2016

A comparative analysis of middle level teacher preparation and certification in California

Rodas Paula Hart

Pepperdine University

Graduate School of Education and Psychology

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MIDDLE LEVEL TEACHER PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION IN CALIFORNIA

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership, Administration, and Policy

by

Paula Hart Rodas

January, 2016

Linda Purrington, Ed.D. – Dissertation Chair

This dissertation proposal, written by

Paula Hart Rodas

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Doctoral Committee:

Linda Purrington, Ed.D., Chairperson

Robert Barner, Ph.D.

Steven Romines, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Page

LIST OF TABLES

DEDICATION

To my mother, Stephanie, who taught me through countless examples and life lessons how to embrace challenges and to persevere no matter what obstacles I encountered. I attribute my strengths of negotiation, persistence, and flexibility directly to the way you navigated the complexities of life and showed me how to be a strong and caring woman. The best I have to offer the world I have learned from watching you.

To my father, Thomas, who never once let me believe that I was incapable of achieving my goals; whether it was by virtue of our shared hard-headedness or the refusal to let a challenge defeat me, I am strong because you taught me to be so.

Thank you both for your unrelenting love and support. I truly have the best parents a child could ever wish for.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to first acknowledge my committee chair, Dr. Linda Purrington, for guiding me along the convoluted path I journeyed in reaching this point. Throughout the experience you were a constant voice of positivity and encouragement urging me to continue. Your kindness, mentorship, and support are truly appreciated.

To my committee members, Dr. Robert Barner and Dr. Steve Romines, thank you for sharing your ideas and constructive feedback. Your patience and understanding during this process has been a source of strength and reassurance. This project could not have come to fruition without your guidance and support. To Kristin Bailey who answered all of my ridiculous and repetitive questions, kept my paperwork and forms organized, and genuinely was someone supporting me from behind the scenes. Thank you for all the hard work that you put into helping me succeed.

Lastly I must acknowledge my family and friends who have endured life with me during this program; I know that this journey has been a test for all of us. My parents, Tom and Stephanie Hart, and my grandfather, Palmiro Gligo, encouraged me to pursue and complete my doctorate. My children, Anthony and Nicholas, and stepson, Abel, have only ever known a life where Mama was in school, and they never once complained about the time I spent in front of the computer completing this project. My husband, Eric, who was supportive in every way, shape, and form along the way; including taking over as both Mom and Dad doing chores and driving kids around while I was busy writing. My sister Amy, her husband Matt, my niece Heather, and my nephew Ian have always understood when school caused my absence at family events. I could not have completed this journey without the support from all of you. I am truly blessed.

VITA

EDUCATION

2015	Doctoral Candidate Educational Leadership, Administration, and Policy Pepperdine University
1999	M.A. Multicultural Education California State University, Dominguez Hills
1995	B.S. Medical Microbiology California State University, Long Beach
1991	A.A. Liberal Arts Marymount College, Palos Verdes

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2014 - Present	Principal, Lawndale High School, Lawndale, CA
2013 - 2014	Associate Principal, Leuzinger High School, Lawndale, CA
2008 - 2012	Vice Principal, Mira Costa High School, Manhattan Beach, CA
2007 - 2008	Vice Principal, Manhattan Beach Middle School, Manhattan Beach, CA
2006 - 2007	Microbiology Instructor, Marymount College, Rancho Palos Verdes, CA
2003 - 2007	Assistant Director, Community Educational Programs, Marymount College, Rancho Palos Verdes, CA
1998 - 2007	Science Instructor, Miraleste Intermediate School, Rancho Palos Verdes, CA
1996 -1998	Science Instructor, David Starr Jordan High School, Long Beach, CA

CERTIFICATIONS AND CREDENTIALS

California: Administrative Services Clear Credential

Professional Clear Single Subject Teaching Credential, Biological Sciences and Health Science

Cross Cultural Language and Academic Development Certificate

ABSTRACT

The young adolescent learner is in a unique and distinctive phase of development, and as such requires a developmentally responsive educational program delivered by specially prepared middle level educators. The purpose of this qualitative mixed methods study was to compare current California policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation programs with the most recent research on young adolescent development. A second purpose of this study was to investigate the design and implementation of middle school specific teacher preparation programs in California in relation to the most recent research on young adolescent development.

The findings of this study indicate that the young adolescent student is in a unique phase of development, which requires a specialized developmentally responsive educational program, delivered by specifically prepared teachers. The evidence further demonstrates that strong middle level teacher preparation programs, such as the program at CSU San Marcos, are designed to prepare teachers to address these complex developmental needs of the young adolescent student. An additional finding was that the current California teacher licensure and preparation requirements have not kept pace with the research on the young adolescent learner and are thereby misaligned with the best practices determined for this age group. A restructuring of the policies for California teacher licensure and preparation requirements to align with the research on best practices for the young adolescent learner is recommended.

The voluminous body of research on the young adolescent learner consistently demonstrates the need for developmentally responsive schools staffed by specially prepared middle level educators. The current licensing and teacher preparation systems in place in California are poorly coordinated with known best practices and, are failing to meet the needs of the middle level learner. There is a need for restructuring of schooling for the young adolescent

learner in California, including the method for preparing and licensing teachers for the middle level, in order to provide developmentally responsive schools.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

"Schools are peculiar social agencies, charged by society with socializing youth into that society, while excluding them from it – they are surrogate societies" (Lipsitz, 1984, p.7).

Young adolescent students in middle school are going through a crucial stage of development. The experiences they have during their middle school career sets the pace and the tone for their future educational experiences, and ultimately affects their ability to perform and succeed in high school and beyond. A key to making the middle school experience meaningful and successful is the quality of the middle school teacher (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; National Middle School Association, 2003). Highly qualified middle school teachers have the knowledge, skills, and disposition for working with young adolescents; they are able to recognize and deal with the complex nature of the physical, social, and emotional development of the young adolescent. They are able to address the specific needs of the young adolescent and they understand that the needs of the young adolescent are vastly different from that of an elementary school or high school student (National Middle School Association, 1982, 2003).

In order for middle level teachers to become highly qualified, they need to be trained through specialized preparation programs focusing on the young adolescent student. Currently most states divide their credentialing and licensure into elementary and secondary certification. This in turn produces teacher preparation programs that are broad and lack the specific training and knowledge necessary to understand the unique needs of the young adolescent (Gaskill, 2002). The bulk of secondary teacher preparation programs are geared toward preparing teachers for the high school level and rarely include relevant and meaningful preparation for teachers of

young adolescents (Lipsitz, 1984). If we are to move American education forward and better serve the young adolescent student, then we need to better prepare teachers for the middle level student through changes in licensure, preparation, induction, and support. To ignore this need is to ignore the future of the children (National Middle School Association, 1982, 1995, 2003).

Early adolescence and developmental needs. The collective understanding of adolescence by society is that of an isolated event or stage characterized by awkward behaviors, raging hormones, and growth spurts. However, as Lipsitz (1984) expounds "the events of adolescence are part of continuum, not an isolated phenomena" (p. 6). Adolescence is characterized by a wide range of physical, cognitive, social, emotional, and intellectual developments (Bee, 1989; Woolfolk, 1998). In effort to better serve the adolescent student the longest and potentially most successful educational reform movement in the history of American education began. Spanning nearly 100 years from its earliest beginnings, the reform, calling for the development of specialized schools for the young adolescent with specifically designed instruction taught by specially trained teachers, has made major strides in improving the educational environment for students aged 10 – 15 years old, yet there is still much work to do (Gaskill, 2002). The charge of middle school reform is to create a school with developmentally appropriate programs, culture, and teachers for a group of students who are, in many ways, completely misunderstood by the rest of society (Lipsitz, 1984).

Models of schooling for early adolescents. American educators have been struggling to provide an appropriate educational environment for young adolescents since the early part of the twentieth century. The junior high school model, adopted around 1910, was initially designed as a place where young adolescents could be provided with improved "guidance" regarding choosing their educational paths toward the workforce or the college campus (Beane &

Brodhagen, 2001). The junior high school design was the dominant educational format for young adolescents until the early 1960s when emerging psychological and sociological research suggested that the junior high school model, a mere miniature version of traditional high schools, did not serve the vast and varying social, emotional, and educational needs of the young adolescent (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; National Middle School Association, 1995, 2003; Williamson, 1996). From this new view of the adolescent, changes began to take place in the American educational world.

Middle school teacher licensure. Despite all of the research in support of middle-school-specific preparation, relatively few of America's teachers and administrators in the over 13, 000 middle schools nation-wide have been specifically prepared to teach and work with young adolescents. We are a nation where a large number of middle school teachers are "simply unprepared for the challenging task of understanding, coping with, and effectively educating young adolescents" (McEwin, 1992, p. 369). The majority of teacher preparation programs in America fall into one of two categories: elementary education or secondary education. The line of demarcation between elementary and secondary varies from state to state, but the sentiment is the same throughout – students in the middle are the same as one group or another and do not require special attention (National Middle School Association, 1982, 2003). Furthermore, the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) regarding the need for Highly Qualified Teachers for all students seemingly demand the development of middle level teacher preparation requirements (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2002; National Middle School Association, 1982, 1995, 2003, 2008; United States Department of Education, 2008). According to the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1989), "teachers in middle grades schools

should be selected and specially educated to teach young adolescents" (p. 19); yet we still do not see this call to arms reflected in the majority of our nation's teacher preparation programs nor in our state licensure requirements (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2002; National Middle School Association, 1982, 2003, 2008).

Middle school teacher preparation programs. At the heart of the reform effort is the emphasis on the adequate and specialized preparation of educational professionals for the middle school, namely teachers and administrators. For many years, the prevailing belief regarding teacher preparation was that there were two types of teachers – elementary and secondary. The exact definition of what constituted elementary and secondary teacher licensure differs depending on from which state of the union a teacher is licensed (National Middle School Association, 2008). What appears to be lacking is a clearly defined and specially designed preparation and accreditation path for teachers and administrators who seek to work in America's middle schools. Williamson (1996) argues that due to the complex nature of the young adolescent student, "the role of the middle level teacher is perhaps one of the most vital in the educational continuum" (p. 378). Volumes of research on adolescent development, such as the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development's Turning Points (1989, 2000) and the National Middle School Association's This We Believe (1982, 2003), have yielded compelling evidence in support of middle level school reform, especially in the area of teacher preparation, induction, and professional development.

It is the assertion of top research organizations, such as the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1989, 2000) and the National Middle School Association (1982, 2003), that the preparation programs for teachers at the middle level need to be vastly different than those for teachers at the elementary or secondary level. This is not a recent phenomenon; as

early as 1965, Toepfer raised this question when he proposed that middle level teachers were distinctly different from both elementary and secondary teachers – they are not one or another but some new "species" altogether. Across the realm of middle level reform, support organizations report on the belief that teachers working with young adolescents need specific and extensive training in adolescent development so that he teachers may be developmentally responsive to the varied needs of the young adolescent student. According to Beane & Brodhagen (2001), the greatest expectation of middle level teachers is "that they know about and be sensitive to the characteristics of the young adolescents with whom they spend their days" (p. 1159). Increasingly middle level teachers are called upon to teach in a developmentally appropriate fashion, which according to Lipsitz (1984), means that teachers need "to be responsive to the individual needs of rapidly changing individuals in a group setting" (p. 9). Therefore, effective middle-level teacher preparation programs are needed to prepare teachers that are capable of appropriately addressing the emotional, intellectual, physical, and social needs of young adolescents (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989, 2000; Davies, 1995; Hunt, Wiseman, & Bowden, 1998; National Middle School Association 1982, 2003). This is a great divergence from the majority of teacher preparation programs currently found across the country.

Middle school teacher induction and support. Appropriate training and licensure for middle grades teachers is only half of the battle. As with any lesson, the learner needs practice and support as they incorporate the new materials into their repertoire. For new middle level teachers this comes in the form of support and induction programs. "All new teachers need mentoring from expert veteran teachers to translate the lessons of university classrooms into the practical artistry of excellent teaching" (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 2000, p.

105). McEwin, Dickinson, and Smith point out that mentoring and induction programs are an integral part of "the continuum of support teachers need as they move from their novice status into the professional culture of their schools, departments, or teams" (2004, p. 122). Most teacher induction and support in California is District and County based. Many schools in California utilize the State funded and supported Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) induction program. Outside of homegrown, grassroots support and induction programs at local sites, there are no formal methods that are used specifically for middle level teachers.

Statement of the Problem

While the vast body of research on early adolescence yields evidence in support of the development and requirement of special preparation, licensure, and induction programs for the middle level educator, many states have failed to recognize this important information and therefore have not created policy regarding special preparation for teachers at the middle school level. This choice not to act upon the volumes of confirming data is perceived as having a negative impact on the relative academic success of young adolescents across the country. Once a forerunner in the field of educational innovations, the state of California has been left behind and can be considered to be "in the dark ages" when considering developmentally appropriate preparation of middle level educators based upon the extensive research available (Fenwick, 1986). A need and opportunity exists to compare current California policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation programs with the most recent research on young adolescent development. A need and opportunity also exists to investigate the design and implementation of middle school-specific teacher preparation programs in California and to compare them with the most recent research on young adolescent development. Both comparisons would serve the purposes of informing policy and preparation recommendations for state and local consideration.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to compare current California policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation programs with the most recent research on young adolescent development. A second purpose of this study was to investigate the design and implementation of middle school specific teacher preparation programs in California in relation to the most recent research on young adolescent development. It was anticipated that the outcomes of both methods would serve to inform policy recommendation and inform middle school teacher preparation program design and implementation.

Importance of Study

Historically, although the period of adolescence has been recognized as a period of great developmental change, teachers have rarely been specially trained to work with young adolescent students. Appropriate middle level education is "firmly anchored in the realities of human growth and development" (Lounsbury, 1991, p. 68), yet the vast majority of American middle school teachers have little or no special training to understand this development. This study argues that this lack of preparation of middle level educators rests on the shoulders of the individual states (and their institutes of higher education) in their unwillingness to require specific middle level teacher credentials/licensure for teachers of young adolescents, rather than on the current or prospective middle school teachers.

This study sought to provide feedback and guidance for the CTC and teacher education programs for the purposes of better preparing potential teachers for work at the middle level. Potentially, the results of this study would influence the CTC and the California State University system to implement a middle level credential programs. This in turn would potentially produce teachers who are more prepared and ready to address the complex needs of the young adolescent

student. By providing a more comprehensive and detailed preparation program for potential teachers, California could produce more competent and prepared educators. A better teaching force should, in turn, provide a greater opportunity for the idle level student to be successful.

Results of this study were used to recommend policy changes to the State of California regarding teacher certification for the middle level. Ideally, the CTC would restructure the requirements for obtaining a teaching credential for use at the middle level. Currently the CTC has two levels of credential: elementary/multiple subject for grades K-6; and secondary/single subject for grades 6-12. A more appropriate distribution of specialties, based upon the relevant literature and research, would be to issue credentials for grades K-5, 5-9, and 9-12. Once this differentiation is set in motion, it would yield a tremendous opportunity to observe and record the differences produced by these properly prepared educators. The data from this could drive new and important research in adolescent development and psychology as well as educational research.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout the study and are defined below.

Middle level education / Middle school education / Middle school is defined by the National Middle School Association (2003) as a school that "usually consists of grades 6-8, but may also be comprised of grades 5-7, 6-7, 5-8, and 7-8. Middle schools are based on the developmental needs (social and academic) of young adolescents and provide: curriculum that is challenging, integrative, and exploratory" (p. 1). Middle level education was further defined by George Melton of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) as those schools in the "middle" between elementary and secondary education regardless of grade

configuration (Williamson, 1996). The terms middle level and middle school are used interchangeably throughout the literature and will be used as such throughout this study.

Junior high school as defined by the National Middle School Association in 2003, is a "school [that] usually consists of grades 7-9, but may be comprised of grades 5-9, 6-9, and 8-9. The junior high school was conceived primarily as a downward extension of secondary education organized by subjects and departments" (p. 1). The inception of the junior high school and its attempts to improve the education of students in grades 6-9 "failed to result in the establishment of developmentally responsive schools for young adolescents" (Williamson, 1996, p. 378).

Developmentally appropriate is defined as actions on the part of a teacher or school that are specifically aligned with developmental stage of the student(s) involved and implies a complete and extensive understanding of the developmental stage on the part of the educator.

Teacher certification programs are defined as programs of study that prepare individuals for the profession of teaching. These programs may be hosted by a university or alternative educational institution as determined by individual state requirements. These programs are traditionally divided in to elementary or secondary education preparation programs. Completion of these programs is intended to render an individual the ability to acquire a teaching license / credential.

The terms Young adolescent / Early adolescent / Young adolescence / Early adolescence / Middle level student / Middle school student all refer to children between the ages of ten and fifteen years of age. First described by Briggs in 1920, these students were "presumed to be at a unique stage in human development, imbued with characteristics that were in need of special attention and instructional adaptation" (from Beane & Brodhagen, 2001, p. 1159). Lipsitz

describes these students as “experiencing the dramatic conjunction of rapid biological, social, emotional, and cognitive changes” (1984, p. 6).

State licensing agencies are the individual entities, such as state boards of education and state credentialing commissions, which determine qualifications for and provide access to individual licenses or credentials for teachers. Licenses / credentials vary by state in terms of their preparation requirements and applicable grade distributions.

The terms Middle school movement / Middle school reform / Middle school concept refer to the shift in thinking regarding the education of young adolescents that began in the early 1960s. This shift was based upon the dissatisfaction with the junior high school model and a desire to have a school more aligned with the developmental stage of the students. This marked a radical change from the traditional forms of schooling for this age group (10-15 years). As understanding of the developmental changes of young adolescence were broadened, new ideas toward appropriate schooling for these students was investigated and proposed (Lipsitz, 1984; Lounsbury, 1984, 2000; Williamson, 1996). The middle school movement calls for developmentally responsive schools with specifically trained teachers working in collaborative interdisciplinary groups.

Specifically prepared / Specially prepared refers to teachers who have completed a teacher preparation program that is developmentally appropriate for the age level of student that the teacher will be certified to teach.

Theoretical Framework

As the collective understanding of the young adolescent expanded, so did the volume of research on how to best serve their needs. The previously held ideas about the most effective methods for educating the young adolescent were fading in light of this new understanding

(Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Williamson, 1996). In the latter half of the twentieth century, schools were faced with the fact that they were not meeting the needs of the students they served. The educational community recognized this and took it as a call to action (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Eichorn, 1966; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Lounsbury, 1992, 2000; Williamson, 1996). From this calling, the middle school movement began. The middle school concept called for the special preparation of teachers to effectively educate young adolescents while also requiring a more appropriate balance of academics and developmental (emotional, psychological, social) support of the student (Beane, 2001; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; McEwin, 1983, 1992; McEwin & Dickinson, 1995; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996; Wiles & Bondi, 1987; Williamson, 1996). Rather than focusing on a singular aspect of the developing student, the middle school concept strives to service all aspects of need for the young adolescent student: physical, social, emotional, intellectual, moral, and psychological (Beane, 2001; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; McEwin, 1992).

From a collective understanding of the relevant research spanning nearly a century, this researcher was drawn to question where California was in the spectrum of middle school reform. The history of middle level education demonstrates that the American educational system has made strides in providing better educational opportunities for the young adolescent, but this researcher failed to find significant evidence of these improvements in the California system. Through this critical lens, the researcher developed the questions to guide this study.

Research Questions

The following three questions guided this study:

1. What does the current research recommend regarding the content and importance of teacher preparation programs specifically designed for middle school teachers?

2. What are the current California Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation and how, if at all, do these policies incorporate the most recent research?
3. How is the middle-school specific teacher preparation program at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) designed and implemented to incorporate the most recent research?
4. What evidence, if any, exists to demonstrate that the CSUSM middle-school specific teacher preparation program more successfully prepares graduates/potential teachers for middle school assignments than those prepared in more traditional programs?

Delimitations

This study was delimited to:

1. Using existing data that is available publicly from California State Department of Education (CDE), the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), and California State University web sites.
2. CCTC approved and established California State University preparation programs specially designed for middle school teachers. Experimental or developing programs will not be included in this study. Focusing on only one part of middle school reform-teacher preparation.
3. Focusing only on teacher preparation regarding adolescent development and not on subject matter proficiency.

Limitations

1. Focusing on only one part of middle school reform - teacher preparation – rather than on all areas suggested by literature (including school arrangement, exploratory curriculum, etc.) gives only a narrow view of the recommendations set forth in the relevant research. This may make it difficult to generalize the findings of this study to all middle school reform.
2. Focusing solely on teacher preparation regarding adolescent development may give a myopic view of appropriate teacher preparation. By choosing not to focus on or include subject matter proficiency, which is another key factor in teacher efficacy, the findings of this study may not be sufficient to affect change in teacher preparation programs in California.

Assumptions

1. Adolescent developmental research regarding education is valid.
2. Preparing teachers by requiring special middle school credentials attained through specialized teacher preparation programs is the best way to address early adolescent students' needs in the schoolhouse.
3. The directors of teacher preparation programs in the California State University system schools are considered knowledgeable and reliable resources for the programs they direct.
4. The directors of teacher preparation programs in the California State University system schools will be able to be candid and truthful when discussing their programs.

Overview of Chapters

This study was comprised of five chapters. Chapter one introduced the topic, problem, and research questions. Chapter two discussed the relevant literature regarding adolescent development and middle level teacher certification with special attention paid to the correlation between the two. Chapter three discussed in depth the methodology employed in this study. Chapter four presented the study findings and chapter five culminated this study with a discussion of the findings, a presentation of conclusions supported by data from the study and literature, and recommendations for policy, practice, and further study.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Spanning nearly a century, middle school development and reform continues to be one of the longest running improvement projects in American education today (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001). From the early beginnings of the junior high school in the early twentieth century to the professional learning communities of today, educators have continually sought to improve the education of the child in the middle.

While considering the research on the topic of the middle school movement, the review of the literature was divided into two sections. The first section took a historical look at the development of the middle school concept. The second section reviewed the current research on specifically designed middle level teacher preparation programs and licensure.

Theoretical Framework

Spurred on by the developing understanding of the psychological and sociological differences of the young adolescent child, the American educational system set out to develop an appropriate schooling scenario for the middle level student in the early 1960s. Early evidence from researchers such as Lounsbury (1984), Eichorn (1966), and Alexander et al., (1969) sparked the longest running educational reform movement in history - the middle school movement (Anfara, 2004). Over the next twenty-five years, several large research organizations focused their efforts on improving the middle level schooling environment. This included the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development's (ASCD) 1969 report The Middle School We Need, the National Middle School Association's (NMSA) 1982 and 2003 position papers entitled This We Believe, the National Association of Secondary School Principal's (NASSP) 1985 release of An Agenda for Excellence, and the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development's 1989 and 2000 releases of Turning Points. The common theme throughout all of

the research was that the young adolescent is vastly different developmentally than the older adolescent child, and as such requires a school setting that is culturally sensitive and developmentally appropriate and teachers that are specially prepared to teach these youngsters.

Models of Schooling for Early Adolescents

A specialized school designed to meet the needs of young adolescent students was not a new idea. As early as the 1890s, American educators were focusing on increasing the number of students attending college and restructuring the primary and secondary school systems. Led by Harvard University president Charles Eliot, the National Education Association's (NEA) Committee of Ten, and later the Committee of Fifteen, studied the issue in great depth during the 1880s (Balfanz, Ruby, & MacIver, 2002; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001). According to the National Education Association (1893, 1895), these committees made recommendations regarding lowering of the age at which students enter college; at the time the average student entering college was 18 years old. It was the NEA's perspective that potential college-bound students squandered their time during the last years of primary education on curriculum that did not offer enough rigor or diversity. The NEA Committees recommended a restructuring of the traditional primary and secondary education programs that would allow more students to have an opportunity to attend some secondary education. Recommendations called for the removal of the last two grades of elementary education – grades 7 and 8 – and moving them to the secondary education program. This restructuring would allow the offering of college preparatory classes to young adolescent students in grades 7 and 8 as a means of increasing the college readiness of more students (National Education Association, 1893, 1895). Thus the foundation for the creation of the junior high school was set.

Creation of the junior high school. In the early part of the twentieth century, America's schools were facing two major issues: a decreased number of students eligible for entrance into high school (and college), and an increased awareness of the uniqueness of the early adolescent and their need for a specialized educational program. The convergence of these two issues, combined with the growing number of students immigrating into America, sparked the eventual development of the junior high school (Balfanz et. al, 2002; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Douglas, 1920; Williamson, 1996).

Most American school systems of the early twentieth century included an eight-year primary education program (grades 1-8) and a secondary education program (grades 9-12) and compulsory school attendance laws were prevalent in many states (Balfanz et. al, 2002). Yet this model proved to be far from ideal in preparing American youth for productive futures. According to Beane and Brodhagen, elementary schools of the early twentieth century were in crisis:

> Nearly 70% of those who finished sixth grade dropped out by the end of eighth grade, not only exacerbating the growing issue of child labor, but also flooding the market with unskilled workers. The elementary schools were generally overcrowded with the large influx of immigrants and also, in the two upper grades, with increasing numbers of students who were held back for academic failure in grade. (2001, p. 1157)

During this same time, developmentalists, such as G. Stanley Hall (1908), pushed for recognition of the young adolescent students as neither children nor adolescents, but rather as another developmental stage worthy of a specialized education program that could serve their unique needs. The developmentalists further pressed that separating the young adolescent student would "prevent their being negatively influenced by older adolescents, and, in turn, negatively

influencing younger children" (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001, p. 1157). Lounsbury (1992) states that the idea of that junior high school as a means to "bridge the gap" between elementary school and high school became widely accepted in the early part of the twentieth century. The idea became so well received that that first junior high schools opened in Columbus, Ohio and Berkeley, California in 1909 (Lounsbury, 1992).

Educators agreed that students in the last two years of primary school – grades 7 and 8 – were vastly different than their younger peers in terms of social, emotional, and academic needs (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Williamson, 1996). It became clear that young adolescents required an educational program that was more sophisticated than traditional elementary education. Additionally, to combat the overabundance of unskilled workers entering the workforce, it was decided that a vital component of the junior high school program was to include vocational education (National Education Association 1893, 1895). According to Briggs (1920) and Pringle (1937), the junior high school was designed with a dual purpose in mind; the junior high school was to become a great filter – separating out the students destined for college and those destined for the workforce. The addition of commercial, domestic, and vocational courses was thought to entice a greater number of young adolescents to stay in school, even if only through the ninth grade (Balfanz et. al, 2002). Beane and Brodhagen (2001) state that all of these concepts, whether part of a vocational or college preparatory program, were to be delivered to the young adolescent students in a developmentally sensitive and appropriate fashion with their unique characteristics in mind. This model of the junior high school persevered for some time with little change in form or function (Williamson, 1996).

Middle School Program Content and Implementation

It was not until the early part of the 1960s that the educational community began to reassess the efficacy of the junior high school model. Beane and Brodhagen (2001), Williamson (1996), and Wright (1950, 1958) discussed how the junior high school had diverged from its original intention and had become nothing more than a small-scale high school. The junior high school had become a "miniature version of the senior high school" (George, Lawrence, & Bushnell, 1998, p. 229). The junior high school had not become the developmentally sensitive educational arena it had originally intended to be. Course programs and schedules at the junior high school of the early 1960s failed to meet the developmental needs of the adolescent (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Eichhorn, 1966; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Lounsbury, 1992; Williamson, 1996). More often than not, the junior high school followed a format of departmentalized courses taught during a seven or eight period day utilizing the strategies and techniques known to be effective at the high school level (Knowles & Brown, 2000). The junior high school movement had essentially failed to create developmentally responsive schools for the young adolescent (Alexander et. al, 1969; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Eichhorn, 1966; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Lounsbury, 1992; Williamson, 1996). By and large, junior high schools did not provide developmentally appropriate or responsive school climates and staff; they did not provide a diversified and exploratory curriculum; they were not staffed by teachers and administrators who had been specially trained to help the young adolescent student navigate the territory of their developmental stage (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Eichhorn, 1966; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Lounsbury, 1992; Williamson, 1996). By the late 1960s after assessing the state of junior high schools across the country, Charles Silberman proclaimed the junior high school to be "a wasteland - one is tempted to say cesspool - of American education" (1970, p. 324).

General disappointment with the direction and program of the American junior high school led to the evolution of the middle school concept (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; Williamson, 1996). Pioneers such as Eichhorn, Alexander, Lounsbury, and Toepfer began working on the study of the early adolescent, their developmental needs, and the most effective manners in which a school could service those needs (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Toepfer, 1965; Williamson, 1996). Alexander et al. expounded on this perspective when they discussed their vision for the middle level school:

> In the first place, the youth served are in the 'middle,' between childhood and adolescence. In the second place, the schools serving them should be in the 'middle,' between schools for childhood and for adolescent education. (1969, p. 5)

As originally designed, the junior high school was intended to meet the educational needs of young adolescents in a manner that was both appreciative of and responsive to their unique developmental stage while simultaneously providing a functional yet creative curriculum (Wiles & Bondi, 1987). One of the major factors influencing the inability of the junior high school model to be a developmentally appropriate setting for the young adolescent was the absence of teachers specifically prepared for the middle level (Beane, 2001; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996; Williamson, 1996). As is the case for many middle level schools today, the teachers working at the middle level during the first half of the twentieth century were not given any specific instruction for dealing with the unique developmental needs of the young adolescent (Alexander & McEwin 1984; McEwin, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1987). Lounsbury states that middle level education should be grounded in the "realities of human growth and development" (1991, p. 68). Lounsbury further asserts that this

distinctive period of young adolescent development demands a specialized approach toward education and learning on the part of teachers.

More than just a schoolhouse. The middle school movement was designed to create developmentally responsive schools that could effectively educate young adolescent students while successfully shepherding them through the difficult developmental period of young adolescence. George and Alexander described the proposed middle school as being "in the middle of the school ladder" serving as a bridge between elementary and secondary education (1993, p. 42). The middle school concept called for the special preparation of teachers to effectively educate young adolescents while also requiring a more appropriate balance of academics and developmental (emotional, psychological, social) support of the student (Beane, 2001; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; McEwin, 1992; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996; Wiles & Bondi, 1987; Williamson, 1996). Rather than focusing on a singular aspect of the developing student, the middle school concept strives to service all aspects of need for the young adolescent student: physical, social, emotional, intellectual, moral, and psychological (Beane, 2001; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; McEwin, 1992).

In the early 1960s, as belief and support of the junior high school model began to wane, progressive researchers and educators, such as Alexander and Eichhorn, began to move toward developing schools for the young adolescent student (Anfara, 2004; Beane, 2001; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; McEwin, 1992). Landmark literature such as W. M. Alexander's "The Junior High: A Changing View" in 1965, D. H. Eichhorn's "The Middle School" in 1966, and W. M. Alexander's "The Emergent Middle School" in 1969, helped to light the way on the road to the creation of the middle school (Anfara, 2004). A true pioneer in the field of middle level education, Donald Eichhorn, Assistant Superintendent for the Upper St.

Clair school districts in Pennsylvania, made history when he changed the names of the St. Clair schools from "junior high" to "middle schools" (George, Stevenson, Thomason, & Beane, 1992). This was only the first step for Eichhorn in the restructuring of middle level education. The middle school envisioned by Eichhorn included an advisory component to meet the emotional, social, and psychological needs of students; multi-age ability grouping for students rather than age-based grouping; and a complete re-definition of instructional delivery and student assessment (Balfanz et al., 2002; Eichhorn, 1966). Eichhorn advocated for a school culture and climate in the middle schools that would allow for numerous opportunities for students to participate in active learning through interdisciplinary thematic units; he further stressed the importance of providing non-threatening opportunities for physical, as well as psychological, growth and development such as a broad-based physical education and intramural athletics program (Balfanz et al., 2002).

The middle school movement gained momentum across the country and scores of schools changed their names from junior high school to middle school in an attempt to ride the wave of reform and school improvement. This development continued into the 1970s, however, the changes that occurred in the majority of schools were a matter of semantics rather than operating principle (Balfanz et al., 2002; Beane, 2001; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Dickinson & Butler, 2001; Dickinson & McEwin, 1997; Entwisle, 1990). Balfanz et al., (2002) reported that in 1965, a mere five percent of American middle-grade schools were considered to be middle schools (grades 5-8 or 6-8), while 67 percent were considered to be junior high schools (grades 7-9). These figures were transposed by the year 2000, where only five percent of the nation's schools were still operating as grade 7-9 junior high schools, while 69 percent of the schools in America were either grade 5-8 or 6-8 middle schools. In 1969, William Alexander reflected that despite

the increased number of middle schools in operation around the country, many schools showed "limited progress toward the objectives of the middle school movement" (p. 19).

The need for clarity and consensus within the field of middle level education led many organizations to launch research explorations and to develop position papers regarding the middle school movement. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) established the Council on the Emerging Adolescent Learner in 1969, and, in 1970, a small group of educational professionals founded the Midwest Middle School Association; both groups searched for meaningful ways to provide developmentally appropriate educational experiences for young adolescents (Anfara, 2004; Balfanz, 2002; McEwin & Dickinson, 1995). Responding to the nation-wide scope of the middle school debate, the Midwest Middle School Association changed its name to the National Middle School Association (NMSA) in 1973, and began advocating nationally, working toward "improving the educational experiences of young adolescents by providing vision, knowledge, and resources to all who serve them in order to develop healthy, productive, and ethical citizens" (NMSA, 2008). In 1974, the ASCD chartered a team of researchers to work on "developing a paper for the Association identifying the rationale and significance of the America middle school and stressing the kinds of programs appropriate for emerging adolescent learners" (1975, p. v). The ASCD successfully published this paper as The Middle School We Need in 1975; the work reaffirmed the necessity of creating middle schools that were focused on the distinct developmental needs of the young adolescent; schools that would incorporate flexible course scheduling, team teaching, and individualized instructional opportunities (Anfara, 2004). Throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s, middle schools and junior high schools continued with "business as usual" despite recommendations from researcher organizations such as the ASCD and NMSA. Most middle level schools of this

era showed little improvement over the standard junior high school program of the 1950s and 1960s (Balfanz et al., 2002). Continuing the drive toward creating middle level schools to meet the unique needs of the young adolescent student, Joan Lipsitz produced Growing Up Forgotten: A Review of Research and Programs Concerning Early Adolescence in 1980. In Growing Up, Lipsitz vividly represented the young adolescent as misinterpreted and neglected in the American school system (Scales, 1992). Lipsitz furthered emphasized the need for developmentally appropriate middle level schools with the publishing of Successful Schools for Young Adolescents in 1984; here Lipsitz argued for the importance of the need to provide "schooling for an age group experiencing the dramatic conjunction of rapid biological, social, emotional, and cognitive changes…schools are called upon to create programs for students at different levels of social and physical development in communities that accept neither their social competence nor their biological precocity" (p. 6).

In 1982, the National Middle School Association (NMSA) published arguably one of the most influential position papers on the topic of middle level reform entitled This We Believe (Anfara, 2004; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; NMSA, 1982; Williamson, 1996). "The middle school stands for clear educational concepts which evolve from a melding of the nature of the age group, the nature of learning, and the expectations of society" (NMSA, 1982, p. 10). In This We Believe, the NMSA delineated the ten essential characteristics of an effective, developmentally responsive middle school:

1. Educators knowledgeable about and committed to young adolescents,
2. A balanced curriculum based on the needs of young adolescents,
3. A range of organizational arrangements (flexible structures),
4. Varied instructional strategies,

5. A full exploratory program,
6. Comprehensive counseling and advising,
7. Continuous progress for students,
8. Evaluation procedures compatible with the nature of young adolescents,
9. Cooperative planning, and
10. Positive school climate. (1982, p. 19)

This We Believe was revised in 1995 and again in 2003. The 2003 revision included a new subtitle – Successful Schools for Young Adolescents – and introduced eight newly reframed characteristics of developmentally responsive middle schools as well as six new program components. The components in the 2003 edition were derived in an effort to provide concrete examples for putting the position paper recommendations into practice (Anfara, 2004; Williamson, 1996). The eight characteristics delineated in the 2003 edition were:

1. Educators who value working with this age group and who are prepared to do so;
2. Courageous, collaborative leadership;
3. A shared vision that guides decisions;
4. An inviting, supportive, and safe environment;
5. High expectations for every member of the learning community;
6. Student and teachers engaged in active learning;
7. An adult advocate for every student; and
8. School-initiated family and community partnerships. (NMSA, 2003)

The six program components consisted of:

1. Curriculum that is relevant, challenging, integrative, and exploratory;
2. Multiple learning and teaching approaches that respond to the students' diversity;

3. Assessment and evaluation that promote quality learning;
4. Organizational structures that support meaningful relationships and learning;
5. School-wide efforts and policies that foster health, wellness, and safety; and
6. Multifaceted guidance and support services. (NMSA, 2003)

According to Anfara (2004), This We Believe has become the "most widely used document about middle level education ever published" (p. 4).

In 1985, the Middle Level Council of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) published An Agenda for Excellence at the Middle Level (Anfara, 2004; NASSP, 1985; Williamson, 1996). According to the Council, middle schools "have special missions that require cultivation and serious attention if they are to help young adolescents reach their potential" (NASSP, 1985, p. 1). The report described twelve high priority elements of middle level schools intended to bring about educational productivity in middle schools (Anfara, 2004; Williamson, 1996). These elements are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Recommendations from the National Association of Secondary School Principals

1. Core values
2. Culture and climate
3. Student development
4. Curriculum
5. Learning and instruction
6. School organization
7. Technology
8. Teachers
9. Transition
10. Principals
11. Connections
12. Client centeredness

Note: From "An Agenda for Excellence at the Middle Level," by National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985, Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals. Copyright 1985. Reprinted with permission.

In the final report, the Council gave precise recommendations for implementation of each of the elements including such ideas as: a) the development of advisory groups that included parents in major decision making for the school, b) teachers should be afforded a great deal of autonomy over use of instructional time, c) instructional time should be sectioned into large blocks of time as to minimize interruption, and d) teaching teams and block courses should drive the production of the master schedule (Anfara, 2004; NASSP, 1985).

In 1987, amidst the rising interest and volume of research supporting middle level reform, California stood out as the first state in the union to charter a task force specifically dedicated to the pursuit of statewide middle school reform (Balfanz et al., 2002; California Department of Education, 1987). With the publication of Caught in the Middle: Educational Reform for Young Adolescents in California Public Schools, the state of California opened the door for numerous other states to follow suit, and nearly twenty other states published their own reports (Balfanz et al., 2002). Prior to publication, the Middle Grade Task Force completed a year of research and public hearings on California's successful middle grade schools. Caught in the Middle detailed twenty-two principles of middle grade education in California covering aspects of education including: a) curriculum and instruction, b) student potential, c) organization and structure, d) teaching and administration, and e) leadership and partnership. Each principle was accompanied by discussion, illustrations, charts, and diagrams, as well as detailed recommendations for implementing these principles (California Department of Education, 1987). Bill Honig, the Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1987, expressed the urgency of the need for California schools to act when he stated:

> For too long, the middle grades have been treated as a wild card for solving facilities and enrollment problems. Now it is time to face the critical educational issues at stake in

> these 'neglected grades'…middle grade students are unique. No other grade span encompasses such a wide range of intellectual, physical, psychological, and social development, and educators must be sensitive to the entire spectrum of these young people's capabilities…the most effective instruction at the middle grade level emphasizes academic integrity while making and emotional connection with students. (California Department of Education, 1987, p. v)

As the middle school movement became a national issue, the response of the Carnegie Corporation of New York was the formation of the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development in 1986 (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 2000). The council was formed in order to investigate causes and possible solutions to many problems that adolescents were experiencing across the country: alcohol and drug abuse, academic failure and dropouts, promiscuity and unwanted pregnancy, and violence (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 2000; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Williamson, 1996). "Through task forces and working groups, meetings and seminars, commissioned studies and reports, and other activities, the Council has endeavored to synthesize the best available knowledge and wisdom about adolescence in America, to consider how families and other pivotal institutions can meet young people's enduring human needs for healthy development, and to craft a set of practical strategies for setting young adolescents on the paths toward successful adulthood" (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 2000). In 1989, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development published Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century. The report outlined eight recommendations for middle school reform. Unlike many of the previous reports on the middle level school or the middle level student, Turning Points not only gave detailed recommendations for improving middle level education, but each recommendation was

accompanied by several examples of programs that could be utilized to achieve the goal of each recommendation (Anfara, 2004; Balfanz et al., 2002; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Williamson, 1996). The Council's recommendations are included in Table 2. By the time that this report was published, several schools had begun to implement the recommendations made in This We Believe and An Agenda for Excellence; the confirming data and information included in Turning Points served as fortification and support for their endeavors toward creating developmentally responsive middle level schools (Williamson, 1996). In 2000, slightly more than a decade after the publication of Turning Points, the Carnegie Corporation published an updated edition entitled Turning Points 2000: Educating Adolescents for the 21st Century. Anfara (2004) noted that "while the original Turning Points provided a framework and the philosophy for middle grades educational reform, Turning Points 2000 provided valuable guidance to practitioners interested in implementing this model" (p. 5).

Table 2

Recommendations from Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development

1. **Create small learning communities** where stable, close, mutually respectful relationships with adults are considered fundamental for intellectual development and personal growth.
2. **Teach a core academic program** that results in students who are literate, including the sciences, and who know how to think critically, lead a healthy life, behave ethically, and assume the responsibilities of citizenship in a pluralistic society.
3. **Ensure success for all students** through elimination of tracking by achievement level and promotion of cooperative learning, flexibility in arranging instructional time, and adequate resources fro teachers.
4. **Empower teachers and administrators** to make decisions about the experiences of middle grade students through creative control by teachers over the instructional program.
5. **Staff middle grade schools with teachers who are expert at teaching young adolescents** and who have been specially prepared for assignment to the middle grades.

(continued)

6. **Improve academic performance** through fostering the health and fitness of young adolescents.
7. **Reengage families in the education of young adolescents** by giving families meaningful roles in school governance, communicating with families about the school program and student progress, and offering families opportunities to support the learning process at home and at school.
8. **Connect schools with communities**, which together share responsibility for each middle grade student's success.

Note: From "Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century" (p. 9-10) by Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989, New York, NY: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. Copyright 1989 by Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. Reprinted with permission.

As the number of schools across the country converting to the middle school concept grew, so do the obstacles standing between the schools and full attainment of the successes heralded in Turning Points 2000 (Anfara, 2004; Balfanz et al., 2002). Over the past twenty years, schools have changes their names, changed their schedules and grade organizations, provided advisory programs, and instituted small learning communities, but the middle school envisioned in Turning Points has yet to materialize (Anfara, 2004; Balfanz et al., 2002; Williamson, 1996). Williamson noted in 1996, while more and more schools were implementing policies and procedures called for in Turning Points, This We Believe, and An Agenda for Excellence, "the challenge educators face is the preparation of teachers to work successfully in such 'developmentally responsive' schools" (p. 383). In a 1998 study of middle schools in Michigan that implemented the recommendations of Turning Points, Mertens, Flowers, and Mulhall observed that schools who employed the recommendations in conjunction with significant and regular teacher professional development out-performed schools that did not utilize a professional development or teacher training module (Balfanz et al., 2002; Mertens, Flowers, & Mulhall, 1998). While great strides have been made to align middle schools with the developmental needs of young adolescents, high performing middle schools are still a rarity

(Anfara, 2004; Balfanz et al., 2002; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001). Balfanz et al. (2002), go further to assert that while structuring middle level schools in alignment with the research on adolescent development is crucial for true middle-level reform and increased student achievement, specialized training and consistent professional development for both teachers and administrators is absolutely vital to achieving truly high performing middle schools. Theoretical and empirical evidence both pointed to mandatory, extensive, and specialized preparation and licensure of middle school educators – teachers and principals – as the next logical step along the road of middle school reform.

Policies for Middle School Teacher Preparation and Licensure

With the inception of the junior high school in the early parts of the twentieth century, a place designated to meet the needs of the early adolescent student was created. However, the designation of schools as "junior high school" or "middle school" and the movement of students and grades to different locations was not enough to truly meet the unique needs of the students. The key feature that has been lacking all of these years is the specifically prepared and licensed teacher. Traditionally teachers have been prepared to meet general educational requirements, sometimes regardless of the age of the intended student audience. In the more recent past, teacher licensing has been divided between elementary and secondary education with little thought given to the young adolescent student, who as the California Department of Education once classified is "Stuck in the Middle." Today, most teacher education programs across the country still operate along these same paradigms; they prepare either elementary or secondary teachers with overlapping programs designed to "cover the middle" and without any sort of specialization for those who will become teachers of young adolescent students (age 10 -15). Most teacher licenses across the country are divided as elementary (usually K-8 or K-6) and

secondary (usually 6-12 or 7-12). This is in clear contradiction to what the volumes of research spanning nearly a century have pointed to. Overlapping licensure does not allow teachers to select the grade level or student type that they would most prefer to work with during their teaching career. In fact, it relegates the middle level to a sort of waste land where many teachers "get stuck" due to lack of availability of positions at either the elementary or high school. A vast majority of the teachers who are initially placed in the middle school are teachers who had been specifically trained to teach either younger (elementary) or older (high school) students; many of these teachers had never considered teaching at the middle level and now find themselves grossly unprepared for the challenges faced by middle level teachers. Of these teachers, some eventually seek assistance and learn to love teaching at the middle level, while others simply "put in their time" until they can get promoted to a position in their preferred grade level. This situation leaves the bulk of American middle-schoolers in classes taught by teachers who were not specially prepared to teach this level and who do not want to be working with young adolescents. This issue will persist until teacher licensing and preparation requirements change to include the middle level student and young adolescents as a distinct and unique group requiring teachers with specific skills and knowledge.

As long as the states continue to ignore the clear needs of the middle level student, middle schools will continue to fail the young adolescent. The solution to this problem is the designation of required specific middle level licensure. By eliminating the overlapping of the current licensing system, the states can pave the way for the universities to create specialized teacher training programs. Currently there are few specialized middle level teacher-training programs throughout the country; teachers who desire to work with young adolescents are hard pressed to find specially designed undergraduate or graduate programs to prepare teachers for

work at the middle level. In 2002, Gaskill conducted a national survey of the teacher licensure requirements at the middle level; Gaskill (2002) found that some form of specialized middle level license or endorsement existed in forty-three states and the District of Columbia. It is important to note that this represents an increase over previous similar studies by McEwin and Allen (1995) who found twenty-six states with special requirements in 1984. While Gaskill's (2002) results sound promising, only twenty-one of the forty-three states actually require middle level teachers to earn this specific licensure in order to teach at the middle level. The mismatch is further perpetuated by the lack of specifically designed teacher training programs, even in states that require the middle level license (Gaskill, 2002). Jackson and Davis (2000) stated in Turning Points 2000, "Prospective teachers should have the opportunity to decide upon a career that focuses on a single developmental age group and should receive rigorous preparation in the subjects they will teach. This specialized professional preparation for the middle grades should be rewarded by a distinctive license that accurately informs all concerned that the teacher holding it has demonstrated his or her abilities to teach young adolescents effectively" (p. 103). Additionally, the requirements for obtaining the middle level license or endorsement vary greatly from state to state; some states require a specialized training program, some require additional university courses to be added on to an elementary or secondary credential, while some states merely require a teacher to have worked at the middle level for one year to obtain a middle level license or endorsement (Jackson & Davis, 2000).

Another key barrier to implementing required specific middle level licensure and training programs was the overlapping nature of current licensing in most states. Teacher licensing patterns in most states include overlaps in grade levels that diminish to significance of a specific middle level license: California teachers can earn licensing for grades preK-12 that are

designated for departmentalized (single subject) or self-contained (multiple subject) classrooms; Mississippi teachers can earn licenses for grades K-8 or 7-12; Vermont teachers can earn licenses for grades K-6, 5-8, or 7-12; while the license options for teachers in Indiana include K-3, 1-6, 5-9, 5-12, and 9-12 (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2009; Gaskill, 2002; Jackson & Davis, 2000; McEwin & Dickinson, 1996). Jackson and Davis (2000) report that "in some states, efforts to design and implement mandatory, non-overlapping middle grades licensure have been blocked by representatives of districts that have difficulty employing enough licensed teachers" (p. 103).

Middle School Teacher Preparation Program Design and Implementation

The efforts to establish the middle school as an educational haven for the young adolescent have been stymied by the lack of teacher preparation programs specifically designed to prepare teachers of young adolescents. Alexander and McEwin (1998) point out that the largest impediment to the growth of developmentally appropriate middle schools is the absence of a middle level teacher license. A core tenet of the middle school theory is that the teachers are specially prepared to address the complex social, emotional, and academic needs of the early adolescent student (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; McKay, 1995; NMSA, 2003). McEwin, Dickinson, and Smith (2004) suggest "one key element for developing and sustaining high performing middle schools, schools that are exemplary in their intellectual and individual development of young adolescents – a high quality teaching staff characterized by appropriate licensure and professional preparation to teach, direct, and support young adolescents" (p. 112). According to Toepfer (1992), research has clearly demonstrated that the adolescent brain is undergoing a significant phase of growth thereby making the early adolescent student's learning capacity far different than their younger elementary or older secondary-aged

peers. However, Dickinson and Butler (2001) add, "the sad fact remains that the majority of teachers throughout the history of the middle school movement's last forty years have not been educated to teach at this level" (p. 9).

In the early parts of the twentieth century, developmentalists, such as G. Stanley Hall (1908), pushed for recognition of the young adolescent students as neither children nor adolescents, but rather as another developmental stage worthy of a specialized education program that could serve their unique needs. The developmentalists further pressed that separating the young adolescent student would "prevent their being negatively influenced by older adolescents and, in turn, negatively influencing younger children" (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001, p. 1157). Lounsbury (1992) states that the idea of that junior high school as a means to "bridge the gap" between elementary school and high school became widely accepted in the early part of the twentieth century. The idea became so well received that that first junior high schools opened in Columbus, Ohio and Berkeley, California in 1909 (Lounsbury, 1992).

Barriers and roadblocks. With the opening in the junior high school came a need for junior high school teachers. As early as 1920, Douglas called for teachers who specialized in teaching the early adolescent; "a type of teacher is needed that has some knowledge of child and adolescent psychology, and that appreciates the true pedagogical value of subject matter – in other words, a teacher that has the 'junior high school' idea" (p. 96). To a large degree, the junior high school movement was unsuccessful in meeting the needs of early adolescents because it lacked the key factor of specifically trained teachers for the junior high school level (Dickinson & Butler, 2001; McEwin, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1987).

The middle school movement has stalled as it encounters the same roadblock: the need for specifically designed teacher preparation. The Carnegie Council (1989) asserts that in order

for middle schools to properly serve their target student audience, teachers for middles grades should be chosen and specifically trained to teach the young adolescent student. Dickinson and Butler (1994) add that the while middle school is accepted as a fundamental part of the educational spectrum, the movement "remains in desperate need of appropriately trained staff to advocate and secure its mission" (p. 184-185). Researchers and educators in the field have consistently called for specially prepared and licensed middle grades teachers. Despite this call to arms, the majority of today's middle level teachers lack specific training, preparation, or licensure as a requirement of employment at the middle level (Anfara, 2004; Balfanz et al., 2002; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, & Scales, 1995; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996; Scales & McEwin, 1994). The primary reason for this phenomenon resides with the difficulties associated with creation and implementation of programs for a specifically designated middle level teaching license (Anfara, 2004; Balfanz et al., 2002; Knowles & Brown, 2000; McEwin, 1992; McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, & Scales, 1995, 1999; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996). This impediment to progress – the lack of specifically designed preparation and licensure programs for the middle level teacher – has been the single most difficult barrier to the success of the middle school movement since the inception of the middle school concept (Anfara, 2004; Balfanz et al., 2002; Lipsitz, Mizell, Jackson, & Austin, 1997; McEwin, 1992; McEwin & Dickinson, 1997; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996; Wiles & Bondi, 1987). While advances have been made in the availability of middle grades teacher preparation programs, the vast majority of programs across the country do not adequately address the training needs of future middle school teachers. McEwin reported in 1991 that 38% of educational institutions provided either an undergraduate or graduate program in middle level education. Yet according to Scales, in 1994, only one-fifth of the nation's middle school teachers

had been specially prepared for teaching in the middle grades. While the number of programs continues to grow, the vast majority of these programs present little specialized training or experiences as called for in the large body of adolescent and middle level education research (Anfara, 2004; Jackson & Davis, 2000; McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, & Scales, 1997; McEwin, Dickinson, & Smith, 2004; Scales, 1992; Scales & McEwin, 1994).

Specialized preparation for prospective middle grades teachers. Several organizations and individuals have researched and published papers focusing on the key components of middle level teacher preparation programs. These include the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the National Middle School Association (NMSA), National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the Carnegie Corporation's Council on Adolescent Development, the University of North Carolina's Center for Early Adolescence, and countless individual researchers (NMSA, 2003). The National Middle School Association (NMSA) reports in Research and Resources in Support of This We Believe (2003) that "between 1991 and 2002, 3,717 studies related to middle schools were published" (p. 2). Each group has spent significant time and effort looking at the issue of creating high performing middle schools from all angles, and while the individual reports from each institution differ in small ways they all share one component: specialized preparation for teachers.

In *Organizing Principles for Middle Grades Teacher Preparation*, McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, and Scales (1997) describe the components of a high quality comprehensive middle level teacher education program as a three-pronged. The first prong can be considered the basic teaching knowledge base. The second prong is that of subject matter proficiency or teaching field knowledge or "depth beyond the basics in some area(s) of academic inquiry" (p. 10). The third

prong is the middle level specialization component comprised of special functions and activities designed to train the teacher to work specifically with young adolescents.

Teaching knowledge base. The first component of a middle level teaching program called for in Organizing Principles (1997) seeks to prepare the future teacher for a successful career in the teaching field. It is based upon the collaboration between the liberal arts department and the education department of a university to provide co-curricular opportunities for students to learn about the teaching field while simultaneously increasing their liberal arts knowledge (McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, & Scales, 1997). It calls for "an intellectually challenging, liberal post-secondary education and a study of eleven areas [foundations] that form the basis for sound educational practice" (p. 11). Table 3 is an excerpt of these foundations.

Table 3

Eleven Foundations for Middle Level Teacher Preparation Programs

1. **Liberal Arts Education:** A liberal arts education has as its major goal the grounding of a person in his or her historical and cultural time and place. The outcome of applying one's critical faculties to the liberal disciplines leads one to place oneself historically, culturally, scientifically, ethically, and aesthetically in the intellectual heritage of humankind.
2. **Child Development:** A middle school teacher needs to be able to place young adolescent development into a broader lifespan context. Teachers of young adolescents must especially understand both the period of late childhood that their students a re moving out of and the subsequent periods of human development to better understand the consequences of various patterns of young adolescent development on later health and well being.
3. **Consultation Skills:** Especially in people-oriented environments such as schools, teachers must be able to communicate in a larger variety of situations than ever before. They must be able to communicate with a wide variety of parents and with an expanding variety of support staff and administrators as equal partners in the decision-making processes. Teachers must be able to function as advisors to their students on a number of matters related to successfully negotiating the school environment.

(continued)

4. **Diversity:** Teachers in the schools of the 1990s and beyond must understand and respond to students who differ from each other on a wide range of dimensions. The differential treatment of the genders remains a major concern for educators as well as dozens of variables upon which students differ that influence their achievement, including academic self-concept, field dependence, learning style, attribution of success, type of intelligence, and general and domain specific ability. Against this backdrop of other forms of diversity, teachers must deal with developmental diversity which itself is multidimensional: physical, social, emotional, intellectual and moral. Understanding this array of diversity is the first step to being responsive to it.
5. **Technology:** Teachers must be able to apply computer and multimedia technology to instruction. Today's teacher must be prepared to access remote data bases, interact via networks, communicate though e-mail, create interactive video programs, perform desktop publishing, and use a whole host of new applications that did not even exist ten, five, or three years ago.
6. **Management:** All teachers must understand how to manage human behavior. Management also involves understanding how to plan successful learning experiences. Teachers must know the options for setting incentives that will cause students to learn without having to resort to coercion.
7. **Instruction:** Teachers must be able to relate learning experiences to students' prior knowledge. This means that teachers must find ways to engage students with subject matter to be learned; a different issue than determining what teaching performance the teacher will carry out.
8. **Methods:** Methods are conceived as the technical understanding and knowledge that teachers need in order to successfully organize and present learning experiences for students. It involves knowing about community resources, both human and material, that can be used to promote learning. Methods involve learning strategies for incorporating alternatives into the planning of instruction for a diverse set of learners.
9. **Changing Society:** Regardless of subject area or level, teachers must be aware of how our society is changing in ways that affect the learning of young people. To teach today, teachers must keep abreast of societal change and adapt their own behavior to avoid obsolescence.
10. **Families and Community:** Teaches at all levels today must be able to collaborate with parents/guardians/caregivers and representatives of other social agencies to provide the conditions that promote student learning. The role of the teacher extends beyond that of the traditional subject expert performing for a captive audience in an isolated classroom.

(continued)

11. **Organizational Renewal/Reform:** Teachers must understand that organizations that are successful in the Information Age are organized differently than those that were successful in the Industrial Age. Failure to recognize the paradigm shift in the structure of successful organizations is a formula for failure. Therefore teachers must have knowledge of the change process in an organization.

Note: From "Organizing Principles for Middle Grades Teacher Preparation" (p. 10-13) by McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, and Scales, 1995, Pleasantville, NY: National Middle School Association. Copyright 1995 by National Middle School Association. Reprinted with permission.

Teaching fields/subject matter proficiency. According to McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, and Scales (1995), a successful middle grades teacher needs to be more than the "traditional single-subject-matter specialist" (p. 13). They recommend that middle grades teachers be knowledgeable in two different subject matter fields such as science and mathematics, or history and language arts. This, combined with their broad liberal arts knowledge base, will provide the prospective middle grades teacher with the ability to make interconnections and plan instruction in a manner that young adolescents will be able to understand (McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, & Scales, 1995).

Chapter Summary

For nearly 100 years, the American educational system has been struggling to find an appropriate solution to providing meaningful and successful schooling for the young adolescent student (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001). Advances in the understanding of young adolescent development, particularly as it relates to education, have stemmed significant interest and research into creating developmentally appropriate middle-level schools (Williamson, 1996). A key factor in providing developmentally appropriate schooling for the young adolescent is to staff the middle school with specially prepared teachers who have specific knowledge of adolescent development and the disposition to work with this age group (National Board for

Professional Teaching Standards, 2002; National Middle School Association 1982, 2003, 2008). While great strides have been made in understanding the young adolescent and describing their needs in detail, a significant amount of progress toward reaching those goals has not yet been made in California (Fenwick, 1986; Gaskill, 2002).

Chapter 3: Methodology

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative mixed methods study was to compare current California policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation programs with the most recent research on young adolescent development. A second purpose of this study was to investigate the design and implementation of middle school specific teacher preparation programs in California in relation to the most recent research on young adolescent development. It was anticipated that the outcomes of both methods would serve to inform policy recommendation and middle school teacher preparation program design and implementation.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. What does the current research recommend regarding the content and importance of middle school-specific teacher preparation programs?
2. What are the current California Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation and how, if at all, do these policies incorporate the most recent research?
3. How is the middle-school specific teacher preparation program at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) designed and implemented to incorporate the most recent research?
4. What evidence, if any, exists to demonstrate that the CSUSM middle-school specific teacher preparation program more successfully prepares graduates/potential teachers for middle school assignments than those prepared in more traditional programs?

Methodology

This study was qualitative in nature and used a mixture of comparative content analysis and modified case study methodologies. The first part of the study consisted of comparative content analyses of the educational needs of the young adolescent, the current California teacher licensing policies, and the current middle level teacher preparation programs in the California State University system. The second part of the study consisted of a modified case study of the sole middle-school-specific teacher preparation program at California State University, San Marcos and included document and record observations and review, as well as a semi-structured interview of the co-directors of the program. The interview questions were be open-ended and focused on the curricular design of the teacher preparation program.

The qualitative mixed methodology was chosen for this study because of the complex nature of the research questions. This study sought not only to compare the components of current teacher preparation and licensure programs with each other, but also to compare the current program content with the recent research on adolescent developmental needs with specific focus on their educational needs. This comparison was best addressed through comparative content analysis of the documents detailing the teacher preparation program requirements (Berelson, 1952; Holsti, 1969). The third layer of the study sought to understand how specifically-designed middle level teacher preparation programs are different from general secondary teacher preparation programs. This feature was best addressed through the case study including document analysis and semi-structured interviews of the personnel leading these programs (Creswell, 1998; Leedy & Ormond, 2005).

Content analysis was defined as a systematic, replicable technique for compressing many words of test into fewer content categories based on explicit rules of coding (Berelson, 1952;

Krippendorff, 1980, 2004). Content analysis was also a means for identifying patterns and trends found in documents. Weber (1990) defined content analysis as a research method that uses asset of procedures to make valid inferences from text. Content analysis methodology was chosen to identify common themes of curricular content in middle level teacher preparation programs and to compare the comprehensiveness of each program with regard to the specific needs of middle level preparation programs.

A case study is a comprehensive inspection of a particular individual or program, an event, or collection of documents (Bogdan & Bilken, 2003; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). Case studies generally include a combination of participant observations, interviews, and document analysis and are completed over an extended period of time (Bogdan & Bilken, 2003; Creswell, 1998; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). However, for the purposes of this study, the typical case study model was modified slightly. This study sought to more fully understand how specifically-designed middle level teacher preparation programs are different from general secondary teacher preparation programs. This modified case study included document review of middle level credential coursework and semi-structured interviews with the co-directors of the middle level teacher credential program at California State University, San Marcos. The data gathered from the interviews as well as the document analysis provided a comprehensive view of the programmatic differences found at CSU San Marcos.

Setting

The initial portions of the study were completed using content analysis methodologies via document analysis. The documents to be reviewed were all public domain documents found on the websites of the organizations relevant to the study: the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the twenty-three California State University (CSU) campuses. The

documents that were analyzed include the CTC's SB 2042 Multiple Subject and Single Subject Preliminary Credential Program Standards and the teacher preparation program outlines and course descriptions from the twenty-three CSU campuses.

The campus of California State University, San Marcos was the setting for the third portion of this study. CSU San Marcos was the only CSU campus in California that provides a specifically- designed middle level teacher preparation and credentialing program. While a specific middle level credential does not currently exist in California, the CSU San Marcos program "is designed to prepare teachers to work with young adolescents in grades 5-9….The Middle Level Program provides focused preparation in teaching, Learning and schooling for youngsters in the middle grades" (CSUSM, 2013). The middle level program was not taught solely on the CSU San Marcos campus, but rather was jointly administered on a number of partner middle school campuses. The program was coordinated by two individuals; one was a CSUSM faculty member from the School of Education and the other was a Professor Emeritus and was one of the founding leaders of the Middle Level Education Program. Interviews with the co-coordinators took place in their office location.

Subjects

The current coordinators of the California State University, San Marcos middle school-specific teacher preparation program were the subjects interviewed in this study. Two individuals coordinate the program; one was a CSUSM faculty member from the School of Education and the other was a Professor Emeritus and was one of the founding leaders of the Middle Level Education Program. Interviews with the co-coordinators took place in their office location. The coordinators were asked eight open-ended questions about the specifically designed middle level teacher preparation programs regarding the content design and program correlation with current

adolescent research. Program coordinators were selected because of their expertise and thorough understanding of the programs they manage.

Human Subjects Considerations

This study followed Pepperdine University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) protocols. It complied with the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, DHHS (C.F.R.), and Title 45 Part 46 (C.R.F.R 46), titled Protection of Human Subjects, and Parts 160 and 164 (Pepperdine University, 2013). Prior to contacting the coordinators of the program at CSU San Marcos, appropriate permissions to conduct this study were solicited from the University's Dean (or designee) of the College of Education, Health and Human Services (Appendix A). Once permissions from the University were granted, middle level credential program coordinators at CSU San Marcos were contacted via telephone and / or email to discuss their participation in the study. All interview participants signed consent forms prior to their participation (Appendix B). The researcher prior to the commencement of the study collected these forms. Once consent was acquired, an abstract of the proposed study, as well as copies of the interview questions, was provided to participants via email and/or postal mail within 5 days of the scheduled interview (Appendix C). Given that the participants were interviewed regarding the content of the programs that they manage, there was very little potential risk to the participants. Additionally, the proposed interview participants were not members of any type of protected group. Data collected through interviews focused on the content of the curriculum rather than the opinions of the director or the personnel employed in the program; therefore the study neither presented more than minimal risk to the participants nor would disclosure of the interview data outside of the study place the participants at risk for any criminal activity or civil liability. At no time was the financial standing, employability, or reputation of the participants at risk. It was possible that

the imposition of time requried to complete the interviews and review of the transcripts, posed a risk for the two participants. Should the participants determine that the proposed timeline for the interviews or transcript review was unacceptable, the researcher would have coordinated with the participants to determine a more acceptable timeline for completion of said portions of the study. Additional minimal risks could have included inconveneince, fatigue, boredom, and possibly feelings of being uncomfortable with a particular question. If a participant was uncomfortable with any question, they had the option to not answer. The researcher attempted to minimize risks of inconvenince by scheduling interviews at times and locations that are mutually agreed upon as convenient and conducive to the proposed interview. The researcher attempted to minimze risks of fatigue by adhering to the proposed timeframe for the interview and frequent checking with participants throught the interview to assure that they are comfortable. Should the participant have become fatigued and/or bored during the course of the interview, the researcher provided the participant with a break sufficient enough in length to provide the participant recover before continuing. Should the participant have been unble to continue due either to fatigue or time constrasints, the researcher would have scheduled additional meetings with the participant in order to complete the interview. At no time during the interview process was deception used. Interviews were be digitally recorded and transcribed to Microsoft Word for accuracy of data reporting. The remainder of the data collected throughout the study was collected from existing sources – program documents and websites – however this data collection and analysis did not have any human subject interaction. All data collected, including program documents, coding sheets, and interview recordings and transcriptions, was kept in a password protected electronic file on an external hard drive kept at the residence of the researcher. Hard copy backups of electronic documents were kept in a locked file at the

residence of the researcher. The researcher had sole access to both the electronic files as well as the paper files. All documentation was removed for use as needed by the researcher and was returned to the secure location at the conclusion of the analysis. Study data will be kept for a minimum of three years following conclusion of the study and then it will be disposed of properly.

Instrumentation

In order to address the first research question the researcher reviewed five relevant documents related to middle level reform for common themes, ideas, and recommendations. The five documents reviewed were:

1. Association for Middle Level Education: This We Believe
2. Association for Middle Level Education: Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards
3. California Department of Education, Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force: Caught in the Middle
4. Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development: Turning Points / 2000
5. National Association of Secondary School Principals: Recommendations for Middle Level Reform

Each document was reviewed for specific reference to middle level teacher preparation programs. The concepts were coded into four categories: young adolescent development knowledge, middle level curricular knowledge, middle level philosophy, and other. Data collected will be collated to determine common themes and ideas. The data collection instrument for research question one was included as Appendix D.

A review of the relevant and recent literature on the topic of middle level reform revealed four major groups contributing to the research on adolescent development and the corresponding middle level reform in California. The Association for Middle Level Education [formerly National Middle School Association] (NMSA/AMLE), the Carnegie Council for Adolescent Development (CCAD), the California Department of Education's Superintendent's Middle Grades Task Force (CDE), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) have all contributed greatly to the body of knowledge regarding middle level educational reform, including specific mention of teacher preparation programs. For this reason, the recommendations set forth in the principal reform guides produced by these groups were used to develop the instrument for addressing the second research question regarding California teacher licensure requirements and teacher preparation programs.

With regards to research question two of this study, the common recommendations for specifically designed middle level teacher preparation programs from these four documents – NMSA/AMLE's "This We Believe", the CCAD's "Turning Points", and CDE's "Caught in the Middle", and NASSP's "Recommendations for Middle Level Reform" – California's Senate Bill 2042 (SB2042): Multiple Subject and Single Subject Preliminary Credential Program Standards will be reviewed for the recommended components. The SB2042 guides California colleges and universities seeking to provide teacher preparation programs. The researcher examined SB2042 to compare with each of the four recommendation documents for specifically designed middle level program components. A rubric was used to determine the level at which the specific middle school preparation needs were addressed by SB 2042. The rubric ranking was in the following gradations: meets the recommendation, somewhat meets the recommendation, does not address the recommendation (Appendix E). From the completed analysis of SB2042, the researcher

summarized and described how the current California policy on teacher preparation and licensure compared. This demonstrated the degree to which California preparations correlated with the recent research on adolescent developmental needs.

The third and fourth research questions in this study were addressed through a combination of document observation and a semi-structured interview of the directors of the specifically designed middle level teacher preparation program offered at California State University, San Marcos. The document observation consisted of a review of the course descriptions for the middle level teacher preparation program. The interview consisted of eight questions:

1. On what principles or research was the CSUSM Middle Level Program designed?
2. What research guides the course selection and content?
3. How often is the program evaluated and how does the program adapt as research changes?
4. Why is the program a derivation of the multiple subject credentials rather than the single subject credentials?
5. What is the transferability of this middle-level training to high school application?
6. What educational effectiveness indicators has CSUSM identified for the middle school teacher preparation program?
7. Does CSUSM complete an exit interview or post-program survey? If so, what evidence exists that describes the progress and / or accomplishments of the program participants?

8. Does CSUSM have some sort of comparative data demonstrating the relative success of the program graduates?

The interview questions were derived from a thorough review of the literature of recent research on specially designed middle level teacher preparation programs. The key elements discussed in the literature became the major themes in Chapter 2. These themes were demonstrated in Table 4 showing the relationship between the major themes from the literature, the research questions, the instrumentation, and the interview questions. Table 5 shows the relationship between the research questions, the instrument questions, and the literature.

Table 4

Relationship between the Literature Themes and Research Questions

Literature Theme	Research Question	Cited Research
Developmentally appropriate middle schools	What does the current research recommend regarding the content and importance of middle school-specific teacher preparation programs?	Anfara, 2004; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Eichorn, 1996; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Lipsitz, 1984; Lounsbury, 1991, 1992, 2000; Balfanz, et.al, 2002; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996; ; NASSP, 1985; NMSA, 1995, 2003, 2008; Scales, 1992 Wiles & Bondi, 1986; Williamson, 1996
Specific middle level teacher preparation and certification	What are the current California Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation and how, if at all, do these policies incorporate the most recent research?	Anfara, 2004; ASCD, 1975; Carnegie Council, 1989, 2000; Gaskill, 2002; McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, & Scales, 1997; NASSP, 1985; NMSA, 1995, 2003, 2008; Scales, 1992
Middle level teacher preparation, induction, and support	How is the middle-school specific teacher preparation program at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) designed and	Anfara, 2004; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Carnegie Council, 1989, 2000; CDE, 1987;

(continued)

	implemented to incorporate the most recent research?	Dickinson & Butler, 2001; Eichorn, 1996; Jackson & Davis, 2000 Knowles & Brown, 2000;
	What evidence, if any, exists to demonstrate that the CSUSM middle-school specific teacher preparation program more successfully prepares graduates/potential teachers for middle school assignments than those prepared in more traditional programs?	Lipsitz, 1984; Lounsbury, 1991, 1992, 2000; Balfanz, et.al, 2002; McEwin, 1983, 1992

Table 5

Relationship between the Instrument Questions and Literature

Instrument Questions	Research Question	Cited Research
On what principles or research was the CSUSM Middle Level Program designed?	What does the current research recommend regarding the content and importance of middle school-specific teacher preparation programs?	Anfara, 2004; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Eichorn, 1996; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Lipsitz, 1984; Lounsbury, 1991, 1992, 2000; Balfanz, et.al, 2002; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996; Wiles & Bondi, 1986; Williamson, 1996
What research guides the course selection and content?		
Why is the program a derivation of the multiple subject credentials rather than the single subject credentials?	What are the current California Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation and how, if at all, do these policies incorporate the most recent research?	Anfara, 2004; ASCD, 1975; Carnegie Council, 1989, 2000; Gaskill, 2002; McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, & Scales, 1997; NASSP, 1985; NMSA, 1995, 2003, 2008; Scales, 1992
How often is the program evaluated and how does the program adapt as research changes?	How is the middle-school specific teacher preparation program at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) designed and	Anfara, 2004; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Carnegie Council, 1989, 2000; CDE, 1987;

(continued)

	implemented to incorporate the most recent research?	Dickinson & Butler, 2001; Eichorn, 1996; Jackson & Davis, 2000 Knowles & Brown, 2000; Lipsitz, 1984; Lounsbury, 1991, 1992, 2000; Balfanz, et.al, 2002; McEwin, 1983, 1992
What is the transferability of this middle-level training to high school application? What educational effectiveness indicators has CSUSM identified for the middle school teacher preparation program?	What evidence, if any, exists to demonstrate that the CSUSM middle-school specific teacher preparation program more successfully prepares graduates/potential teachers for middle school assignments than those prepared in more traditional programs?	Anfara, 2004; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Carnegie Council, 1989, 2000; CDE, 1987; Dickinson & Butler, 2001; Eichorn, 1996; Jackson & Davis, 2000; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Lipsitz, 1984; Lounsbury, 1991, 1992, 2000; Balfanz, et.al, 2002; McEwin, 1983, 1992
Does CSUSM complete an exit interview or post-program survey? If so, what evidence exists that describes the progress and / or accomplishments of the program participants? Does CSUSM have some sort of comparative data demonstrating the relative success of the program graduates?	What evidence, if any, exists to demonstrate that the CSUSM middle-school specific teacher preparation program more successfully prepares graduates/potential teachers for middle school assignments than those prepared in more traditional programs?	Anfara, 2004; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Carnegie Council, 1989, 2000; CDE, 1987; Dickinson & Butler, 2001; Eichorn, 1996; Jackson & Davis, 2000; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Lipsitz, 1984; Lounsbury 1992; Balfanz, et.al, 2002; McEwin, 1983, 1992

Instrumentation Validity

Prior to the commencement of the research, professional experts in middle level education validated the instruments. The following panel of experts reviewed the draft instruments and interview protocol:

- Mr. John Jackson, Principal, Manhattan Beach Unified School District, Manhattan Beach, California

- Dr. Doug Neufeld, Social Studies Instructor, Lawndale Elementary School District

Each participant was contacted via email to request their participation on the validation of the study instruments. Panelists who agreed were sent the instruments via email and were be asked to review them. Their recommendations for revisions, eliminations, and changes to study instruments and interview protocols were requested. Based upon their expert advice, adjustments were made to the instruments of the study.

Data Collection and Management

Content analysis comparison. The initial portion of this study reviewed the current research on adolescent development and middle school programs to determine the key points of the research. Through a review of the literature, the researcher discovered patterns of characteristics specifically found in developmentally responsive middle schools. One key feature in all of the research was the need for specially designed middle level teacher preparation programs. From this vantage point, the researcher proceeded to analyze the status of teacher preparation. Prior to beginning content analysis of teacher preparation programs, the researcher reviewed the recent research on middle level teacher preparation to determine the leaders in contribution to the literature. From these key pieces of research, the researcher determined the specific qualities or characteristics that were representative of quality specifically designed middle level teacher preparation programs. These qualities were: young adolescent development knowledge, middle level curricular knowledge, middle level philosophy, and other middle level issues.

Interview responses. Prior to the interview, the researcher supplied the participants with the interview questions. The researcher proposed to conduct interviews at the participants'

CSUSM offices at a mutually agreed upon date and time. Prior to the interview, the participants completed and signed an informed consent form (Appendix B); a copy of the completed and signed form was provided to the participants at the time of the interview.

The interviews were semi-structured and consisted of eight questions derived from a thorough review of the literature of recent research on specially designed middle level teacher preparation programs. The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed. Once transcribed, the researcher submitted the transcription to the participants for review to assure accuracy of responses. Participant identities were represented using codes in the transcripts for securty; the codes Participant 1 and Participant 2 will be used to represent Program Director 1 and Program Director 2 respectively. After the participants deemed the responses accurate, the researcher began to analyze their contents. Additionally, the researcher collected reflective field notes during the interview. The use of field notes allowed the researcher to annotate key ideas or thoughts during the interview and assisted the researcher in reflecting on interview methods, the researcher's frame of mind, or for obtaining points of clarification (Bogden & Bilken, 2003). From the interview transcripts and the field notes, the researcher identified patterns and discussed the significance of these patterns to the overarching idea of middle school reform and middle level teacher preparation. The researcher had sole access to both the electronic files as well as the paper files. All documentation was removed for use as needed by the researcher and was returned to the secure location at the conclusion of the analysis. Study data will be destroyed properly three years following conclusion of the study.

Data Analysis

Content analysis comparison. Through the data collection of parts one and two of the study, the researcher reviewed each document and coded each section. Utilizing these

characteristics as a guide for program content analysis, the researcher selected the California State University system schools because they were the primary public institution responsible for preparing public school teachers in California. Additionally, it was important that the researcher also analyzed the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing requirements for teacher preparation programs to determine the relative correlation between the program requirements and the key characteristics from the recent research. The researcher compared the correlation of programs and research using Appendix F for each of the four characteristics. The researcher reviewed each of the twenty-four programs (CTC and twenty-three CSU programs) and recorded specific examples from each program that demonstrated how the program addressed the four key standards previously identified in the relevant research. The results from the comparison were then summarized to describe patterns reflected in the data. From the completed analysis of SB2042, the researcher summarized and described how the current California policy on teacher preparation and licensure compared. This demonstrated the degree to which California preparations correlated with the recent research on adolescent developmental needs.

Interview responses. All interviews were transcribed from their recordings using Microsoft Word and reviewed by the participants for accuracy. Additionally, the researcher collected reflective field notes during the interview. From the interview transcripts and the field notes, the researcher identified patterns and discussed the significance of these patterns to the overarching idea of middle school reform and middle level teacher preparation.

Document review. The researcher reviewed CSU San Marcos Middle Level Credential program documents including program description brochures, program websites, and program course descriptions. The researcher identified core elements of recommendations from current research on developmentally responsive middle level teacher preparation programs. Through the

combination of interview and document review, the researcher distinguished points of convergence within the data collected. From this triangulation of data, the researcher described trends and themes revealed in the data. The researcher then tied these themes to the larger concept of middle school reform.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter presents the results of the study. It begins with a review of the purpose and research questions, followed by a summary of the design. Then the results are presented in regard to the four research questions, including the key findings. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative mixed methods study was to compare current California policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation programs with the most recent research on young adolescent development. A second purpose of this study was to investigate the design and implementation of middle school specific teacher preparation programs in California in relation to the most recent research on young adolescent development. It was anticipated that the outcomes of both methods will serve to inform policy recommendation and middle school teacher preparation program design and implementation.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. What does the current research recommend regarding the content and importance of middle school-specific teacher preparation programs?
2. What are the current California Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation and how, if at all, do these policies incorporate the most recent research?
3. How is the middle-school specific teacher preparation program at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) designed and implemented to incorporate the most recent research?

4. What evidence, if any, exists to demonstrate that the CSUSM middle-school specific teacher preparation program more successfully prepares graduates/potential teachers for middle school assignments than those prepared in more traditional programs?

Research Design Summary

This study was qualitative in nature and used a mixture of comparative content analysis and modified case study methodologies. The first part of the study consisted of comparative content analyses of the educational needs of the young adolescent, the current California teacher licensing policies, and the current middle level teacher preparation programs in the California State University system. The second part of the study consisted of a modified case study of the sole middle-school-specific teacher preparation program at California State University, San Marcos and included document and record observations and review, as well as a semi-structured interview of the director of each program. The interview questions were open-ended and focused on the curricular design of the teacher preparation program.

The qualitative mixed methodology was chosen for this study because of the complex nature of the research questions. This study sought not only to compare the components of current teacher preparation and licensure programs with each other, but also to compare the current program content with the recent research on adolescent developmental needs with specific focus on their educational needs. This comparison was best addressed through comparative content analysis of the documents detailing the teacher preparation program requirements (Berelson, 1952; Holsti, 1969). The third layer of the study sought to understand how specifically-designed middle level teacher preparation programs are different from general secondary teacher preparation programs. This feature was best addressed through the case study

including document analysis and semi-structured interviews of the personnel leading these programs (Creswell, 1998; Leedy & Ormond, 2005).

Content analysis methodology was chosen to identify common themes of curricular content in middle level teacher preparation programs and to compare the comprehensiveness of each program with regard to the specific needs of middle level preparation programs. This study sought to more fully understand how specifically-designed middle level teacher preparation programs are different from general secondary teacher preparation programs. This modified case study included document review of middle level credential coursework and semi-structured interviews with the co-directors of the middle level teacher credential program at California State University, San Marcos. The data gathered from the interviews as well as the document analysis provided a comprehensive view of the programmatic differences found at California State University, San Marcos.

Presentation of Data and Reporting of Findings

Results and data related to research question 1. Research question 1 sought to understand the connection between recent and relevant research on young adolescent developmental needs and middle level teacher preparation programs. The researcher reviewed five relevant documents related to middle level reform for common themes, ideas, and recommendations. The five documents reviewed were:

1. Association for Middle Level Education: This We Believe
2. Association for Middle Level Education: Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards
3. California Department of Education, Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force: Caught in the Middle

4. Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development: Turning Points / 2000
5. National Association of Secondary School Principals: Recommendations for Middle Level Reform

Each document was reviewed for specific reference to middle level teacher preparation programs. The concepts were coded into four categories: young adolescent development knowledge, middle level curricular knowledge, middle level philosophy, and other. The data collected for research question one is included as Appendix D. From this data, the materials were further collated to reveal common themes and ideas to address the similarities within the four categories. The relevant points are discussed below and results are enumerated in Tables 6 – 9.

In reviewing the first content category of young adolescent development knowledge, five key themes emerged (Table 6). These are a) a sense of caring provided by teachers, b) meeting developmental needs of young adolescents, c) having a comprehensive knowledge of adolescent development, d) developing a professional skill set for middle level students, and e) knowledge and appreciation of the diversity of middle level learners. The results are tabulated in Table 6. All five documents supported the idea that teacher preparation programs for the middle level should focus on preparing teacher who are adept at meeting the developmental needs of young adolescents and who have a comprehensive knowledge of adolescent development. This clearly demonstrates the importance of developmentally responsive training for middle level educators. Both the concepts of a specific set of professional skills for the middle level and a knowledge and appreciation of the diversity of middle level learners were supported by the Association for Middle Level Education's (AMLE) This We Believe, the Association for Middle Level Education's (AMLE) Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards, and the Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development's Turning Points / Turning Points 2000. Only the

AMLE's This We Believe and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Recommendations for Middle Level Reform called specifically for middle level teacher training programs to include emphasis on a sense of caring exhibited toward middle level learners.

Table 6

Young Adolescent Developmental Knowledge Themes

Document reviewed	Sense of Caring Provided by Teachers	Meet Developmental Needs of Young Adolescents	Comprehensive Knowledge of Adolescent Development	Professional Skill Set	Knowledge and Appreciation of Diversity
Association for Middle Level Education: This We Believe	X	X	X	X	X
Association for Middle Level Education: Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards		X	X	X	X
California Department of Education, Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force: Caught in the Middle		X	X		
Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development: Turning Points / Turning Points 2000		X	X	X	X
National Association of Secondary School Principals: Recommendations for Middle Level Reform	X	X	X		

A review of the second content category of middle level curricular knowledge yielded more unified support from the relevant literature (Table 7). The five themes that emerged included a) a developmentally responsive curriculum, b) inclusion of active engagement strategies, c) a wide variety of research based teaching strategies, d) an emphasis on literacy across the curriculum, and e) a focus on interdisciplinary studies / an exploratory curriculum.

The results are displayed in Table 7. All five documents supported the idea that teacher preparation programs for the middle level should include specific learning of developmentally responsive curriculum, a wide variety of research based teaching strategies, and a focus on interdisciplinary studies / exploratory curriculum. Preparing teachers to provide active engagement strategies was supported only by the Association for Middle Level Education's This We Believe, the Association for Middle Level Education's Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards. The Association for Middle Level Education's (AMLE) Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Recommendations for Middle Level Reform called specifically for preparing middle level educators to provide literacy across the curriculum.

Table 7

Middle Level Curricular Knowledge Themes

Document reviewed	Developmentally Responsive Curriculum	Active Engagement of Students	Wide Variety of Research Based Teaching Strategies	Literacy Skills Across the Curriculum	Interdisciplinary Studies/ Exploratory Curriculum
Association for Middle Level Education: This We Believe	X	X	X		X
Association for Middle Level Education: Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards	X	X	X	X	X
California Department of Education, Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force: Caught in the Middle	X		X		X

(continued)

Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development: Turning Points / Turning Points 2000	X	X		X
National Association of Secondary School Principals: Recommendations for Middle Level Reform	X	X	X	X

The review of the third category of middle level philosophy yielded more mixed results (Table 8). Again five themes emerged including a) inclusion of advisory programs at the middle level, b) presence of adult advocates / role models for all students, c) community building / team based approach, d) developmentally responsive philosophy when making decisions, and e) the inclusion of social development practices in middle level schools. The results are shown in Table 8. Only the theme of developmentally responsive philosophy when making decisions was supported by all five documents. Both themes of the presence of adult advocates / role models for all students and a community building / team based approach were supported by all research except the California Department of Education's Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force: Caught in the Middle. The theme of the inclusion of social development practices in middle level schools was supported the Association for Middle Level Education's This We Believe, the Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development's Turning Points / Turning Points 2000, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Recommendations for Middle Level Reform. The Association for Middle Level Education's This We Believe, the Association for Middle Level Education's Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards, and the Carnegie

Corporation for Adolescent Development's Turning Points / Turning Points 2000 support the inclusion of specific student advisory programs in the middle level schools.

Table 8

Middle Level Philosophy Themes

Document reviewed	Advisory Programs	Adult Advocates / Role Models	Community Building/ Team Based Approach	Developmentally Responsive Philosophy	Social Development
Association for Middle Level Education: This We Believe	X	X	X	X	X
Association for Middle Level Education: Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards	X	X	X	X	
California Department of Education, Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force: Caught in the Middle				X	
Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development: Turning Points / Turning Points 2000	X	X	X	X	X
National Association of Secondary School Principals: Recommendations for Middle Level Reform		X	X	X	X

The review of the fourth category, called other middle level issues, revealed several similarities between the five documents reviewed (Table 9). Five themes were revealed including a) a need for specialized licensing or certificate, b) developmentally appropriate instructional strategies, c) a need for specialized preparation programs, d) developmentally responsive materials, and e) understanding and desiring the role of the middle level educator. All five documents stressed a need for specialized preparation programs and developmentally appropriate

instructional strategies. The themes of the need for developmentally responsive materials and understanding the role of the middle level educator were supported by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Recommendations for Middle Level Reform, the Association for Middle Level Education's This We Believe, the Association for Middle Level Education's Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards, and the Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development's Turning Points / Turning Points 2000. The Association for Middle Level Education called for specialized licensing or certificate programs in both This We Believe and Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards.

Through the detailed review of these documents, examination of the common themes, and careful consideration of the evidence, two overarching ideas garnered significant support; these are a focus on a deep understanding of the developmental needs of young adolescents and the appropriate selection of developmentally responsive and appropriate curricular materials and instruction.

Table 9

Other Middle Level Issues

Document reviewed	Specialized Licensing / Certification	Developmentally Appropriate Instructional Strategies	Specialized Preparation Programs	Developmentally Responsive Materials	Understand Roles of Middle Level Educator / Desire to Work at Middle Level
Association for Middle Level Education: This We Believe	X	X	X	X	X
Association for Middle Level Education: Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards	X	X	X	X	X
California Department of Education, Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force: Caught in the Middle		X	X		

(continued)

Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development: Turning Points / Turning Points 2000	X	X	X	X
National Association of Secondary School Principals: Recommendations for Middle Level Reform	X	X	X	X

Results and data related to research question 2. Research question 2 sought to understand the connection between the current California Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation and how, if at all, these policies incorporate the most recent research. The researcher reviewed the common recommendations for specifically designed middle level teacher preparation programs from four documents: AMLE's "This We Believe," CCAD's "Turning Points," CDE's "Caught in the Middle," and NASSP's "Recommendations for Middle Level Reform," as well as from California's Senate Bill 2042 (SB2042): Multiple Subject and Single Subject Preliminary Credential Program Standards. The SB2042 guides California colleges and universities seeking to provide teacher preparation programs. The researcher examined SB2042 and compared it to each of the five recommendation documents to determine the level at which the specific middle school preparation needs were addressed by SB 2042. The rubric ranking in the following gradations was used: meets the recommendation, somewhat meets the recommendation, does not address the recommendation. The designation of meets the recommendation is designated by evidence that the teacher preparation program contains a full course or courses of study specifically focusing on a detailed and deep understanding of the developmental stages and needs of the young adolescent student. These programs demonstrate a profound attention to the needs and development of the young adolescent student, their educational needs, and the instructional strategies that are most effective for the young adolescent. A program would be designated as somewhat meets the

recommendation by including a course or courses of study that focus on adolescent development as a whole, but that does not focus intently or with depth on the development of the young adolescent. In some cases the program may include a course that focuses on educational psychology of the adolescent, but does not focus primarily on the young adolescent. Programs that are classified as does not meet recommendation are those in which there is no evidence that a course or courses of study exist where adolescent development is discussed. These programs generally include a basic course in child development or general educational psychology.

The researcher then utilized this rubric to assess the capacity to which the 23 California State University schools and the California Teacher Credentialing Commission (CTC) teacher preparation program requirements were designed toward meeting the four programmatic recommendations for preparing potential teachers for service at the middle level. The programs were assessed in their capacity to meet the recommendations in four categories: a) young adolescent development knowledge, b) middle level curricular knowledge, c) middle level philosophy knowledge, and d) other middle level issues. This data is enumerated in Appendix E.

Considering the concept of young adolescent development knowledge, 14 schools did not meet the recommendation, 9 schools and the CTC somewhat met the recommendation and only one school met the recommendation; CSU San Marcos (CSUSM) was the only school to meet this recommendation. The Middle Level Program at CSU San Marcos not only has courses focused on the developmental needs of young adolescents, but also includes significant pre-service experiences with students at the middle level. Several of the schools that were designated as somewhat meeting the recommendation included a course or courses that focused on the aspects adolescence such as biological, cognitive, and social changes, but do not specifically focus on the young adolescent (aged 11 to 15 years old). Those schools that did not meet the

recommendations either did not include any course on educational psychology or child development or had only basic level course on learning and development.

For the concept of middle level curricular knowledge, 21 schools did not meet the recommendation, two schools and the CTC somewhat met the recommendation and only one school me the recommendation; CSU San Marcos was the only school to meet the recommendation. This program embodies all of the recommendations called for in the research. The CSU San Marcos program focuses on an interdisciplinary approach, where teachers are prepared to teach all subjects including the preparation to address literacy across the curriculum. Additionally, pre-service teachers at CSU San Marcos spend a significant amount of time learning how to prepare developmentally appropriate curriculum. Schools that were classified as somewhat meets the recommendations for middle level philosophy are those that include some mention of the differences between high school and missile school in their program. As an example, while CSU Channel Islands does not offer a specially designed middle level teacher preparation program, their program does allow for participants to choose the level (MS or HS) when selecting subject specific methodology courses. Schools that were designated who did not meet the recommendations were those that contained no socialized courses or materials relating to middle level education.

In reviewing the programs for inclusion of middle level philosophy concepts, 22 programs did not meet the recommendations, one program somewhat met the recommendation, and one program met the recommendations. CSU San Marcos was the sole program to include significant study of the middle level philosophy including a focus on the history of middle level education, middle school organizational models, and developmentally responsive curriculum and assessment. One school, CSU Monterey Bay (CSUMB), was coded as somewhat meeting the

recommendations because of its inclusion of a course on teaching and learning where the focus includes "human development learning strategies…and psychological principles underlying culturally congruent pedagogy (CSUMB, 2015)." The schools that were categorized as not meeting the recommendations were those where there was no specialized focus or inclusion of the middle level philosophy in their instructional program.

When considering other middle level issues recommended by the relevant research that was reviewed, only CSU San Marcos addressed the concepts that are recommended for a comprehensive and complete teacher preparation program for the middle level. Other middle level issues include focus areas such as teacher collaboration, middle level planning, teaching, and assessment, middle level field experiences, middle level teacher dispositions, and middle level licensure. The Middle Level Program at CSU San Marcos includes all of these as part of their comprehensive preparation of middle level teachers. Unlike any other program reviewed, CSU San Marcos prepares middle level educators in a comprehensive program that includes the major themes of interdisciplinary teaching and learning and exposes pre-service teachers to extensive observations and field work at partner middle schools. IN alignment with the current research on the young adolescent learner, CSU San Marcos' program assesses each pre-service teacher candidate on their mastery of the middle level program curriculum and on a set of professional dispositions deemed as crucial to the teaching profession. Program documents from the Middle Level Program at CSU San Marcos state that the inclusion of the dispositions exists to "foster the development of the following professional dispositions among our Teacher Candidates (CSUSM, 2013)." They go further to note that "Teaching and working with learners of all ages requires not only specific content knowledge and pedagogical skills, but also positive attitudes about multiple dimensions of the profession (CSUSM, 2013)." The focus on these

dispositions paired with their inclusion of the other previously specified aspects crucial to effective middle level teacher preparation programs clearly identify CSU San Marcos as the most comprehensive middle level education program in California.

Results and data related to research questions 3 and 4. Research questions 3 and 4 were designed to understand how specifically designed middle level teacher preparation programs are different from general secondary teacher-preparation programs. The third and fourth research questions in this study were addressed through a combination of document observation and a semi-structured interview of the directors of the specifically designed middle level teacher preparation program offered at California State University, San Marcos. The document observation consisted of a review of the course descriptions for the middle level teacher preparation program as well as program assessment and planning documents provided by CSU San Marcos. This allowed the researcher to look more deeply into the Middle Level Education Program of CSU San Marcos in order to determine the correlation between the program design, California policies on middle school credentialing, and the relevant research. The interview consisted of eight questions:

1. On what principles or research was the CSUSM Middle Level Program designed?
2. What research guides the course selection and content?
3. How often is the program evaluated and how does the program adapt as research changes?
4. Why is the program a derivation of the multiple subject credentials rather than the single subject credentials?
5. What is the transferability of this middle-level training to high school application?
6. What educational effectiveness indicators has CSUSM identified for the middle school teacher preparation program?

7. Does CSUSM complete an exit interview or post-program survey? If so, what evidence exists that describes the progress and / or accomplishments of the program participants?
8. Does CSUSM have some sort of comparative data demonstrating the relative success of the program graduates?

The interview questions were derived from a thorough review of the literature of recent research on specially designed middle level teacher preparation programs. The researcher then used a compilation of the interview responses, interview field notes, and the review of the documents as the findings.

The first interview question was focused on the establishment and philosophical underpinnings of the Middle Level Program at CSU San Marcos (CSUSM). Both Co-Coordinators indicate that the program design was based upon the early research on young adolescent developmental needs, primarily the work done by the preeminent researchers in Middle Level Education such as Tom Dickinson, Ken McEwin, Tom Erb, and the National Middle School Association (now known as the Association for Middle Level Education) in their report This We Believe. The basis of the program is to prepare potential middle level educators to address the developmental needs of the young adolescent through developmentally responsive educational programs. Of particular note are the concepts that young adolescence is a distinct developmental stage and therefore need teachers who are prepared to deal with their unique needs. Middle level philosophy, adolescent developmental understanding, and curricular knowledge are infused into every course in the Middle Level Program at CSUSM.

Participant 1 noted that:

The most basic principle is that young adolescents are unique, and they have unique cognitive, physical, social emotional needs. If we're going to really truly meet their needs, we need to understand how they're different.

Participant 2 added to this with:

> The principle that teachers should be well prepared to teach, not only their subject matter, but their specific students and the whole notion of young adolescence being a particular, distinct phase of development was, you know, quite really foundational to everything that was done in terms of educating middle school kids… really the principle was that young adolescents have this certain phase of development, that they have certain needs, that in order to serve them best, we should have programs [in middle level teacher education].

The second interview question strove to ascertain how the CSUSM program selects program content. Outside of the California Teacher Credentialing and Common Core requirements for content of teacher education programs, CSUSM focuses its curriculum on providing a high quality interdisciplinary program focused on the principles of young adolescent developmental needs and middle level philosophies. This is evident in many ways. First and foremost, it is evidenced by the program design focusing on Multiple Subject Credential requirements rather than a Single Subject approach. By focusing on the California Multiple Subject Credential requirements, the program addresses the recommendation for interdisciplinary curricular knowledge and a heavy emphasis on literacy learning. Moreover, for CSUSM, the program is about meeting the needs of middle level schools and students by connecting theory and research to practical application.

Participant 1 adds this:

> The School of Education has a mission statement that's grounded in educational equity, and a belief that all kids can learn, and a belief that we want to work together with our public school partners to transform public education so that theory and practice inform each other. Our course content is grounded in that as well.

Both participants comment that the core research on adolescent learning is the basis for the course selection and content; both point out that the faculty members in each core content area rely on the current best practices and research in their individual areas to inform their instruction. Participant 1 comments "Each of them grounds their course work in the best research in that content field." Participant 2 adds "within our own program and within each course, the faculty members, as a team, and then as individuals, are relying on the best practices and the research that guides their own teacher education choices."

The third interview question was focused on understanding how the CSUSM Middle Level Program is evaluated and how it evolves as research on young adolescence developmental needs changes. The CSUSM program is evaluated yearly by a School of Education survey of postgraduate students in their first year post graduation. The Middle Level (ML) program leadership reviews this data yearly, and combined with observations of practices, team values, and changes in research, the MLP leadership adapts and modifies the program of study when appropriate. Additionally, the School of Education Program Directors meet monthly to discuss programmatic needs and analyze data, and the ML program staff meets monthly to discuss student progress on the Teaching Performance Assessments, and the Professional Dispositions acquisition. The MLP is also engaged in a yearly ongoing self study of their program which they report to CTC and the University administration. Each year the ML program leadership chooses

to focus on different data points based upon need and perceived areas of weakness. Changes are made to the program based upon the analysis of the data in conjunction with other input, such as feedback from the partner school districts where the ML program hosts its fieldwork. Both Participant 1 and Participant 2 commented on a situation in recent years where feedback from partner districts called for an extended period of clinical fieldwork practice. A sample of the schedule is shown in Appendix G. The ML program leaders took this feedback and piloted an alternate program based upon that feedback.

Participant 1 describes the process:

> For example, all of our programs are what we call the 'eight-week model.' There's eight weeks where they have all their courses. They have a semester's worth of courses in eight weeks, and then they do clinical practice for eight weeks. Well, two years ago we decided we wanted to try something a little different based on feedback we were getting from our school partners; that they wished that our candidates could be in the schools for longer. Last year, we piloted something where we did the first six weeks: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, in course work, [and] Thursdays in clinical practice; and then the second 10 weeks: Mondays in course work, Tuesdays through Fridays in clinical practice. In the first eight weeks they've always been in clinical practice on Thursdays, but we decided to try it a little differently, and the results were mixed.
>
> We did a lot of data collection, a lot of surveying, and at the end of the year it was pretty much mixed from our school partners. Some of them loved it, others of them hated it, and from the teaching team it was kind of the same thing. We went back to our eight-eight [week] this year because with such mixed results, and the passion seemed to run higher on not liking it, we went back. That's an example of when we pilot something; we make

every effort to actually pilot it, collect data, and then make a decision about whether to continue the pilot.

In all, the Middle Level Program leadership uses multiple points of data, collected from a variety of sources to assure that the program will serve their participants, and ultimately their future students well.

The Middle Level Program at CSU San Marcos is a based upon a derivation of a California Multiple Subject Credential, which is typically reserved for teachers who wish to teach at the elementary level. However in California, middle level schools are typically considered to be secondary schools thereby requiring teachers to hold a California Single Subject Secondary Credential. Interview question four probed into the reasons behind why CSUSM ML program leadership made this choice. The founding members of the Middle Level Program based the choice of credential in the recommendations made by the research, specifically the work of the National Middle School Association (now known as the Association for Middle Level Education). Of particular importance was the focus on literacy and interdisciplinary knowledge, much like can be found in preparation programs for elementary school teachers. Participant 2 commented, "the middle level emphasis really did follow what the recommendations were that NMSA was putting [out]. Which was to say that students should have both a broad background, like a liberal studies background, and have two areas of [curricular] expertise... Now we also thought this was the right thing to do – to prepare middle grades teachers – because we especially are literacy teachers."

In the early stages of the program, the ML program-founding members made the decision to base their program on best practices and the volumes of middle level and young adolescent research. Participant 1 added that "one of the things that the research tells us about effective

middle schools is that a characteristic is strong interdisciplinary teams… it's pretty well accepted that the best middle schools have these strong interdisciplinary teams where its teachers of all the categories talk to each other." By training pre-service teachers under the multiple subject paradigms, the ML program achieves the broad and interdisciplinary knowledge called for by the research. CSUSM carried the process one step further by coordinating an agreement with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) that allows CSUSM ML program graduates to simultaneously earn Single Subject Secondary credentials by completing the full ML program, including the MLP teaching methodology courses, and passing the subject specific content exams (C-SET) in at least one curricular area. Participant 2 noted that while the majority of students compete the ML program with the Multiple Subject Credential and at least one Single Subject Credential, many students challenge themselves to obtain two or three additional Single Subject Credentials by taking and passing the appropriate subject specific C-SET exams. Participant 2 added that "we encourage them to do it because they will be more likely to be hired."

Interview question 5 focused on the transferability of the middle level training to high school application. Both Participant 1 and Participant 2 indicated that while the intent of the Middle Level Program is to prepare highly qualified middle level educators, occasionally some of the graduates make their way to working in high schools. Because the graduates typically have at least one Single Subject Secondary Credential, they are qualified to teach at the high school level. Participant 1 points out that a central theme in the ML program is the idea that teachers are responsible for teaching content "to students;" understanding the prepositional phrase emphasizing "to" is important to their mission. Participant goes further to describe how this supports the transferability of the ML program to work on high schools:

The content knowledge is there so that's no problem at all with functioning at the content expectations for high school… our middle level grads, they end up being good additions to high school teams because they help focus the conversation on students and shift it a little bit away from the content… they help shift the conversation a little bit, which we think is important.

Participant 2 took a different approach when describing how the ML program graduates can transfer their learning to work in high schools. Participant 2 emphasizes the interdisciplinary teaming philosophy as an asset for the ML graduates who move to positions in high schools. Participant 2 said this:

> One of the things that we always said about our middle level preparation being good for teaching in ninth or tenth grade was when interdisciplinary teaching – which is really a foundational piece of middle level education - was being picked up by high schools for ninth grade transition… because we were very strong in preparing our students to be on interdisciplinary teams, they could be leaders in a high school to help establish ninth or tenth grade interdisciplinary teams.

The additional Single Subject Secondary credentials, the theme of focusing conversation about students, and the high degree of skill working in interdisciplinary teams all point to a high transferability between the ML program content and the ability to successfully teach at the high school level.

The sixth interview question concentrates on measuring the educational effectiveness of the Middle Level Program at CSUSM. There are both qualitative and quantitative indicators of the success of the ML program. Qualitatively the program collects data from graduates and from the employers of graduates in the form of surveys and anecdotal evidence based on their experiences in graduates' first year of teaching. Consistently Participant 1 and Participant 2

describe the feedback from their graduates as the feeling that the graduates were well prepared for entering the field of middle level teaching. Participant 2 describes the opportunity to witness ML program graduates at work while ML supervising teachers are observing pre-service teachers taking part in fieldwork in the participating schools. Another qualitative indicator is referred to as the "One Year Out" survey sent out by the School of Education. Each year graduates from the education programs are surveyed for their feedback on their experiences at the University and in their first year of employment. Participant 2 commented "we have tons of anecdotal evidence that leads us to believe that we're doing well… we have [students who are] teachers of the year and other awards… we had one who got the big Disney award and some nationwide awards. We even had one who was administrator of the year for San Diego County."

Quantitatively the program has several different indicators of effectiveness. The first and most important is the pass rate of the candidates on the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA), which is close to 92% for first time test takers according to Participant 1. The TPA is a requirement for obtaining a credential. Additionally, the ML program utilizes a rubric to assess the growth of candidates in the six professional dispositions that are held as important by the ML program. These dispositions include social justice and equity, collaboration, critical thinking, professional ethics, reflective teaching and learning, and lifelong learning. Teacher candidates are evaluated twice per semester by their professors. Additionally there is a final end of program self-assessment of the dispositions that each teacher candidate completes. Participant 1 notes "we actually quantitatively evaluate those dispositions. We have a rubric, and twice a semester we do an evaluation of them."

The combination of the qualitative and quantitative data collected by the ML program help leaders shape the program for the future. It is important to note that since the ML program is

the only program of its kind in California it is difficult for them to compare their graduates to other graduates working in California.

Interview question 7 seeks to understand how the ML program assesses the accomplishments of its graduates. The ML program does not conduct any exit interviews once graduates leave the program, however the California State University Chancellor's office does send out a survey to graduates that identifies effectiveness indicators of education programs at each CSU school.

The ML program completes an informal post-program survey at the end each school year in May. Participant 1 describes how post-grads are brought to a gathering to discuss the first year teaching experience with the current graduating cohort of pre-service teachers. During this meeting, the leaders of the ML program collect extensive amounts of informal information through notes on discussions and feedback from graduates. Specifically the ML program leadership asks the graduates to describe for the teacher candidates what parts of the program they feel set them up for success and what parts of the program they felt needed more work or where they felt not completely prepared in their first year of teaching. Participant 1 describes a situation during one of these meetings where a post-graduate described difficulties they had experienced while in the program. This experience and discussion helped the ML program leadership to make changes to the program for the following year so that the new teacher candidates would be able to be more successful. Participant 1 noted that:

> We bring the graduates back to give tips for success in your first year of teaching. We usually are taking notes during the panel discussion, because those grads have been out for a year. We take a lot of notes on what they felt about the program prepared them and

where they felt the gaps were, because that to us is more important than anything because they've just completed their first year.

The final interview question seeks to determine if there is comparative data demonstrating the relative success of program graduates from CSU San Marcos' Middle Level program. San Marcos collects both qualitative and quantitative data yearly to assess the efficacy of their program. As students progress through the program the directors quantitatively evaluate students on their progress in attaining the dispositions necessary for successful middle level educators. Quantitative data on the efficacy of the program is also collected by the CSU Chancellor's office yearly in a survey sent out to program graduates regarding their experiences.

The directors of the Middle Level program at San Marcos also gauge their efficacy on direct observation of program graduates working in local schools. Consequently, because of the partnership between San Marcos and the neighboring school districts, many program graduates are currently employed in schools where the ML program pre-service teachers complete their fieldwork. Participant 2 describes this as a perfect opportunity to see the quality of their program in action. Survey and anecdotal data collected from the employers of ML program graduates yields positive feedback. Both Participant 1 and 2 comment that feedback from school administrators where San Marcos ML program graduates are employed has been unanimously positive; stating that middle level graduates are well prepared and handled their first year of teaching easily.

Both participants state that other then the CSU Chancellor's "One Year Out" survey, no other data existed to compare the success of CSUSM graduates with graduates from other schools. The survey does give feedback to the School of Education on a variety of measures that includes social justice, equity, supporting English learners, supporting advanced learners, and

community engagement. Both participants comment that the survey is not entirely helpful because it is difficult to disaggregate the data because of the way that it is worded in the survey. Participant 2 commented that one of the difficulties is because the way that the respondents mark the survey does not indicate whether or not they were part of the middle level program it only indicates whether not they add received a multiple subject or a single subject credential.

Summary of Key Findings

After a thorough review of all of the evidence relating to research question 1, it is clear that strong middle level teacher preparation programs include four critical areas of focus. These are:

- Young adolescent development knowledge
- Middle level curricular knowledge
- Middle level philosophy
- Middle level issues

Within these four areas of focus, four important themes emerged. These are:

- Developmentally appropriate interdisciplinary curriculum, strategies, and materials
- Developmentally responsive philosophy and school structure
- Comprehensive knowledge of adolescent developmental needs
- Student advocacy and advisement

Regarding research question 2, evidence suggests that California Teacher Credentialing policies only somewhat meet recommendations from research on strong middle level teacher preparation programs. Current California policy calls for only a basic understanding of

adolescent developmental needs and a general understanding of grade-level based curriculum standards in each content area.

The evidence regarding research questions 3 demonstrates that the Middle Level teacher preparation program at California State University San Marcos includes extensive middle level theory and adolescent developmental learning for pre-service teachers. Additionally, San Marcos's program includes regular and comprehensive observations and fieldwork experiences within functioning middle schools throughout the entirety of their middle level teacher preparation program. Also included in the San Marcos program is a strong focus on interdisciplinary curricular knowledge and student advocacy.

The evidence regarding research question 4 demonstrates that while there is no empirical comparative evidence to confirm that graduates of the CSUSM Middle Level program perform better than graduates of other programs, there is considerable evidence to support that the ML program graduates are well equipped and do perform effectively in the classroom.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter presents a discussion of the findings, followed by the conclusions, and recommendations for policy and practice as well as for further study. The chapter concludes with the researcher's final thoughts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative mixed methods study was to compare current California policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation programs with the most recent research on young adolescent development. A second purpose of this study was to investigate the design and implementation of middle school specific teacher preparation programs in California in relation to the most recent research on young adolescent development. It was anticipated that the outcomes of both methods will serve to inform policy recommendation and middle school teacher preparation program design and implementation.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. What does the current research recommend regarding the content and importance of middle school-specific teacher preparation programs?
2. What are the current California Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation and how, if at all, do these policies incorporate the most recent research?
3. How is the middle-school specific teacher preparation program at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) designed and implemented to incorporate the most recent research?

4. What evidence, if any, exists to demonstrate that the CSUSM middle-school specific teacher preparation program more successfully prepares graduates/potential teachers for middle school assignments than those prepared in more traditional programs?

Research Design Summary

This study was qualitative in nature and used a mixture of comparative content analysis and modified case study methodologies. The first part of the study consisted of comparative content analyses of the educational needs of the young adolescent, the current California teacher licensing policies, and the current middle level teacher preparation programs in the California State University system. The second part of the study consisted of a modified case study of the sole middle-school-specific teacher preparation program at California State University, San Marcos and included document and record observations and review, as well as a semi-structured interview of the co-directors of the program. The interview questions were open-ended and focused on the curricular design of the teacher preparation program.

The qualitative mixed methodology was chosen for this study because of the complex nature of the research questions. This study sought not only to compare the components of current teacher preparation and licensure programs with each other, but also to compare the current program content with the recent research on adolescent developmental needs with specific focus on their educational needs. This comparison was best addressed through comparative content analysis of the documents detailing the teacher preparation program requirements (Berelson, 1952; Holsti, 1969). The third layer of the study sought to understand how specifically-designed middle level teacher preparation programs are different from general secondary teacher preparation programs. This feature was best addressed through the case study

including document analysis and semi-structured interviews of the personnel leading these programs (Creswell, 1998; Leedy & Ormond, 2005).

Content analysis methodology was chosen to identify common themes of curricular content in middle level teacher preparation programs and to compare the comprehensiveness of each program with regard to the specific needs of middle level preparation programs. This study sought to more fully understand how specifically-designed middle level teacher preparation programs are different from general secondary teacher preparation programs. This modified case study included document review of middle level credential coursework and semi-structured interviews with the co-directors of the middle level teacher credential program at California State University, San Marcos. The data gathered from the interviews as well as the document analysis provided a comprehensive view of the programmatic differences found at California State University, San Marcos.

Discussion of Key Findings

Analysis of research findings for question 1. Since the earliest parts of the 20th century American education has recognized that the early adolescent student was unique and that there was a need for a specialized educational program for these students. From these first observations, the American junior high school was developed (Balfanz et.al, 2002; Beane & Broadhagen, 2001; Williamson, 1996). As early as 1908, researcher such as G. Stanley Hall pushed for the recognition of young adolescent students as neither children nor adolescents but rather as another developmental stage worthy of a specialized education program to serve their unique needs.

After a thorough review of all of the evidence relating to research question 1, it is clear that strong middle level teacher preparation programs include four critical areas of focus. These are:

- Young adolescent development knowledge
- Middle level curricular knowledge
- Middle level philosophy
- Middle level issues.

Within these four areas of focus, four important themes emerged:

- Developmentally appropriate interdisciplinary curriculum, strategies, and materials
- Developmentally responsive philosophy and school structure
- Comprehensive knowledge of adolescent developmental needs,
- Student advocacy and advisement

Several top researchers including Beane (2001), Beane & Brodhagen (2001); Lipsitz (1984), McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins (1996); and Williamson (1996) suggest that the junior high school could be made more developmentally appropriate setting for the young adolescent if teachers were prepared and specific middle level preparation programs. Eichhorn (1966) proposed that all middle schools should include an advisory component to meet the emotional social and psychological needs of the students, as well as having multi age ability grouping for instruction delivery and for student assessment (Balfanz et al., 2002). Eichhorn extended this definition of developmentally appropriate middle schools to include opportunities for students to learn through multiple interdisciplinary thematic units which would require teachers to be capable of content delivery in more than one curricular area. In its 1989 publication Turning Points, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development proposed that the staff of middle grade

schools should be comprised of teachers who are expert at teaching young adolescents and who have been specially prepared for assignments in the middle grades. Carnegie (1989) also recommended that schools create small learning communities where close mutual respectful relationships with adults are considered fundamental for intellectual development; where students are literate including in the sciences; know how to think critically; lead a healthy lives; and behave ethically in as responsible citizens in our pluralistic society. In 1982 the National Middle School Association published a position paper entitled This We Believe which delineated ten central characteristics of an effective developmentally responsive middle school. In summary, the findings related to the need for specially-designed middle level teacher preparation programs, as well as the specific content they should include are all supported by the relevant literature.

Analysis of research findings for question 2. Middle school reform, which began in the early part of the 20th century, requests specialized schools for the young adolescent that have developmentally responsive instruction taught by specially trained teachers. The middle school concept corners on the creation of schools with developmentally appropriate programs, culture, and teachers for a group of young adolescent students who are in a specific and unique phase of development (Gaskill, 2002). The most important factor in making the middle school experience meaningful and successful for the young adolescent student is the quality of the educators in their school. Highly qualified middle school teachers have to be trained in specially designed programs that allow them to have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with young adolescents (NMSA, 1982, 2003; Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989, 2000). Through the work of many researchers, such as Eichhorn, Alexander, Lounsbury, Lipsitz, McEwin, and Toepfer, it is an accepted fact that the young adolescent student has specific needs

that are vastly different from those students in elementary or senior high school (Beane & Broadhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Williamson, 1996). In 1982, the National Middle School Association pleaded for a nationwide change in licensure, preparation, induction, and support of middle level teachers. In 2002, Balfanz et al. stated that both middle school teachers and principals need more specialized preparation and continuing professional development in order to fulfill true middle level reform requirements and address the unique needs of the young adolescent learner. Jackson and Davis (2000) stated in *Turning Points 2000*, "Prospective teachers should have the opportunity to decide upon a career that focuses on a single developmental age group and should receive rigorous preparation in the subjects they will teach. This specialized professional preparation for the middle grades should be rewarded by a distinctive license that accurately informs all concerned that the teacher holding it has demonstrated his or her abilities to teach young adolescents effectively" (p. 103). Research describes the need for middle level teachers to be trained in specifically designed programs focusing on the developmental needs of the young adolescent.

A key barrier to implementing required specific middle level licensure and training programs is the overlapping nature of current licensing. Teacher licensing patterns that include overlaps in grade levels diminish the significance of a specific middle level license. In California, as in most states, teacher licensing parameters are set up so that there are only two types of licenses - elementary school and secondary; this lumps all adolescent students into a single category. More often than not, secondary school teacher preparation programs are geared towards preparing teachers to teach at the high school level, and rarely do they include relevant or meaningful information regarding the young adolescent student (Lipsitz, 1984). California teachers can earn licensing for grades preK-12 that are designated for departmentalized (single

subject) or self-contained (multiple subject) classrooms (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2009; Gaskill, 2002; Jackson & Davis, 2000; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996). Jackson and Davis (2000) report that the barrier is caused due to the fact that "in some states, efforts to design and implement mandatory, non-overlapping middle grades licensure have been blocked by representatives of districts that have difficulty employing enough licensed teachers" (p. 103).

Considering the volume of literature supporting the need for specially designed middle level teacher preparation programs, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) policies regarding middle level teacher preparation programs was reviewed. Using a rubric to assess the degree to which that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing secondary school credential met the requirements described in the literature, it was determined that the CTC Secondary Credential program requirements only somewhat met the recommendations from the literature. The relevant literature calls for middle level teacher preparation programs include four categories of information: a) young adolescent developmental knowledge, b) middle level curricular knowledge, c) middle level philosophy knowledge, and d) knowledge of other middle level issues.

This research yielded that the CTC only somewhat meet the recommendation for inclusion of young adolescent developmental knowledge in that the CTC requires knowledge of the adolescent, but not specifically the developmental understanding of the young adolescent phase.

The CTC distinguishes between middle school level and high school level curricular standards as determined by the California Department of Education. However, the CTC does not require the interdisciplinary nature and multiple subject curricular knowledge that is

recommended in the research. This difference in specificity accounts for the CTC only partially meeting the recommendation regarding middle level curricular knowledge.

The CTC did not meet the recommendations in either the inclusion of middle level philosophy concepts or middle level issues as determined by the relevant literature. In the requirements for teacher preparation programs, the CTC makes no mention or nor has any requirement for any specified coursework or discussions of the middle school philosophy or issues.

From this compilation of evidence, it can be determined the California Teacher Credentialing policies only somewhat meet the recommendations of the research on the level education. There is a significant misalignment between the policies in California and the relevant literature on middle level teacher preparation programs and licensure.

Analysis of research findings for question 3. The evidence regarding research questions 3 demonstrates that the Middle Level teacher preparation program at California State University San Marcos includes extensive middle level theory and adolescent developmental learning for pre-service teachers. Additionally, San Marcos's program includes regular and comprehensive observations and fieldwork experiences within functioning middle schools throughout the entirety of the middle level teacher preparation program. Also included in the San Marcos program is a strong focus on interdisciplinary curricular knowledge and student advocacy. These findings are supported by the literature.

In the fall of 1992, based upon the significant amount of research on middle level educational requirements, California State University San Marcos began the Middle Level credentialing program. The leaders at CSU San Marcos were strongly influenced to create the Middle Level program by middle level reform and the middle school movement. A common

theme throughout all of the research on middle level education is that the young adolescent is vastly different developmentally than the older adolescent child and as such requires a school setting that is culturally sensitive developmentally appropriate is staffed with teachers are specially prepared to teach these young people (Beane, 2001; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; McEwin, 1992; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996; Wiles & Bondi, 1987; Williamson, 1996). The founders of the Middle Level program at San Marcos described that there was a great need for a program that would produce teachers who could service all of the aspects and needs of the young adolescent student their physical, social, emotional, intellectual, moral, and psychological development.

The San Marcos middle level program espouses five themes of middle level philosophy in their work; these include a) learning happens in a caring community, b) students are the center of our work, c) teaching is the negotiation among theory, practice, and students, d) empowerment of students is essential to the students meaningful participation in a democratic society, and e) education requires political action to achieve a just society. These themes address the complexity of the middle level concept and complete teacher preparation program through extensive study of middle school theory and adolescent development of learning (Beane & Broadhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; Knowles & Brown, 2000; Williamson, 1996). The inclusion of the dispositions and their assessments in the teaching program is supported by the literature from the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1989, 2000), National Middle School Association (1982, 2003), as well as by researchers such as Anfara (2004) and Williamson (1996).

San Marcos frames their middle level teacher preparation program around the multiple subject credential structure because of the interdisciplinary nature of a multiple subject credential and the inclusion of strong literacy across all content areas. According to McEwin, Dickinson,

Erb, and Scales (1995), a successful middle grades teacher needs to be more than the "traditional single-subject-matter specialist" (p. 13). They recommend that middle grades teachers be knowledgeable in two different subject matter fields such as science and mathematics, or history and language arts. This, combined with their broad liberal arts knowledge base, will provide the prospective middle grades teacher with the ability to make interconnections and plan instruction in a manner that young adolescents will be able to understand (McEwin, Dickinson, Erb, & Scales, 1995).In their individual position papers and reports, the National Middle School Association, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and National Association of Secondary School Principals have described the necessity of creating middle schools that were focused on the distinct developmental needs of the young adolescent; schools that would incorporate flexible course scheduling, team teaching, interdisciplinary lessons, and opportunities for student advisement (Anfara, 2004; Beane & Broadhagen, 2001; Balfanz et al., 2002).

In total, the evidence demonstrates and literature supports that both the design and implementation of the Middle Level program at CSU San Marcos is aligned to the most recent research on adolescent developmental needs and middle level teacher preparation.

Analysis of research findings for question 4. The evidence regarding research question 4 demonstrates that, while there is no empirical comparative substantiation that confirms that graduates of the CSUSM Middle Level program perform better than graduates of other programs, there is considerable evidence to support that the ML program graduates are well equipped and do perform effectively in the classroom.

This study determined that, other than the CSU Chancellor's survey, no data exists to compare the success of CSUSM graduates with graduates from other schools. The CSU

Chancellor's survey does give feedback to the School of Education on a variety of measures which includes social justice, equity, supporting English learners, supporting advanced learners, and community engagement. One of the barriers to comparing San Marcos's ML students to other students prepared on alternate CSU campuses is the method that the respondents use to mark the Chancellor's survey. The survey does not allow respondents to indicate whether or not they were part of the middle level program, rather it only indicates whether not they add received a multiple subject or a single subject credential. Therefore, comparison between programs is essentially nil.

In light of this, San Marcos collects both qualitative and quantitative data yearly to assess the efficacy of their program. The directors of the Middle Level program at San Marcos gauge their efficacy on direct observation of program graduates working in local schools. Consequently, because of the partnership between San Marcos and the neighboring school districts, many program graduates are currently employed in schools where the ML program pre-service teachers complete their fieldwork. Survey and anecdotal data collected from the employers of ML program graduates yields positive feedback. Feedback from school administrators where San Marcos ML program graduates are employed has been unanimously positive; stating that middle level graduates are well prepared and handled their first year of teaching easily.

The literature supports the appropriateness of the components of the ML program at San Marcos and from all evidence gathered; the program at San Marcos meets the requirements of a comprehensive middle level teacher preparation program (Beane, 2001; Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Lipsitz, 1984; McEwin, 1992; McEwin, Dickinson, & Jenkins, 1996; Wiles & Bondi, 1987; Williamson, 1996; NMSA, 1982, 2003; Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development,

1989, 2000). Being the only program of its kind in California, the ML program at San Marcos is operating in relative isolation and lacks the ability to compare itself to other California-based schools. All evidence collected by both the CSU Chancellor's office and the ML program itself point to the relative success of their graduates, yet this does not offer any comparability to graduates of other middle level programs. In order to fully gauge the true effectiveness of the ML program at San Marcos, comparative data would need to be collected from other institutions with similar programs. In the absence of this, the data collected by the ML program itself only offers a narrow view of the programs successfulness. Therefore at this time, a comparison of San Marcos graduates to middle level program graduates from other schools is unavailable.

Conclusions

Based on the findings from the comparative content analysis and the modified case study, the following conclusions have been drawn.

Conclusion 1. It has been established that the young adolescent student is in a unique period of development. Jackson and Davis (2000) describe young adolescence as "a fascinating period of rapid physical, intellectual, and social change. It is the time when young people experience puberty, when growth and development is more rapid than during any other developmental stage except that of infancy" (p. 6-7). Part of what makes the young adolescent student so unique is not only the variety of developmental changes happening, but the varied pace at which each individual student moves through this development. The developmental changes a young adolescent student experiences are vastly different than those of childhood and older adolescence. In turn, this great variety of student capabilities makes the capacity of the middle level teacher crucial to the success of the student. The volumes of research on middle level reform center on the idea that in order to meet the unique developmental needs of the

young adolescent student, a middle school must be developmentally responsive and include an interdisciplinary curriculum that is taught by teachers prepared in specialized programs. In the absence of specialized licensure for middle level educators, there is little support for programs to specially prepare middle level educators in California. Thus, in order to address the developmental needs of the young adolescent student, prospective middle level educators require specialized training. This can only be accomplished by changes in the teacher preparation program requirements as set by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to include specific requirements for middle level teacher training programs as described in the relevant research.

Conclusion 2. Young adolescent research distinguishes the developmental needs of the young adolescent as distinctly different from their older and younger peers. It is clear that the young adolescent student is in need of developmentally responsive and appropriate schools. Research on middle school reform requires specialized preparation of middle level educators as a key factor in student success. However it is noted that it absence of specialized licensure, support for specialized middle level teacher preparation programs do not exist. California Teacher Credentialing policies are misaligned with the relevant research on young adolescent development and middle school reform. The result is that the policy and practice of the California Teacher Credentialing system is not keeping pace with research on adolescent development and, therefore, the structure of California teacher licensing and teacher preparation programs needs to be revisited. The California Teacher Credentialing system must restructure the teacher licensing policies to require a middle level license. This is turn will support the development of specialized middle level teacher preparation programs.

Conclusion 3. This study has shown that according to the relevant research, the California State University San Marcos's Middle Level educator program exhibits all of the characteristics of a strong middle level preparation program. San Marcos's own multiple measures self-study has yielded positive results regarding the efficacy of their instructional program. Therefore is can be concluded that the CSUSM Middle Level program is successful in preparing teachers for service in the classroom. However, in the absence of true comparative data with other similar programs, it cannot be concluded that the San Marcos students are better prepared to perform in the classroom than traditionally prepared students.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings of this study indicate that young adolescent students have unique developmental needs and should be educated in developmentally responsive schools that employ teachers who have been trained in specialized middle level educator preparation programs and who hold specific middle level licensure. In order to bring California's policy and practice up to date with the most recent research on the young adolescent learner and their developmental needs, a cascade of changes need to take place. First, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) should align the standards for teacher preparation programs and licensure with the recommendations included in the literature and this study. Specifically, the CTC should discontinue the use of overlapping elementary and secondary credentials, and should create a required middle level licensure. The recommended differentiation of credentials should be dependent upon prospective developmental stages to be taught: a) Elementary / Childhood: Grades K – 5; b) Middle School / Early Adolescence: Grades 5 – 9; c) High School / Older Adolescence: Grades 9 – 12.

Secondly, in changing the structure of the licensing, the CTC would also need to change

the requirements for teacher preparation programs to include the new middle level licensure. The new middle level teacher preparation program requirements set forth by the CTC would need to include the recommended program requirements as found in the four major documents on middle level reform:

1. Association for Middle Level Education: This We Believe
2. Association for Middle Level Education: Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards
3. Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development: Turning Points / 2000
4. National Association of Secondary School Principals: Recommendations for Middle Level Reform.

Lastly, the change in requirements for middle level teacher preparation programs by the CTC, would then require California universities, both public and private, to adopt new middle level educator preparation programs. After 22 successful years of operation, the CSU system should utilize the CSU San Marcos program as a template for implementation at the other 22 CSU campuses.

Recommendations for Further Research

Recommendation 1. In order to further the research completed by this study, specifically aimed at determining whether or not the CSUSM Middle Level program graduates are better prepared than those teachers from traditional programs, an assessment of the academic proficiencies should be completed. A case study could be completed in one of the San Marcos cooperating middle schools comparing the academic proficiency of students taught by ML program graduates and non-ML program graduates. This could better determine whether or not

Middle Level program graduates are better prepared than those teachers from traditional programs

Recommendation 2. A second comparative study could be completed comparing the competencies and effectiveness of CSU San Marcos MLP graduates versus middle level program graduates from a different state, such as Connecticut or Georgia, where middle level programs and licensure have been in place for a significant amount of time. This would help determine if the structure and implementation of the CSUSM program is the more effective than other middle level programs.

Summary

This study attempted not only to compare the components of current teacher preparation and licensure programs with each other, but also to compare the current program content with the recent research on adolescent developmental needs with specific focus on their educational needs. This study also sought to investigate the design and implementation of middle school specific teacher preparation programs in California in relation to the most recent research on young adolescent development. The study first examined the educational needs of the young adolescent, the current California teacher licensing policies, and the current middle level teacher preparation programs in the California through comparative content analysis of the documents. The study then examined the middle-school-specific teacher preparation program at California State University, San Marcos and included document and record observations and review, as well as a semi-structured interview of the co-directors of the program. The data gathered from the interviews as well as the document analysis provided a comprehensive view of the programmatic differences found at California State University, San Marcos.

The findings of this study indicate that the young adolescent student is in a unique phase of development which requires a specialized developmentally responsive educational program delivered by specifically prepared teachers. The evidence further demonstrates that strong middle level teacher preparation programs, such as the program at CSU San Marcos, are designed to prepare teachers to address these complex developmental needs of the young adolescent student. An additional finding was that the current California teacher licensure and preparation requirements have not kept pace with the research on the young adolescent learner and are thereby misaligned with the best practices determined for this age group. A restructuring of the policies for California teacher licensure and preparation requirements to align with the research on best practices for the young adolescent learner is recommended.

The voluminous body of research on the young adolescent learner consistently demonstrates the need for developmentally responsive schools staffed by specially prepared middle level educators. The current licensing and teacher preparation systems in place in California are poorly coordinated with known best practices and, are failing to meet the needs of the middle level learner. There is a need for restructuring of schooling for the young adolescent learner in California, including the method for preparing and licensing teachers for the middle level, in order to provide developmentally responsive schools.

References

Alexander, W., Wiliams, E., Compton, M., Hanes, V., Prescott, D., & Kealy, R. (1969). *The emergent middle school*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Wilson.

Alexander, W.M. & McEwin, C.K. (1984). Training the Middle Level Educator – Where Does the Solution Lie? NASSP Bulletin, *68*, 6-11. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/019263658406847303

Alexander, W.M., & McEwin, C.K. (1998). *Preparing to teach at the middle level*. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Anfara, V. (2004). Creating high-performing middle schools. In S. Thompson (Ed.), *Reforming middle level education: Considerations for policymakers* (pp. 1-18). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1975). *The middle school we need*. Washington DC: Author.

Balfanz, R., Ruby, A., & MacIver, D. (2002). *Essential components and next steps for comprehensive whole-school reform in high poverty middle schools.* In S. Stringfield & D. Land (Eds.), Educating at-risk students: One hundred first yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (pp. 128–147). Chicago, IL: NSSE.

Beane, J.A. (2001). *Reform and reinvention. Reinventing Middle School*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Beane, J.A., & Brodhagen, B.L. (2001). Teaching in middle schools. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (4th ed.; pp. 1157-1174). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Bee, H. (1989). *The developing child*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishing.

Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Bogdan, R.C., & Bilken, S.K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Group.

Briggs, T.H. (1920). *The junior high*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009). *Teacher Credentialing Requirements.* Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/req-teaching.html.

California State Department of Education. (1987). *Caught in the middle: Educational reform for young adolescents in California public schools*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

California State University Monterey Bay, School of Education. (2015). *Single subject teaching credential.* Retrieved from https://csumb.edu/catalog/single-subject-teaching-credential

California State University San Marcos, School of Education. (2013). *Middle level credential.* Retrieved from http://www.csusm.edu/education/Programs/MiddleLevel.html.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1989). *Turning Points: Preparing American youth for the 21st Century*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (2000). *Turning Points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st Century*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation.

Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative* inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Davies, M.A. (1995). The ideal middle level teacher. In M.J. Wavering (Ed.), *Educating young adolescents: Life in the middle* (pp. 149-169). New York, NY: Garland Publishing.

Dickinson, T.S., & Butler, D.A. (1994). The journey to the other side of the desk: The education of middle school teachers. In F.M. Smith & C.O. Hausafus (Eds.), *The education of early*

adolescents: Home economics in the middle school, Yearbook 14 of the American Home Economics Association (pp. 183-191). Peoria, IL: Macmillan/McGraw-Hill.

Dickinson, T.S. & Butler, D.A. (2001). Reinventing the middle school. *Middle School Journal 33*(1): 7-13. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2001.11495571

Dickinson, T.S., & McEwin, C.K. (1997). Perspective and profiles: The professional preparation of middle level teachers. *Childhood Education 73*(5), 272-277. doi:10.1080/00094056.1997.10521113

Douglas, A. (1920). *The junior high school*. Bloomington, IL: National Study of Education.

Eccles, J. S. (1999). The development of children ages 6 to 14. *The Future of Children*, *9*(2). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1602703

Eichorn, D. (1966). *The middle school*. New York, NY: Center for Applied Research in Education.

Entwisle, D.R. (1990). Schools and the adolescent. In S.S. Feldman & G.R. Elliot (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fenwick, J. J. (1986) *The Middle School Years*. San Diego, CA: Fenwick Associates.

Gaskill, P.S. (2002). Progress in the certification of middle-level personnel. *Middle School Journal*, *33*(5), 33-40. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2002.11495329

George, P.S., & Alexander, W.M. (1993). The middle school student. In George, P.S. & Alexander, W.M. (Eds.), *The Exemplary Middle School* (pp. 1-22). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

George, P., Lawrence, G., & Bushnell, D. (1998). *Handbook for Middle School Teaching (2nd Ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

George, P.S., Stevenson, C., Thomason, J., & Beane, J. (1992). *The middle school - and beyond*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hall, G.S. (1908). *Adolescence* (Vols. 1-2). New York, NY: D. Appleton.

Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hunt, G., Wiseman, G., & Bowden, S. (1998). *The Middle Level Teachers' Handbook*. Chicago, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishers.

Jackson, A.W., & Davis, G.A. (2000). *Turning points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Knowles, T., & Brown, D.F. (2000). *What Every Middle School Teacher Should Know*. Portsmouth, NH: National Middle School Association.

Krippendorf, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. . Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Leedy, P., & Ormond, J. (2005). *Practical research: Planning and design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Lipsitz, J., Mizell, M.H., Jackson, A.W., & Austin, M. (1997, March). Speaking with one voice: A manifesto for middle-grades reform. *Phi Delta Kappan* 533-550. Retrieved from http://web.a.ebscohost.com.lib.pepperdine.edu/ehost/

Lipsitz, J. (1984). *Successful Schools for Young Adolescents*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Lounsbury, J. (1984). *Middle school education: As I see it*. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Lounsbury, J. (1991). *As I see it*. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Lounsbury, J. (1992). Perspective on the middle school movement. In J. Irvin (Ed.), *Transforming schools for middle level students: Perspectives and possibilities* (pp. 3-15). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Lounsbury, J. (2000). The middle school movement: A charge to keep. *Clearing House, 73*(4): 193. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00098650009600947

McEwin, C.K. (1983). Middle Level Teacher Education and Certification. *NASSP Bulletin, 76,* 78-82. doi: 10.1177/019263658306746313

McEwin, C.K. (1992). Middle level teacher preparation and certification. In J.L. Irvin, (Ed.), *Transforming middle level education: Perspectives and possibilities* (pp. 369-380). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

McEwin, C.K., & Allen, M. G. (1985). Moving toward middle level teacher certification. *Middle School Journal, 16*(4), 18-20. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00940771.1985.11495710

McEwin, C.K., & Dickinson, T.S. (1995). *The professional preparation of middle level teachers: Profiles of successful programs*. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

McEwin, C.K., & Dickinson, T.S. (1997). Middle level teacher preparation and licensure. In J.L. Irvin (Ed.), *What current research says to the middle level practitioner*. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

McEwin, C.K., Dickinson, T.S., & Jenkins, D.M. (1996). *America's middle schools: Practices and progress, a 25year perspective.* Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

McEwin, C.K., Dickinson, T.S., & Smith, T.W. (2004). In S. Thompson (Ed.), *Reforming middle level education: Considerations for policymakers* (pp. 109-129). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

McEwin, C.K., Dickinson, T.S., Erb, T.O., & Scales, P. (1995). *A vision of excellence: Organizing principles for middle grades teacher preparation*. Pleasantville, NY: National Middle School Association.

McKay, J.A. (1995). *Schools in the middle: Developing a middle-level orientation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Mertens, S.B., Flowers, N., Mulhall, P. (1998). *The Middle Start Initiative, phase 1: A longitudinal analysis of Michigan middle-level schools*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

National Association of Secondary School Principal's Council on Middle Level Education. (1985). *An agenda for excellence at the middle level*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2002). *What teachers should know and be able to do.* Retrieved from http://www.nbpts.org/sites/default/files/documents/certificates/what_teachers_should_know.pdf

National Education Association. (1893). *Report of the committee on secondary school studies*. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.

National Education Association. (1895). *Report of the committee of fifteen on elementary education, with reports of the sub-committees: On the training of teachers; On the correlation of studies in elementary education; On the organization of city school systems.* New York, NY: American Book.

National Middle School Association. (1982). *This we believe*. Columbus, OH: Author.

National Middle School Association. (1995). *This we believe: Developmentally responsive middle level schools.* Columbus, OH: Author.

National Middle School Association. (2003). *This we believe: Successful schools for young adolescents.* Westerville, OH: Author.

National Middle School Association. (2008). *This we believe: Keys to educating young adolescents*. Westerville, OH: Author.

Pepperdine University. (2013). *Institutional review board protocols.* Retrieved from http://www.pepperdine.edu/about/administration/provost/content/policies/hipaa-manual.pdf

Pringle, R.W. (1937). *The junior high school: A psychological approach*. New York, NY: McGraw.

Scales, P.C. (1992). *Windows of opportunity: Improving middle grades teacher preparation*. Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute.

Scales, P.C., & McEwin, C.K. (1994). *Growing Pains: The making of America's middle school teachers.* Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association and Carrboro, NC: Center for Early Adolescence, University of North Carolina at Chappell Hill.

Silberman, C. (1970). *Crisis in the classroom: The remaking of American education*. New York, NY: Random House.

Toepfer, C., Jr. (1992). Middle level school curriculum: Defining the elusive. In J.L. Irvin (Ed.), *Transforming Middle Level Education: Perspectives and Possibilities* (pp. 205-243). Needham Height, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Toepfer, C.F. Jr. (1965). Who should teach in the junior high school? *The Clearing House*, *40*(2), 74-76. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/30182853

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wiles, J., & Bondi, Jr., J. (1987). *Making Middle School Work.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Williamson, R.D., (1996). Middle level education. In J.Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyon (Eds). *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 378-391). New York, NY: McMillan.

Woolfolk, A. (1998). *Educational psychology*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Wright, G.S. (1950). *Core curriculum in public high schools: An inquiry into practices, 1949. Bulletin 1950, No.5, Office of Education*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wright, G.S. (1958). *Block-time classes and he core program in the junior high school. Bulletin 1958, No. 6, Office of Education*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Appendix A

Dean or Designee Permission to Conduct Study

TO: Dr. Janet Powell, Dean - College of Education, Health & Human Services
California State University San Marcos

FROM: Paula Hart Rodas

DATE: February 7, 2015

SUBJECT: Dean or Designee Permission to Conduct Study

I would like your permission to conduct a research study at California State University San Marcos as part of my doctoral dissertation at Pepperdine University. I am researching specially designed middle level teacher preparation programs.

The purpose of this study is to compare current California policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation programs with the most recent research on young adolescent development. A second purpose of this study is to investigate the design and implementation of middle school specific teacher preparation programs in California in relation to the most recent research on young adolescent development. It is anticipated that the outcomes of both methods will serve to inform policy recommendation and inform middle school teacher preparation program design and implementation. Your university's participation in the study will contribute to knowledge and practices surrounding middle level teacher preparation programs.

I selected California State University San Marcos for this study as it is the only CSU campus that hosts a middle school credential program. If the co-coordinators of the Middle Level Program agree to participate, the participants will be asked to participate in a 30-45 minute interview regarding the curricular design of the teacher preparation program. The study will also include program and course document observations and review. The research questions that drive this study are as follows:

1. What does the current research recommend regarding the content and importance of middle school-specific teacher preparation programs?
2. What are the current California Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation and how, if at all, do these policies incorporate the most recent research?
3. How is the middle-school specific teacher preparation program at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) designed and implemented to incorporate the most recent research?
4. What evidence, if any, exists to demonstrate that the CSUSM middle-school specific teacher preparation program more successfully prepares graduates/potential teachers for middle school assignments than those prepared in more traditional programs?

I will share the purpose of the study and explain why the particular site was chosen with all participants. Interviews will be scheduled at mutually convenient times for the participants during the normal workday and will not be disruptive to the school program. The results of the study may be shared following the study. Tape recordings and transcribed materials will be locked and secured. Participant's identities will remain confidential and the interview notes and recordings will not be shared with others. The interview notes will be examined for common themes, used to identify professional practices in teacher preparation, and examine to connections between the program and current research on adolescent development.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Participants who decide to participate are free to withdraw their consent or discontinue participation at any time. A copy of the informed consent and the interview protocol and questions are attached for your information.

Please sign and return your approval by March 15, 2015. If you are unable to respond by that date, please send this approval as soon as possible. Please return one copy of this signed form to: Paula Hart Rodas. You may also fax the signed form to my attention or email it. If you have any questions regarding this study please feel free to contact me. If you have any additional questions or concerns regarding this study, you may also contact the researcher's supervisor Dr. Linda Purrington.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understood the information provided above, that you willingly agree for me to invite your site and staff to participate in this study, and that you have received a copy of this form.

Respectfully,
Paula Hart Rodas

Attachments:
Copy of Dean or Designee Permission to Conduct Study;
Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities;
Interview Protocol and Questions

I hereby consent to my university's participation in the research described above.

_____
CSU San Marcos Dean or Designee Signature

_____
Please Print Dean or Designee's Name

_____
Date

Appendix B

Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities

Participant: _____

Principal Investigator: Paula Hart Rodas

Project Title: Comparative Analysis of Middle Level Teacher Preparation and Certification in California

I,_____, agree to participate in the dissertation research study conducted by doctoral student Paula Hart Rodas, from the Educational Leadership, Administration and Policy Program at Pepperdine University. I understand that I may contact Mrs. Hart Rodas's supervisor Dr. Linda Purrington if you have any questions or concerns regarding the study.

I understand that the overall purpose of this research study is to compare current California policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation programs with the most recent research on young adolescent development. I understand that the second purpose of this study is to investigate the design and implementation of middle school specific teacher preparation programs in California in relation to the most recent research on young adolescent development.

I understand that I have been asked to participate in this study because I am a co-coordinator of California State University San Marcos's Middle Level Credential Program and because CSUSM is the only CSU campus that hosts a middle school credential program.

I understand that my participation will involve one 30-45 minute interview regarding the curricular design of the teacher preparation program. The study will also include program and course document observations and review. I also understand that the study will be taking place between January 2015 – March 2015.

I understand that my interview will be audio taped if I decide to participate in this study. The tapes will be used for research purposes only. The interview will be conducted face-to-face and tape recorded in order to ensure the accuracy of the interview notes. The researcher will convert the audio files to written text and will use the interview content to determine common themes, to identify professional practices in teacher preparation, and examine to connections between the program and current research on adolescent development. The audio files, written text and interview notes will be stored in a locked file cabinet and destroyed after five years.

I understand that the researcher will work with me to ensure there are minimal risk, discomfort, and inconvenience, identifying and addressing any concerns I may have. I understand that the potential risks of participating in this study are fatigue, boredom, and possibly feelings of being uncomfortable with a particular question. In the event that I do experience fatigue and/or boredom, a break will be provided. If I am uncomfortable with any question, I have the option to not answer.

I understand that there is no direct benefit from participation in this study; however, the benefit to the profession may help to provide feedback and guidance for the CTC and teacher education programs for the purposes of better preparing potential teachers for work at the middle level. Potentially, the results of this study will influence the CTC and the California State University system to implement a middle level credential programs on all campuses. This in turn will produce teachers throughout California who are more prepared and ready to address the complex needs of the young adolescent student.

I understand my participation in this study is strictly voluntary. I understand that I have the right to refuse to participate in, or to withdraw from, the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I also have the right to refuse to answer any question I choose not to answer. I also understand that the researcher may find it necessary to end my participation in this study.

I understand that the researcher will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this study. I understand that under California law, the privilege of confidentiality does not extend to information about the abuse of a child. If the researcher has or is given such information, the researcher is required to report this information to the authorities. The obligation to report includes alleged or probable abuse as well as known abuse. Furthermore, under California law, the researcher is obligated to report any evidence of physical abuse against elders or dependent adults, or if a person indicates that he/she wishes to do serious harm to self, others, or property.

I understand that if the findings of the study are published or presented to a professional audience, no personally identifying information will be released. I understand that the interviews will be tape recorded only with my permission prior to the interview. The raw data gathered will be stored on the researcher's personal computer and transcribed interviews will be stored in locked file cabinets to which only the investigator will have access. The raw data will be maintained in a secure manner for five years at which time the data will be destroyed.

I understand that I will receive no compensation, financial or otherwise, for participating in this study.

I understand that if I have any questions regarding the study procedures, I can contact Paula Hart Rodas to get answers to my questions. If I have further questions, I may contact Dr. Linda Purrington at Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I may contact Dr. Thema Bryant-Davis, Chairperson of Pepperdine University Graduate and Professional Schools IRB.

I understand that I will be informed of any significant new findings developed during the course of my participation in this research which may have a bearing on my willingness to continue in the study.

I understand to my satisfaction the information in the consent form regarding my participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand.

I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

_____

Participant's Signature

_____
Date

_____
Witness

_____
Date

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am cosigning this form and accepting this person's consent.

_____
Principal Investigator

_____
Date

Appendix C

Participant Interview Questions and Protocol

Questions:

1. On what principles or research was the CSUSM Middle Level Program designed?
2. What research guides the course selection and content?
3. How often is the program evaluated and how does the program adapt as research changes?
4. Why is the program a derivation of the multiple subject credentials rather than the single subject credentials?
5. What is the transferability of this middle-level training to high school application?
6. What educational effectiveness indicators has CSUSM identified for the middle school teacher preparation program?
7. Does CSUSM complete an exit interview or post-program survey? If so, what evidence exists that describes the progress and / or accomplishments of the program participants?
8. Does CSUSM have some sort of comparative data demonstrating the relative success of the program graduates?

Protocol:
I will review the following information prior to the interview:

You have been chosen for this study because you are a co-coordinator of California State University San Marcos's Middle Level Credential Program and because CSUSM is the only CSU campus that hosts a middle school credential program.

I will be conducting research to compare current California policies for middle school teacher licensure and preparation programs with the most recent research on young adolescent development. I understand that the second purpose of this study is to investigate the design and implementation of middle school specific teacher preparation programs in California in relation to the most recent research on young adolescent development.

I will be conducting one 30-45 minute interview with you. I will take notes of our conversation during the interview and the interview will be tape recorded with your permission. I will not be excessive in demands and will be sensitive to your needs. I will attempt to be the least disruptive as possible.

Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with the researcher or your school or district.You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty.

Data gathered from the interviews will be safeguarded and not shared with others. Data will be stored for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

The findings will be published and shared with the educational community. I assure you of confidentiality that names will not be used in the manuscript, and individual identities will be disguised through coding of data. No one will have access to the transcriptions, recordings, and field notes except me.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Appendix D

Middle Level Program Recommendations Comparison and Evidence

Document reviewed	Young adolescent development knowledge	Middle level curricular knowledge	Middle level philosophy	Other middle level issues
Association for Middle Level Education: This We Believe	- With young adolescents, achieving academic success is highly dependent on their developmental needs also being met. It is vitally important to recognize that the areas of development – intellectual, physical, social, emotional, and moral – are inexorably intertwined. - Middle level educators must understand the developmental uniqueness of the age group, the curriculum they teach, and effective learning and assessment strategies. - Middle level educators enjoy being with young adolescents and understand the dynamics of the ever changing youth culture. They are sensitive to	- Middle level educators recognize the value of interdisciplinary studies and integrative learning and make sound pedagogical decisions based upon needs, interests, and special abilities of their students. - Successful middle schools are characterized by the active engagement of students and teachers. Successful middle schools empower students to learn, to become intellectually engaged, and to behave as responsible citizens. - The curriculum of a successful middle school must be relevant, challenging, integrative, and exploratory, from both the student's as well as the teacher's perspective.	- Middle level educators serve as role models for students. The realize their own behavior sends influential messages to young adolescents and so practice those qualities of heart and mind that they want young adolescents to develop. - The school ensures that every student has at least one adult advocate who knows the student well, and all students are comfortable talking to any staff member. - Students and teachers understand that they are part of a community where differences are respected and celebrated. - Educators model inclusive, collaborative,	- Middle level educators need specific teacher preparation before they enter the middle level classroom and continuous professional development as they pursue their careers. - Middle level educators should be prepared by specialized programs that require a depth of knowledge in at least two content areas, understanding of the learning process, and extensive field-based experiences at the middle level. - Developmentally responsive middle level schools construct curricula that actively assist young people as they formulate positive moral principles.

	individual differences, respond positively to the diversity present, and know how to involve families. - Successful middle level schools are grounded in the understanding that young adolescents are capable of far more than adults often assume.		democratic, and team-oriented approaches to teaching and learning.	
Association for Middle Level Education: Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards	- Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of young adolescent development. They use this understanding of the intellectual, physical, social, emotional and moral characteristics, needs, and interests of young adolescents to create healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging learning environments for all young adolescents including those	- Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate a depth and breadth of subject matter content knowledge in the subjects they teach (e.g., English/language arts, mathematics, reading, social studies, health, physical education, and family and consumer science). They incorporate information literacy skills and state-of-the-art technologies into teaching their subjects. - Middle level teacher candidates use their knowledge of local, state, national, and	- Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate an understanding of the philosophical foundations of developmentally responsive middle level programs and schools. - Middle level teacher candidates utilize their knowledge of the effective components of middle level programs and schools to foster equitable educational practices and to	- Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate their ability to motivate all young adolescents and facilitate their learning through a wide variety of developmentally responsive materials and resources (e.g., technology, manipulative materials, information literacy skills, and contemporary media). They establish equitable, caring, and productive learning

	whose language and cultures are different from their own. - Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate their understanding of the implications of diversity on the development of young adolescents. They implement curriculum and instruction that is responsive to young adolescents' local, national, and international histories, language/dialects, and individual identities - Middle level teacher candidates use their knowledge of young adolescent development when planning and implementing middle level curriculum and when selecting and using instructional strategies, - Middle level	common core standards to frame their teaching. They draw on their knowledge of these standards to design, implement, and evaluate developmentally responsive, meaningful, and challenging curriculum for all young adolescents. - Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge by helping all young adolescents make connections among subject areas. They facilitate relationships among content, ideas, interests, and experiences by developing and implementing relevant, challenging, integrative, and exploratory curriculum. They provide learning opportunities that enhance information literacy (e.g., critical thinking, problem solving, evaluation of information gained) in their	enhance learning for all students (e.g., race, ethnicity, culture, age, appearance, ability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, family composition). They demonstrate their ability to apply this knowledge and to function successfully within a variety of school organizational settings (e.g., grades K-8, 6-8, 7-12). - Middle level teacher candidates perform successfully in middle level programs and practices such as interdisciplinary teaming, advisory programs, flexible block schedules, and common teacher planning time. - Middle level teacher candidates serve	environments for all young adolescents. - Middle level teacher candidates understand, reflect on, and are successful in their unique roles as middle level professionals (e.g., members of teaching teams and advisors to young adolescents). - Middle level teacher candidates develop and administer assessments and use them as formative and summative tools to create meaningful learning experiences by assessing prior learning, implementing effective lessons, reflecting on young adolescent learning, and adjusting instruction based on the knowledge gained. - Middle level teachers They use

	teacher candidates apply their knowledge of young adolescent development when making decisions about their respective roles in creating and maintaining developmentally responsive learning environments. They demonstrate their ability to participate successfully in effective middle level school organizational practices such as interdisciplinary team organization and advisory programs.	specialty fields (e.g., mathematics, social studies, health). - Middle level teacher candidates use their knowledge of instruction and assessment strategies that are especially effective in the subjects they teach. - Middle level teacher candidates employ a wide variety of effective teaching, learning, and assessment strategies. They use instructional strategies and technologies in ways that encourage exploration, creativity, and information literacy skills (e.g., critical thinking, problem solving, evaluation of information gained) so that young adolescents are actively engaged in their learning.	as advocates for all young adolescents and for developmentally responsive schooling practices. They are informed advocates for effective middle level educational practices and policies, and use their professional leadership responsibilities to create equitable opportunities for all young adolescents in order to maximize their students' learning. - Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate positive orientations toward teaching young adolescents and model high standards of ethical behavior and professional competence. They are continuous, collaborative	instruction that is responsive to young adolescents' local, national, and international histories, language/dialects, and individual identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, culture, age, appearance, ability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, family composition).

			learners who demonstrate knowledgeable, reflective, critical perspectives on their teaching.	
California Department of Education, Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force: Caught in the Middle	- Middle grades teachers should receive preparation which focuses on the developmental characteristics of early adolescence and the professional skills required to plan and implement successful educational programs for middle grades students. - Middle grade teachers should receive preparation that includes study on the intellectual, psychological, social, and physical development of young adolescents; including "human skills" that relate to group dynamics, principles of motivation, the sociology of	- Middle grade teachers should receive preparation in pedagogical studies specifically related to middle grades curriculum and instructional issues. - Middle grades programs should include a full, balanced repertoire of subjects including: reading/literature, language arts, mathematics, science, health, history, geography, visual and performing arts, physical education, elective/exploratory courses, and advisory/group guidance. - Students in grades 6, 7, and 8 shall pursue a common, comprehensive, academically oriented core curriculum which prepares them with the foundation required to exercise	- Middle grade teachers should be provided early field experiences as undergraduates. This training should be a focused, supervised experience which develops awareness of middle grade educational philosophy, knowledge of students' characteristics, and a generalized sense of school organization and curriculum and instructional practices.	- Instructional strategies appropriate for the middle grades, such as team and collaborative teaching, are presently difficult to implement legally because of existing credentialing restrictions. The elementary (K-8) certificate is valid only for teaches assigned to self-contained classrooms; the secondary (7-12) certificate is valid only for the subject(s) specified on the credential. - In order to legally implement a humanities core curriculum block involving two or more discrete subjects, substantive changes must be made in existing regulations

	change, systems of reward and affirmation, group cohesion, collaborative planning, the dynamics of innovation, multicultural and linguistics influences, conflict resolution, and peer group relationships.	future academic and career options. This curriculum shall be appropriate to the developmental characteristics of young adolescents.		affecting teaching assignments in grades 6, 7, and 8. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing must revise and clarify its certification regulations in order to permit greater flexibility and innovation in the design of middle grades instructional strategies/
Carnegie Corporation for Adolescent Development: Turning Points / Turning Points 2000	- Middle grades schools should be staffed with teachers who are expert at teaching young adolescents, and engage teachers in ongoing, targeted professional development opportunities. - Middle grade educators should be prepared in programs where there is a comprehensive study of early adolescence and the philosophy and organization of middle grades education - Middle grade	- Middle grades educators should be prepared for teaching in two or more broad teaching fields. - Middle schools should teach a curriculum grounded in rigorous, public academic standards for what students should know and be able to do, relevant to the concerns of adolescents and based on how students learn best. - Middle schools should use instructional methods designed to prepare all students to achieve higher standards	- Middle grade educators should be prepared with early and continuing field experiences in variety middle grades settings. - Middle grades schools should organize relationships for learning to create a climate of intellectual development and a caring community of shared educational purpose. - Middle schools should provide a safe and healthy	- The main goal of middle grades education is to promote young adolescents' intellectual development. It is to enable every student to think creatively, to identify and solve meaningful problems, to communicate and work well with others, and to develop the base of factual knowledge and skills that is the essential foundation for these "higher order" capacities. - Middle schools should involve parents and

	teachers should know about how developmental realities play out against a backdrop of race, ethnicity, region, gender, socioeconomic status, family, and community. The intended outcome is the creation of developmentally responsive programs and practices for young adolescents.	and become lifelong learners.	environment as part of improving academic performance and developing caring and ethical citizens. - Middle grade teachers will need to understand principles of guidance to serve as advisors.	communities in supporting student learning and healthy development. - Middle grade teacher preparation programs should begin as undergraduate work with extensive field work in middle grade schools and other community settings.
National Association of Secondary School Principals: Recommendations for Middle Level Reform	- It is crucial to the learning environment that middle schools create a supportive environment that cultivates a student's sense of belonging, ownership of learning, and recognition of and ability to make good choices. - Middle schools need teachers who convey a sense of caring so students know that teachers have a stake in their learning.	- Middle schools should align the core curriculum across grades and schools; map efforts that address the academic, developmental, social, and personal needs of students, especially at critical transition periods. - Middle schools need to support school wide literacy initiatives that promote reading across the curriculum; build literacy leadership in all core-curriculum faculty members, provide teachers with the	- Middle schools should have a personal adult advocate for each student to help him or her personalize the education experience. - Middle schools should have flexible scheduling and student grouping patters to meet the individual needs of students and to ensure academic success. - Middle schools should	- Middle schools should provide professional development for teachers to help them implement personalized learning communities and use data and tracking systems to improve personalized teaching and learning. - The social and academic issues and challenges that adolescent students face are significant and thus require significant attention from

	- Middle schools need to provide support services, such as guidance, health, nutrition, and social services, to address the adolescent developmental needs of struggling students so that the students can focus on academic achievement. - Middle level assessments must not only be grounded in rigorous content standards but also must be relevant to the concerns of adolescents and based on how students in middle grades learn best.	time and human a and financial resources to take on their new literacy roles, and plan professional development opportunities on in interdisciplinary reading strategies. - Teaching students how to think critically, be responsible for their own learning, and assess themselves against standards is a crucial component of middle grades education.	provide frequent and meaningful opportunities for students to plan and assess their own academic, personal, and social development with an adult advocate such as a principal, teacher, or counselor. - Middle level best practices shows that interdisciplinary teaming and common planning time are necessary to increase levels of practice and are also associated with higher achievement.	trained counselors. - Middle schools should provide high quality summer bridge programs, supplemental support, and after-school instruction from state approved providers. - Middle schools require specially trained counselors and a well-structured advisory program to personalize the environment for students.

Appendix E

CTC/CSU Program Comparison with Middle Level Program Components

Characteristic 1: Young adolescent development knowledge

Program	Meets Recommendation	Somewhat Meets Recommendation	Does Not Meet Recommendation
CTC		X	
CSU –Bakersfield			X
CSU- Channel Islands		X	
CSU – Chico			X
CSU – Dominguez Hills			X
CSU – Easy Bay			X
CSU - Fresno			X
CSU – Fullerton		X	
CSU – Humboldt		X	
CSU – Long Beach		X	
CSU – Los Angeles			X
CA Maritime Academy			X
CSU – Monterey Bay		X	
CSU – Northridge		X	
CA Polytechnic U – Pomona			X
CSU - Sacramento			X
CSU – San Bernardino			X
CSU –San Diego		X	
CSU – San Francisco			X
CSU – San Jose			X
CA Polytechnic U – San Luis Obispo			X
CSU – San Marcos	X		
CSU – Sonoma		X	
CSU - Stanislaus			X

Characteristic 2: Middle level curricular knowledge

Program	Meets Recommendation	Somewhat Meets Recommendation	Does Not Meet Recommendation

CTC		X	
CSU –Bakersfield			X
CSU- Channel Islands		X	
CSU – Chico			X
CSU – Dominguez Hills			X
CSU – Easy Bay			X
CSU - Fresno			X
CSU – Fullerton			X
CSU – Humboldt			X
CSU – Long Beach			X
CSU – Los Angeles			X
CA Maritime Academy			X
CSU – Monterey Bay			X
CSU – Northridge			X
CA Polytechnic U – Pomona			X
CSU - Sacramento			X
CSU – San Bernadino			X
CSU –San Diego			X
CSU – San Francisco			X
CSU – San Jose			X
CA Polytechnic U – San Luis Obispo			X
CSU – San Marcos	X		
CSU – Sonoma			X
CSU - Stanislaus			X

Characteristic 3: Middle level philosophy

Program	Meets	Somewhat Meets	Does Not Meet

	Recommendation	Recommendation	Recommendation
CTC			X
CSU –Bakersfield			X
CSU- Channel Islands			X
CSU – Chico			X
CSU – Dominguez Hills			X
CSU – Easy Bay			X
CSU - Fresno			X
CSU – Fullerton			X
CSU – Humboldt			X
CSU – Long Beach			X
CSU – Los Angeles			X
CA Maritime Academy			X
CSU – Monterey Bay		X	
CSU – Northridge			X
CA Polytechnic U – Pomona			X
CSU - Sacramento			X
CSU – San Bernardino			X
CSU –San Diego			X
CSU – San Francisco			X
CSU – San Jose			X
CA Polytechnic U – San Luis Obispo			X
CSU – San Marcos	X		
CSU – Sonoma			X
CSU - Stanislaus			X

Characteristic 4: Other middle level issues

Program	Meets Recommendation	Somewhat Meets Recommendation	Does Not Meet Recommendation
CTC			X
CSU –Bakersfield			X
CSU- Channel Islands			X
CSU – Chico			X
CSU – Dominguez Hills			X
CSU – Easy Bay			X
CSU - Fresno			X
CSU – Fullerton			X
CSU – Humboldt			X
CSU – Long Beach			X
CSU – Los Angeles			X
CA Maritime Academy			X
CSU – Monterey Bay			X
CSU – Northridge			X
CA Polytechnic U – Pomona			X
CSU - Sacramento			X
CSU – San Bernardino			X
CSU –San Diego			X
CSU – San Francisco			X
CSU – San Jose			X
CA Polytechnic U – San Luis Obispo			X
CSU – San Marcos	X		
CSU – Sonoma			X
CSU - Stanislaus			X

Appendix F

IRB Approval Notice from Pepperdine University

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board

June 11, 2014

Paula Hart Rodas

Protocol #: E0214D06
Project Title: A Comparative Analysis of Middle Level Teacher Preparation and Certification in California

Dear Ms. Rodas:

Thank you for submitting your application, *A Comparative Analysis of Middle Level Teacher Preparation and Certification in California*, for exempt review to Pepperdine University's Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB). The IRB appreciates the work you and your faculty advisor, Dr. Purrington, have done on the proposal. The IRB has reviewed your submitted IRB application and all ancillary materials. Upon review, the IRB has determined that the above entitled project meets the requirements for exemption under the federal regulations (45 CFR 46 - http://www.nihtraining.com/ohsrsite/guidelines/45cfr46.html) that govern the protections of human subjects. Specifically, section 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) states:

> (b) Unless otherwise required by Department or Agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from this policy:
>
> Category (2) of 45 CFR 46.101, research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: a) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Your IRB approval letter is being reissued following the submission of the site approval letter from California State University, San Marcos.

Your research must be conducted according to the proposal that was submitted to the IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit a Request for Modification Form to the GPS IRB. Because your study falls under exemption, there is no requirement for continuing IRB review of your project. Please be aware that changes to your protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exemption from 45 CFR 46.101 and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the GPS IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite our best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the GPS IRB as soon as possible. We will ask for a complete explanation of the event and your response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event. Details regarding the timeframe in which adverse events must be reported to the GPS IRB and the appropriate form to be used to report this information can be found in the *Pepperdine University Protection of Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual* (see link to "policy material" at http://www.pepperdine.edu/irb/graduate/).

6100 Center Drive, Los Angeles, California 90045 ▪ 310-568-5600

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all further communication or correspondence related to this approval. Should you have additional questions, please contact Kevin Collins, Manager of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at . On behalf of the GPS IRB, I wish you success in this scholarly pursuit.

Sincerely,

Thema Bryant-Davis, Ph.D.
Chair, Graduate and Professional Schools IRB

cc: Dr. Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives
Mr. Brett Leach, Compliance Attorney
Dr. Purrington, Faculty Advisor

Appendix G

IRB Approval Notice from CSU San Marcos

California State University
SAN MARCOS

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) California State University San Marcos
Tel: 760-750-4029 irb@csusm.edu www.csusm.edu/irb

Human Subjects Research Approval Form

IRB #: 2014-085

To: Linda Purrington
Paula Hart Rodas

Project Title: A Comparative Analysis Of Middle Level Teacher Preparation And Certification In California

This letter certifies that the above referenced project was reviewed and approved by the University's Institutional Review Board in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Federal Regulations on Protection of Human Subjects(45 CFR 46), including its relevant subparts.

Continuing Review

This approval is valid through the expiration date shown below. If this research project will extend beyond that date, a continuing review application must be submitted at least 30 days before this expiration using the Continuing Review form available on the IRB website. (www.csusm.edu/irb)

Modifications to Research Protocol

Changes to this protocol (procedures, populations, locations, personnel, etc.) must be submitted and approved by the IRB prior to implementation using the Minor Modification Form available on the IRB website.

Unanticipated Outcomes/Events

The CSU San Marcos IRB must be notified immediately of any injuries or adverse conditions.

☑ ***Approved Information Sheet or Consent Form(s) are attached. Only approved consent forms may be used to obtain participant consent.***

Approval Date: 6/5/2014

Expiration Date: 6/4/2015

Susan Thompson
IRB Chair