Appendix endnotes

1   This report studies teacher preparation programs, rather than institutions as a whole, because institutions are not monolithic in their approach to teacher preparation. NCTQ's work has often found differences between elementary and secondary programs, and between undergraduate and graduate programs; consequently, this report uses the individual programs rather than institutions as the unit of analysis.

2   While no previous NCTQ study has found significant differences between teacher preparation programs in public and private institutions, this study did find that private institutions moderately outperformed public ones, at least on some measures.

3   More undergraduate programs were examined because more full sets of undergraduate syllabi were available.

4   Three programs in the sample do not include any foundational coursework in classroom management.

5   Words such as "management," "behavior," "motivation," "discipline" or "the learning environment" were signals that a course should be included in this study.

6   This includes subject-specific methods courses at the secondary level but not at the elementary level. The reason for the distinction is that secondary programs are less likely to have general methods or classroom management courses and therefore often incorporate general, not just subject-specific, classroom management instruction in such coursework. Subject-specific elementary methods courses, on the other hand, tend to deal with classroom management issues unique to a discipline (e.g., how to organize reading groups, how to conduct a safe science lab, how to keep children from throwing balls at each other in gym class), rather than issues that would apply across various classroom settings and subjects.

    The specific secondary subject-area for which methods courses were examined was the one randomly selected for evaluation in *Teacher Prep Review 2013*. For more information on this selection process, see the Review's general methodology on p. 67 of the report accessed at http://www.nctq.org/dmsStage/Teacher_Prep_Review_2013_Report

7   Some courses are part of multiple programs.

8   In keeping with the rationale for including such coursework in the foundational coursework analysis, subject-specific clinical coursework for secondary methods coursework — but not elementary methods coursework — was included if it mentioned classroom management in its title, description or objectives.

9   Some courses are part of multiple programs.

10 Since there has been no recent revolutionary change in basic approaches or techniques in classroom management, teaching classroom management or its oversight by state agencies or accrediting bodies, there is every reason to think that even syllabi from coursework predating 2008 would be generally representative of instruction in the field. Were we evaluating in-service programs or professional development that dealt with whole school management models, the age of materials would be an issue.

11 The National Academy of Education's report, Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs (October 25, 2013), available at http://www.naeducation.org, describes the strengths and weaknesses of each of the main forms of evaluating teacher training: federal Title II reporting, state approval processes, value-added modeling of the effectiveness of program graduates, national accreditation, program self-evaluation and the document reviews used by NCTQ. The report found each problematic in its own way. The report warns that programs may doctor their syllabi to earn higher ratings. NCTQ mitigates that concern by conducting audits to ensure that documents we obtain from IHEs are authentic.

12 Assumes that a fundamental component of classroom management plans is Rules, even if not explicitly stated in the assignment.

13 Ibid.

14 While the code includes the term "proactive strategies," all lectures were reviewed to ensure that this code only applies to routines, and that all proactive strategies that would fit under least intrusive means (e.g., proximity) were coded under "low profile desists."

15 The only lectures coded as "Praise and criticism" focused specifically on praise and referenced a "5:1" ratio (presumably praise to criticism).

16 Lectures with this code were reviewed to ensure that they only focused on positive reinforcement (e.g., rewards), and that anything focusing on punishment was coded under "responding to disruptive behavior."

17 Also includes rewards and positive reinforcement. Every assignment with this code has a positive reinforcement component.

18 The topics of diversity, cultural, and social/emotional factors were only separated for the Sample 3 cross-program analysis.

19 Examples of unclear lecture titles include "Approaches to instruction," "Managing Learning, Curriculum Integration," and "Myths and Mistakes - Principal Panel."

20   The topics of diversity and cultural and social/emotional factors were only categorized for the cross-program analysis sample.

21   If a syllabus did not contain a lecture schedule, time devoted to classroom management could not be calculated and the program was omitted from calculations related to time devoted to classroom management and strategy coverage.

22   These models include Positive Behavior Intervention Support, Discipline with Dignity and Assertive Discipline, among others. The focus of these models range from understanding the reasons behind students' misbehavior, to giving them a democratic voice in classroom rules, to employing consequences, to reshaping behavior through rewards. While these models all work toward the common goal of minimizing student misbehavior so that the focus is on instruction, they use very different approaches, especially in the types of responses to misbehavior and the degree to which responsibility for managing behavior rests with the teacher or the students. Furthermore, many of them predate the research on which strategies are effective, and not all of their approaches are supported by recent findings. Of the specific approaches discussed, "Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support" is by far the most popular and is mentioned in almost a third of programs whose lecture schedules show that time is set aside to discuss individual systems of classroom management; this program is a school-wide program that requires external training and support. "Discipline with Dignity," included in 15 percent of programs, is the next most common approach presented.

23   The research inventory can be assessed at www.nctq.org/teacherPrep/ourApproach/standards

24   Aggregated research support refers to the findings in the Simonsen et al., Oliver et al., and IES analyses. These studies identified the techniques and approaches with the strongest research support, which informed the "Big Five." The IES report also identified other techniques and approaches with moderate support (e.g., parental involvement), some of which are represented in the second table of categories.

25   These strategies do not precisely match the "mixed support" strategies identified in the cross-program tables. This discrepancy is because this table (Figure 17) identifies only on the strategies that emerged from the studies reviewed by NCTQ. The cross-program tables are based on the strategies that emerged from the Simonsen et al., Oliver et al., and IES studies themselves, which reviewed a larger range of studies.

26   While some of these categories have more studies than the "Big Five," this does not mean that they have more support. NCTQ did not have access to all studies reviewed by Simonsen et al., Oliver et al., and IES. In addition, these strategies tended to have weaker aggregated research support as identified by the IES practice guide.

27   All reports can be accessed at http://www.nctq.org/reports.do?d=Teacher%20Prep

28   Classroom management preparation for special education teacher candidates is essential as well but should include specialized coursework beyond the scope of this preliminary analysis.

29   Report can be accessed at http://www.nctq.org/dmsStage/Ed_School_Essentials_IL_Teacher_Prep_NCTQ_Report

30   Report can be accessed at http://www.nctq.org/dmsStage/Student_Teaching_United_States_NCTQ_Report

31   Most of the syllabi used for this study were collected as part of the *Teacher Prep Review 2013*. Because many institutions refused to provide information, we used public records requests to obtain syllabi and other materials. Only public institutions are subject to public records requests, so we were able to collect more sets of syllabi from public than from private institutions.