004). "The elementary and secondary education act." Retrieved July 10, 2006, from <http://www.ea.gov/policy/esea04>
- Walsh, K., & Snyder, E. (2004, December). Searching the attic: How states are responding to the nation's goal of placing a highly qualified teacher in every classroom. *NCTQ Reports*. Retrieved June 9, 2005. from <http://www.nctq.org>

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Illinois Administrative Code, Section 25, Appendix D
Points Available Under the Illinois HOUSSE

The activities listed in this Appendix D shall be eligible for counting by teachers in general education, bilingual education, and special education. In the case of special education, a given activity, other than teaching experience, may be counted only if it relates to the core academic subject taught rather than special education as the "area of assignment".

Please note that only teachers who have accumulated at least one year of teaching experience may use HOUSSE for highly qualified purposes. New teachers CANNOT use HOUSSE.

- a) Teaching experience in the subject area of assignment: 12.5 points per semester, up to a maximum of 50 points. (Special education teachers may count teaching experience in special education as experience in each core academic subject taught.)
- b) Completion of college coursework in the core academic subject area of assignment: 5 points per semester hour.
- c) Possession of NBPTS certification or an Illinois master certificate applicable to the area of assignment: 100 points for a general education teacher in grades below 6 or a special education teacher.
- d) Completion of the required content-area coursework within the context of completing an Illinois approved preparation program in elementary education or an approved out-of-state elementary education preparation program offered by an institution that was accredited by NCATE at the time: 75 points for a teacher in a self-contained general education classroom through Grade 8. Completion of the required content-area coursework within the context of completing an Illinois approved early childhood education preparation program or an approved out-of-state early childhood preparation program offered by an institution that was accredited by NCATE at the time: 75 points for a teacher in a self-contained general education classroom through Grade 3. (This coursework may not also be counted for points under subsection (b).)
- e) Participation in conference sessions, workshops, institutes, seminars, symposia, or other similar training events that are directly related to the area of teaching assignment: 1 point per full hour of participation.
- f) Presenting at conference sessions, workshops, institutes, seminars, symposia, or other similar training events: 8 or 3 points, in accordance with Section 25.875(k) of this Part.
- g) Work experience (non-teaching) directly related to the area of teaching assignment (e.g., experience in a chemical laboratory on the part of an individual teaching chemistry): 10 points per year of experience, up to a maximum of 50 points.
- h) Supervising a student teacher in the subject area of assignment: 10 points per student teacher, applicable to all subjects.
- i) Peer review or peer coaching that meets the requirements of Section 25.875(b) of this Part: 5, 8, 9, or 11 points per semester, in accordance with Section 25.875(b)(2) of this Part.

- j) Mentoring a new teacher in the subject area of assignment, provided that the mentoring arrangement conforms to the requirements of Section 25.875(c)(1)(A) of this Part: 9 or 11 points per semester, in accordance with Section 25.875(c)(2)(A) of this Part.
- k) Participation in site-based management or decision-making teams, relevant committees, boards, or task forces directly related to school improvement plans and focused on the core academic subject of assignment: 8 or 11 points per semester, in accordance with Section 25.875(d) of this Part. (May be counted only once per subject area.)
- l) Teaching a college course in accordance with Section 25.875(j) of this Part that is directly related to the subject area of assignment: 20 points.
- m) Participating in action research and inquiry projects that meet the requirements of Section 25.875(n) of this Part and are directly related to the subject area of assignment: 8 or 11 points per semester, in accordance with Section 25.875(n)(2) of this Part.
- n) Approved travel related to the area of teaching assignment and meeting the requirements of Section 25.875(p) of this Part: 12 or 15 points per year, in accordance with Section 25.875(p)(2) of this Part.
- o) Participation in a study group directly related to the area of teaching assignment: 6 or 8 points per semester, in accordance with Section 25.875(q) of this Part.
- p) Participation in an internship directly related to the area of teaching assignment that meets the requirements of Section 25.875(s) of this Part: points in relation to contact hours per semester, as set forth in Section 25.875(s)(2) of this Part.
- q) Participation in curriculum development or assessment activities that meet the requirements of Section 25.875(u) of this Part and are directly related to the subject area of assignment: 8 or 11 points per semester, in accordance with Section 25.875(u)(2) of this Part.
- r) Publication of educational articles, columns, or books that are directly related to the subject area of assignment: points in accordance with Section 25.875(x)(2) of this Part.
- s) Teacher-to-teacher consultation that includes activities such as observation, meetings, and exchange of information (whether face to face or via communications technology) and that relates to topics such as materials, curriculum, evidence-based practices, and techniques and strategies aligned to the State Goals for Learning (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1, Appendix D): 1 point per hour of interaction with a teacher who is “highly qualified” in the relevant core academic subject area, up to a maximum of 50 points.
- t) Possession of NBPTS certification or an Illinois master teaching certificate in an area other than in the area of assignment: 15 points.
- u) Possession of an Illinois standard teaching certificate in an area other than in the area of assignment: 10 points.
- v) Completion of a major or an approved program in special education with at least 15 points in each core academic subject taught: 75 points for a special education teacher who teaches two or more academic subjects exclusively to children with disabilities in the primary or middle grades.

Appendix B

Interview Protocol

The following questions are designed to best assist the researcher in answering the research questions posed in this study.

1. Who participated in the development of the Illinois recertification plan, and how were participants selected?
2. How was the state legislature involved in the development of the process?
3. Once the group convened, how did it proceed?
4. What other models of re-licensure or recertification were reviewed when developing the Illinois teacher recertification plan?
5. Once the Illinois process was completed and implemented, what proved to be effective or problematic?
6. What modifications were made to the process and why?
7. What modifications do you foresee being made to the process in the future?

Appendix C

Interview Participants

Title	Contact	Date (2007)	Length of Interview
State Superintendent of Schools	Telephone interview	August 8	50 minutes
Legislative Director for Educational Issues, IFT	Telephone interview	August 13	45 minutes
Assistant Director and Coordinator for QUEST, Chicago Public Schools	Personal interview	August 14	85 minutes
Principal Consultant for Certification Renewal Division, ISBE	Telephone interview	August 21	90 minutes
Assistant Consultant for Certification Renewal Division, ISBE	Telephone interview	August 21	40 minutes
ROE certification clerk	Personal interview	August 28	60 minutes
Education Policy Agency Relations Director, IEA	Telephone interview	August 31	120 minutes
Retired Executive Director of the Illinois Principals' Association	Telephone interview	September 20	70 minutes
LPDC Chair for Niantic-Harristown CUSD	Personal interview	October 1	80 minutes

Appendix D

States' Recertification Requirements

State	Renewal Cycle	Requirements
Alabama	5 years	3 years experience; 50 CPDUs
Alaska	5 years	Employment verification; 6 semester hours of credit
Arizona	5 years	180 CPDUs or 12 semester hours of credit
Arkansas	6 years	Teaching experience and continuing education
California	5 years	150 CPDUs and approved plan
Colorado	5 years	6 semester hours of credit
Connecticut	5 years	Employment verification; 90 CEUs; 15 CPDUs
Delaware	5 years	3 years of teaching experience; 90 CPDUs
Florida	5 years	120 CPDUs or 6 semester hours of credit
Georgia	5 years	6 semester hours of credit or 10 CEUs
Hawaii	5 years	Professional growth plan
Idaho	5 years	6 semester hours of credit
Illinois	5 years	4 years of teaching experience; 120 CPDUs
Indiana	5 years	Earned MS in Ed; 36 CPDUs
Iowa	5 years	Earned MS in Ed; 4 units from NBPTS
Kansas	5 years	NBPTS or 160 CPDUs; (120 with earned MS)
Kentucky	5 years	Graduate credit hours
Louisiana	5 years	150 CPDUs
Maine	5 years	Approved professional development plan
Maryland	5 years	Employment verification; 6 semester hours of credit
Massachusetts	5 years	3 years teaching experience; 150 CPDUs
Michigan	5 years	6 semester hours of credit or 18 CEUs
Minnesota	5 years	125 CPDUs
Mississippi	5 years	5 CEUs or 3 semester hours of credit
Missouri	5 years	Professional growth plan; portfolio
Montana	5 years	60 CEUs
Nebraska	5 years	6 pre-approved semester hours of credit
Nevada	5 years	6 CPDUs
New Hampshire	3 years	Professional growth plan
New Jersey	5 years	Professional growth plan
New Mexico	Annual	Renewal form
New York	5 years	175 CPDUs
North Carolina	5 years	10 semester hours of credit or 15 CEUs
North Dakota	5 years	4 CPDUs
Ohio	5 years	Professional growth plan; 180 CPDUs
Oklahoma	5 years	Teaching experience verification
Oregon	5 years	Professional growth plan; 6 semester hours of credit
Pennsylvania	5 years	6 semester credit hours
Rhode Island	5 years	Professional growth plan
South Carolina	5 years	120 CPDUs
South Dakota	5 years	3 semester hours of credit; 45 CEUs
Tennessee	10 years	MS plus 90 CEUs
Texas	5 years	150 CPDUs
Utah	5 years	95 CPDUs
Vermont	3 years	Professional growth plan; 3 CPDUs
Virginia	5 years	180 CPDUs; professional growth plan
Washington	5 years	150 CPDUs
West Virginia	5 years	MS in subject area
Wisconsin	5 years	Professional growth plan
Wyoming	5 years	5 CEUs or 75 CPDUs

Appendix E

Letter of Information

August 2007

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am conducting a research study as a graduate student at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale in the Department of Higher Education and Administration. You are requested as a candidate for the study due to your involvement with teacher recertification in Illinois. The criteria for participant selection includes involvement in one or more of the following areas: affiliation with or employment through the Illinois State Board of Education, officer of the Illinois Education Association, or officer of the Illinois Federation of Teachers.

The purpose of this study is to investigate how state teacher certification boards have responded to the call for recertification and to identify procedural similarities that emerged among states in the effort to improve the quality of teaching. I will review statutes and policy from other states and conduct interviews with Illinois policymakers to arrive at a historical analysis of the Illinois process.

Your participation in this study will enhance the understanding of the genesis of the Illinois recertification effort and how it compares to the requirements for recertification in other states. If you choose to participate in the study, the initial interview will be scheduled in August and will take approximately an hour of your time. The questions specifically address how the Illinois recertification process evolved.

Your responses will be audio taped, and the recording device will be presented at the beginning of the interview with a statement of acknowledgment at the beginning of the interview. Responses will be analyzed using a coding system, and the code listings and data will be kept in a separate and secure location. The tapes will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in my office at home, and only I have the key. The only other person who may have access to the tapes will be my dissertation chair, and the tapes will be erased upon the successful completion of the study.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact me or my committee chairperson:

Nancy Brodbeck
11936 N. Meridian Ave.
Latham, Illinois 62543
217-674-3432
Nb107@frontiernet.net

Dr. Brad Colwell, Department Chair
Dept of Educational Administration & Higher Education
Pulliam Hall Room 131
475 Clocktower Drive
Mail Code 4606
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
618-536-4434

I hope you will agree to participate in this research study. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Nancy Brodbeck

Appendix F

Consent Letter for Participation and Audiotaping

August 2007

I, (name), agree to participate in this research project being conducted by Nancy Brodbeck, doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Administration and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Your participation is strictly voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question during the interview. You may also end your participation at any time during the interview.

Your responses to interview questions will be audiotaped, and the tape will be transcribed at a later time. The tape will be erased after transcription. Responses will be listed and coded, and the tapes and listings will be secured in a locked cabinet within a locked office. The researcher and her committee chair will be the only people with access to the tapes and listing.

I have read the above information and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity and know that my responses will be tape recorded. I understand a copy of this form will be made available to me for the relevant information and phone numbers.

Signature of participant

Date

CONSENT TO ALLOW QUOTING

I agree to allow _____ I will not allow _____ Nancy Brodbeck to quote me in her paper.

Signature of participant

Date

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Research Development and Administration, SIUC, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone (618) 453-4533.

Appendix G

91st General Assembly Summary of SB0556

Senate Sponsors:

CRONIN-SULLIVAN-MYERS, J-BOMKE-NOLAND, RADOGNO, BERMAN AND PARKER.

House Sponsors:

WOOLARD-MITCHELL, JERRY-SMITH, MICHAEL-MOFFITT-CURRY, JULIE

Short description:

TEACHERS-CERTIFICATES-FEES

Synopsis of Bill as introduced:

Amends the School Code and the State Finance Act. Makes changes concerning an annual teacher supply and demand report, the institute fund, certificate fees, the grant of temporary employment authorizations to teacher applicants, master certificates, administrative certificates, substitute teacher's certificates, the seal of the State Teacher Certification Board, the renewal of certificates, the creation of the State Teacher Professional Development Fund as a special fund in the State treasury, recommendations for certification, regionally accredited institutions of higher learning, school service personnel certificates, and the holder of a letter of continuing eligibility being issued an Initial or Standard Certificate. Repeals a Section concerning a general certificate for part-time teachers of adult education subjects. Effective immediately.

SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 1.

Deletes reference to:

30 ILCS 105/5.490 new
 105 ILCS 5/2-3.11c new
 105 ILCS 5/3-12 from Ch. 122, par. 3-12
 105 ILCS 5/21-1b from Ch. 122, par. 21-1b
 105 ILCS 5/21-1c from Ch. 122, par. 21-1c
 105 ILCS 5/21-2 from Ch. 122, par. 21-2
 105 ILCS 5/21-7.1 from Ch. 122, par. 21-7.1
 105 ILCS 5/21-9 from Ch. 122, par. 21-9
 105 ILCS 5/21-11.3 from Ch. 122, par. 21-11.3
 105 ILCS 5/21-11.4
 105 ILCS 5/21-12 from Ch. 122, par. 21-12
 105 ILCS 5/21-14 from Ch. 122, par. 21-14
 105 ILCS 5/21-16 from Ch. 122, par. 21-16
 105 ILCS 5/21-21 from Ch. 122, par. 21-21
 105 ILCS 5/21-25 from Ch. 122, par. 21-25
 105 ILCS 5/34-83 from Ch. 122, par. 34-83
 105 ILCS 5/21-11 rep.

Deletes everything. Amends the teacher certification Article of the School Code to change a caption to a Section concerning a duplicate certificate.

SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 2.

Adds reference to:

105 ILCS 5/2-3.11c new
 105 ILCS 5/3-11.5 new
 105 ILCS 5/3-12 from Ch. 122, par. 3-12
 105 ILCS 5/21-0.01
 105 ILCS 5/21-1a from Ch. 122, par. 21-1a
 105 ILCS 5/21-1b from Ch. 122, par. 21-1b
 105 ILCS 5/21-1c from Ch. 122, par. 21-1c
 105 ILCS 5/21-2 from Ch. 122, par. 21-2
 105 ILCS 5/21-2.1 from Ch. 122, par. 21-2.1
 105 ILCS 5/21-3 from Ch. 122, par. 21-3
 105 ILCS 5/21-4 from Ch. 122, par. 21-4
 105 ILCS 5/21-5 from Ch. 122, par. 21-5
 105 ILCS 5/21-7.1 from Ch. 122, par. 21-7.1

105 ILCS 5/21-9 from Ch. 122, par. 21-9
 105 ILCS 5/21-11.3 from Ch. 122, par. 21-11.3
 105 ILCS 5/21-11.4
 105 ILCS 5/21-12 from Ch. 122, par. 21-12
 105 ILCS 5/21-14 from Ch. 122, par. 21-14
 105 ILCS 5/21-16 from Ch. 122, par. 21-16
 105 ILCS 5/21-21 from Ch. 122, par. 21-21
 105 ILCS 5/21-25 from Ch. 122, par. 21-25
 105 ILCS 5/34-83 from Ch. 122, par. 34-83
 105 ILCS 5/21-11 rep.
 30 ILCS 805/8.23 new

Deletes everything. Reinserts the contents of bill as introduced, with changes, and further amends the Teacher Certification Article of the School Code. Changes the date the new system of teacher certification is required to be implemented from July 1, 1999 to January 1, 2000. Requires the State Board of Education and the State Teacher Certification Board to establish a procedure for renewing Standard Teaching Certificates and standards for certificate renewal, and adds requirements concerning professional development activities. Requires a Standard Teaching Certificate, whose holder is employed and performing services in an Illinois public or State-operated elementary school, secondary school, or cooperative or joint agreement with a governing body or board of control in a certificated teaching position or a charter school, to be maintained Valid and Active through certificate renewal activities. Requires a Valid and Active Standard Teaching Certificate holder to develop a certificate renewal plan for satisfying continuing professional development requirements, which must be approved by a local professional development committee. Requires a local professional development committee to issue and forward recommendations for renewal or nonrenewal of Standard Teaching Certificates to the appropriate regional superintendent of schools. Requires the holders of Master Teaching Certificates to meet the same requirements and follow the same procedures as holders of Standard Teaching certificates. Increases the fees for Standard and Master Teaching Certificates. Makes other changes. Amends the State Mandates Act to require implementation without reimbursement. Effective July 1, 1999.

SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 3.

Replaces a paragraph relating to appointment of a local professional development committee.

STATE MANDATES NOTE (State Board of Education)
 Teacher Supply and Demand Report--Costs to gather and analyze data could be partially offset by funds received from certificate application fees. ... Regional Professional Development Review Committees--Cost is currently unknown. ... Institute Fund--Amounts collected would probably not be enough to defray all expenses of regional professional development review comm. and necessary technological improvements. ... Additional Powers of State Teacher Certification Board--No fiscal impact. ... Subject Endorsement on Certificates--Merging of fees into a single fund would approximate \$36,000 annually. Applicants would not experience any change in fees paid. State Treasurer would not receive approx. \$36,000 annually for deposit into GRF ... Temporary Employment Authorizations--Will allow applicants to begin employment earlier. ... Grades of Certificates--If the current 20 Master level teachers in Ill. are required to renew at 10-yr. intervals, rather than 7-yr. intervals, fiscal impact would be negligible. ... Administrative Certificates; Resident Teacher Certificates; Illinois Teacher Corps - Regionally Accredited Institutions--Reduces cost and time needed to obtain certificates for persons from accredited institutions. ... General Supervisory Endorsement--No fiscal impact. ... Substitute Certificates--No fiscal impact. ... General Certificate--No fiscal impact. ... Printing of Seal-Signature-Credentials--Approximately \$600,000 in revenues would be diverted from GRF. Fees would not be raised. ... Renewal of Certificates--Implementation costs are unknown. ... Fees Required for Registration--No fiscal impact anticipated. ... Fee for Duplicate Certifi-

ates--Approximately \$18,400 would be diverted from GRF. ...
 School Service Personnel Certificate--No fiscal impact. ...
 Board of Examiners-Certificates-Examination--No fiscal impact.
 HOUSE AMENDMENT NO. 1.

Changes the date the new system of teacher certification is required to be implemented from January 1, 2000 to February 15, 2000. that the examinations and indicators for the issuance of teacher certificates shall also be based on State standards (not just national standards). Provides that the State Board of Education and the State Teacher Certification Board's determination of the maximum credit for each category of continuing professional development activities must be based upon recommendations submitted by a continuing professional development activity task force. Makes changes concerning continuing professional development purposes, continuing professional development activities, membership on a local professional development committee, the number of members that must be present in order for action to be taken, the members of a regional professional development review committee, the meetings of a regional professional development review committee, the amount paid for administrative costs associated with conducting meetings of the local professional development committee, and paying for staff attendance at regional professional development review committee meetings and a training seminar.

HOUSE AMENDMENT NO. 2.

Adds reference to:

105 ILCS 5/21-2a from Ch. 122, par. 21-2a

Further amends the School Code. Provides that (i) all persons exchanging a special certificate and (ii) all persons receiving a special education designation on either a special certificate or an elementary certificate issued under the special certificate provisions of the School Code are exempt from provisions of the School Code concerning a grant program for preschool educational and related model research-training programs, provided these persons meet all the other requirements for teaching. Provides that certificates exchanged or issued under these provisions shall be valid for teaching children with disabilities and the special certificates shall be called Initial or Standard Special Preschool-Age 21 Certificates.

HOUSE AMENDMENT NO. 4.

Replaces references to Valid but Inactive certificates with references to Valid and Exempt certificates. Makes other changes.

Last action on Bill: PUBLIC ACT..... 91-0102

Last action date: 99-07-12

Location: Senate

Amendments to Bill: AMENDMENTS ADOPTED: HOUSE - 3 SENATE - 3

Appendix H

Check your status;

Initial Certificate Holder

Standard/Master Certificate Holder

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
 Educator and School Development Division
 100 North First Street, S-306
 Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001

APPEAL TO THE RPDRC FOR NONRENEWAL (Standard/Master) OR NONISSUANCE (Initial)

DIRECTIONS: Complete and submit this form to the Regional Professional Development Review Committee (RPDRC) within 14 days after receiving either 1) a notice of a recommendation for nonrenewal from your Local Professional Development committee (LPPDC) if you are a Standard or Master certificate holder or 2) a recommendation of nonissuance from your Regional Superintendent if you are an Initial certificate holder. Include any supporting documentation you think is relevant. Include a return receipt and keep copies of all materials for your records.

NAME _____

ADDRESS (Street, City, State, Zip Code) _____

HOME TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) _____ WORK TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) _____

EMPLOYED BY (Name of District, Joint Agreement, Charter School, etc.) _____ TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) _____

ADDRESS (Street, City, State, Zip Code) _____

CERTIFICATES UNDER WHICH YOU ARE CURRENTLY TEACHING		OTHER CERTIFICATES CURRENTLY HELD	
Certificate Type	Certificate Number	Certificate Type	Certificate Number

*I am requesting a review by the RPDRC. I believe the decision for nonrenewal or nonissuance should be reversed because:
 (Attach additional sheets if necessary.)*

Supporting documentation is is not attached.

_____ Date _____ Signature of Certificate Holder _____

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Nancy L. Negley Brodbeck

October 7, 1956

1413 W. Highland Place, Decatur, IL 62526

nbrodbeck@wl.k12.il.us

Spoon River College, Canton, IL
Associate of Arts, May 1976

Illinois State University, Normal, IL
Bachelor of Science, Early Adolescent Education, May 1978

Illinois State University, Normal, IL
Master of Science in Education, May 1983

George S. Counts Doctoral Student Award, 2008

Dissertation Title:

Teacher Recertification: A Historical Analysis of the Illinois Process

Major Professors: Brad Colwell, Ph.D., J.D., and Patrick Dilley, Ph.D.