

ORIGINAL: 2252



PRIDE • ACCOUNTABILITY • COMMITMENT • TEACHER EXCELLENCE

State Unit of

The Association of Teacher Educators & The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Web Site: www.pac-te.org

November 11, 2002

PRESIDENT

DR. TERRY BLUE – 05
Elizabethtown College

VICE PRESIDENT

DR. JOHN BUTZOW – 05
Indiana University

TREASURER

DR. SUSAN CRISWELL – 03
Edinboro University

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DR. JAMES R. FLYNN
12841 Dundon Road
Edinboro, PA 16412
(814) 734-6860
FAX (814) 734-6381
E-mail: jflynn@velocity.net

HISTORIAN-ARCHIVIST

DR. RAY T. SUNDERLAND

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Private Colleges and Universities

DR. FRED SAVITZ – 05
Neumann College

DR. MICHAEL BYRON – 03
Juniata College

DR. JOHN GRAHAM – 04
Robert Morris University

SSHE UNIVERSITIES

DR. GAIL GREJDA – 05
Clarion University

DR. ROBERT BARTOS – 03
Shippensburg University

DR. RICHARD FRERICHS – 04
Millersville University

STATE RELATED UNIVERSITIES

DR. JAMES NOLAN – 05
Penn State University

DR. DAVID HAYES – 03
University of Pittsburgh Johnstown

DR. KAREN SCANLON – 04
University of Pittsburgh Johnstown

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP

JOHN TARKA – 04
Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers

DR. MARY DUPUIS – 03
Retired

THEONA WAXBOM – 05
Retired

Independent Regulatory Review Commission
333 Market Street, 14th Floor
Harrisburg, Pa 17126-0333

Dear Commission Members,

On November 21, 2002, you as members of the Independent Regulatory Review Commission will be voting on the final form of the revisions to the former Social Studies certification guidelines. As the current president of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Teacher Educators (PAC-TE), I am writing to encourage you to consider this with the greatest of care and highest degree of scrutiny allowed by law.

PAC-TE believes that the effort to change from a generic Social Studies certificate to two separate certificates in Citizenship Education and Social Sciences essentially was the work of three individuals who were placed well enough to accomplish their goal. These three, Dr. Eugene Hickok, Dr. Michael Poliakoff, and Dr. David Saxe, used their positions and influence to advance and accomplish this revision even though there was little or no support for the change among the many others who understand the substance of the change and among those who are affected by it.

The members of our association are not so naïve that we do not know that good, and bad, ideas are born this way. We are aware that leaders are, in fact, put in place to lead. They have the right to propose legislation and policy that addresses their personal opinions and preferences. With the right to leadership, however, come responsibilities. Those responsibilities and duties extend beyond loyalty to self when the interests of the all others in the Commonwealth are at stake.

The proposed move to eliminate the Social Studies certificate and replace it with the Citizenship Education and Social Sciences certificates is a clear example of personal interest being misdirected and misapplied. Little meaningful opportunity was given for those in the field to contribute to the decision-making process. When advice was given, it regularly was

discounted and ignored. All of this is not meant to suggest any dishonesty, for the men seem to be true believers in their cause. Neither can any literal violation of procedural requirements be made because information to determine that was not clear and forthcoming. Certainly, the State Board of Education did approve the new guidelines, for whatever reasons, over the objections of many of us who opposed them.

It is PAC-TE's position that this change is greatly to the disadvantage of the current and future teachers, administrators, and school board members of the Commonwealth. More important, it decidedly is not in the interest of the students, parents, and citizens of Pennsylvania. It is a shortsighted decision based on ideological differences of opinion. All sides did not receive an equal opportunity to influence the course of the decision-making process. At times, contributions to it simply were blocked.

With this, you will find my chronological summary of key developments in this debate. If you sense a feeling of concern, frustration, and even anger expressed there and in the other exhibits I have included, you indeed have captured its or their spirit. This is not how such important changes were meant to be made. PAC-TE is hopeful that you will agree.

Sincerely,



Terry W. Blue, Ph.D.
President, PAC-TE

Enclosures:

- Chronological Summary
- September 7, 2000 e-mail
- November 16, 2000 testimony to State Board
- November 17, 2000 letter to Karl Girton
- December 22, 2000 letter to Karl Girton
- Summary and analysis of Social Studies in other states
- Letter to Frank Meehan from Social Sciences focus group
- March 8, 2002 public comments to State Board

A chronology of developments leading to the demise of the Social Studies certificate and the birth of the twins - Citizenship Education and Social Sciences
Terry W. Blue, Elizabethtown College

Note: This is my personal record of developments associated with the Social Studies changes. I put it together as part of my preparation for a presentation on October 10, 2002 at the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies conference in Allentown. It is as complete as I can recreate it from scattered notes, e-mails, papers, and the like that I can gather at this time. I was very difficult, if not impossible, to find records of PDE requests for testimony at hearings on this issue because clear notice seldom was given in a form that practicing teachers and teacher educators could access.

January, 1999 -- Chapter 4 was passed into law, and it lists "Social Studies" and includes the four sub-headings of the Academic Standards

May 10, 1999 - Drafts of the history, civics and government, economics, and geography standards were sent to the State Board.

January 19, 2000 - Another draft of these standards was sent to the State Board.

March 10, 2000 - PDE distributed the products of the 1999 focus groups that reviewed the proposed Professional Education Program Approval Guidelines. These included the Social Studies certificate that included history, civics and government, economics, geography, sociology, anthropology, and psychology. The deadline for public response was set as May 1, 2000.

March 14, 2000 - The first draft of the Professional Education Program Approval Guidelines was shared with the State Board. Reactions and responses were requested by November 1, 2000. Social Studies was the only certificate area included (Citizenship Education and Social Sciences were not included).

May 25, 2000 - A hearing on the history, civics and government, economics, and geography standards was held in Hershey. When they asked for reconsideration of the separate standards in favor of common social studies standards, attendees were told that it was too late to develop generic social studies standards. They were informed that this decision already was made and was irreversible.

August 21, 2000 - A second draft of the Professional Education Program Approval Guidelines was released. All seven disciplines were still included. Social Studies and Citizenship Education were both included. Responses were requested by November 1, 2000.

September 2000 - The final version of the history standards were to be to the State Board by this meeting. Members of PAC-TE began a more serious communication with each other on the issue. (See attached e-mail from Horst von Dorpowski.)

September 7, 2000 - e-mail from Frank Meehan - "The Citizenship Education draft came out of a focus group chaired by David Saxe." "There's a long story on why it was not circulated with earlier drafts. I would prefer not to discuss the story at this time."

September 14, 2000 - In public comments at the State Board meeting, I inquired about work on the Guidelines and asked if Citizenship Education is a new certificate. As usual, no response was offered to my question.

November 2, 2000 - e-mail from "a little bird" at PDE - "The Secretary has agreed with Dr. Saxe to phase out Social Studies and replace it with Citizenship Education."

November 2 - e-mail from PAC-TE member regarding the rumor that most State Board members have no real knowledge of any of this. "Board members report that it has not been shared with them prior to the November meeting."

Nov 2, 2000 - e-mail from Peter Garland. "He (Peter) was not planning to put the Guidelines on the November State Board agenda."

November 8, 2000 - The third draft of the Professional Education Program Approval Guidelines was released. Reactions were requested but no due date was set. Social Studies was dropped. Citizenship Education was retained. Social Sciences was added. The Guidelines were sent to the State Board at its November 15 meeting. Some of the language in the Elementary and Early Childhood Education guidelines was changed to match other parts of the document. In the Early Childhood certificate guidelines, references to Social Studies were changed to Citizenship Education. For Elementary Education, the Social Studies section was changed to two sections, one under Citizenship Education and one under Social Sciences.

November 13, 2000 - e-mail from Ruth Stas, president of the Middle States Council for the Social Studies, to John Butzow, president of PAC-TE. Would John or someone from PAC-TE read a letter from her to the State Board at its meeting? I offered to do so and did.

November 13, 2000 - memo from Peter Garland to John Butzow. He (Peter) just found out that the Guidelines would be on the November agenda.

November 14, 2000 - e-mail from PAC-TE member regarding three specific State Board members. They didn't know when or if the Guidelines would be considered at this meeting.

November 15 & 16 - State Board meeting. The third draft of the Professional Education Program Approval Guidelines is shared with the State Board. At the close of my testimony at that meeting, Jim Gallagher appointed Karl Girton to head a sub-committee to look into the Social Studies/Citizenship Education issue. (See attached copy of my testimony.)

November 17, 2000 - At his request, I sent a one-page summary of the points made at the State Board meeting to Karl Girton. (See attached copy of this letter.)

December 20, 2000 - The State Board of Education Committee on Social Studies held its first (and last) meeting. Present were: Karl Girton, Dick Bunn, Helen Caffrey, Connie Davis, David Saxe, Richard Hupper, Peter Garland (all representing the State Board) Frank Meehan and George Shevlin (PDE), Tom Gentzels (PSBA), Stinson Stroup (PASA), Bill Murray (PCSS), and me. Ruth Stas, Horst von Dorpowski, and Bruce Gersink were invited but couldn't attend. They sent letters that were shared. At the close of the meeting, plans were made to meet again on January 10 or 11.

December 22, 2000 - I sent a letter to Karl Girton reporting my research and comments regarding the previous day's meeting and discussion. (See attached copy of this letter and research.)

January 10, 2001 - The committee commissioned to provide program guidelines for Social Sciences met and decided it would be "professionally irresponsible to undertake the task of developing standards for Social Sciences when the validity of the certification area is in question" for five reasons it enumerated in their letter to Frank Meehan. The members of the committee volunteered to participate in a future focus group that would examine and strengthen the existing integrated, comprehensive Social Studies certificate. (See attached copy of the group's letter.)

January 12, 2000 - John Butzow sent a letter to Jess Stairs asking for the House Education Committee to review this.

January 17 & 18, 2001 - State Board meeting. No mention of the State Board's social studies committee that met on December 20, 2000 was made, even though I asked about it in public comments. Karl Girton saw me after the meeting and told me that he was told to forget about it. Neither was there any acknowledgement that the committee that met on January 10, 2001 to develop program guidelines for Social Sciences refused to agree to the plan to implement a Social Sciences certificate.

March 14 & 15, 2001 or May 9 & 10, 2001 -- State Board meeting. The Professional Education Program Approval Guidelines were adopted by the Board.

September 18, 2001—The implementation plans for the two new certificates were announced. A paper interim review was to be completed when regular program review was not imminent. No Social Studies certificates will be awarded after September of 2004.

March 8, 2002 - I made some "sour grapes" comments on this whole process (or lack of one) at this month's State Board meeting. (See attached copy of this testimony.)

October 10, 2002 - Along with three others, I made a presentation on the change to the two separate certificates from the current Social Studies certificate at the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies conference in Allentown. Virtually none of the inservice Social Studies teachers and supervisors present at that session knew anything about the change. They were appalled to learn of it.

November 21, 2002 - The Independent Regulatory Review Commission is scheduled to decide upon the final form of the Citizenship Education and Social Sciences certificates.

Terry Blue

From: Horst von Dorpowski <horstv@psu.edu>
To: <mjmdupuis@aol.com>; <bluetw@acad.etown.edu>
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2000 12:31 PM
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Pa. Guidelines/Standards for each Certificate Area

Mary and Terry, I just realized that when I cc'd Ranny below, I just have also cc'd both of you. Sorry !

Date: Thu, 07 Sep 2000 14:53:26 +0000
To: jflynn@edinboro.edu,jwbutzow@grove.iup.edu
From: Horst von Dorpowski <horstv@psu.edu>
Subject: Proposed Pa. Guidelines/Standards for each Certificate Area
Cc: rsingiser@aol.com,rls28@psu.edu

Greetings to each of you !... As you know, the above-referenced standards have now been released electronically, and one of my major puzzlements, which I'm also finding among colleagues, is that in addition to the standards for **Social Studies**, there is now also a new, proposed certificate area named "*Citizenship Education*." (Mind you, it has not yet gone through the PDE-internal process by which new certificates are 'born' and approved, but one way to start that process, I guess, is to develop standards.)

I believe that this new development could easily escape the notice of many of our colleagues, even those in the Social Studies area, because we tend to look for our own disciplines in that electronic directory.

Therefore, I'm wondering what *your* reaction is to this superfluous certificate area, and believe that PAC-TE should express itself on this issue to Clifton Edwards, who's receiving any input about these standards. As PAC-TE expresses itself on this, you might cc your PAC-TE Listserv, inviting others to express their opinions as well, hopefully patterned after the PAC-TE input.

Below follow the PDE URL for these proposed standards, and then excerpts of a statement on this matter I received today, interwoven with some of my own comments. I'm suggesting that PAC-TE's statement could be patterned after the one below.

Thanks for your attention to this important matter. If you'd like to discuss the background on this, I'll be glad to do so.

The new PDE Draft Guidelines for Professional Educators are now on-line at

www.pde.psu.edu/certification/draftguide.pdf

and comments are being solicited. The document runs 146 pages, but is well demarcated using the alphabetical listing. Social Studies runs about 3 pages (85-87) and seems reasonably well done, seeming to incorporate the kind of program most teacher training institutions have or should have in Pennsylvania. What you might not notice is an entirely new proposed certification area entitled "*Citizenship Education*" which is very duplicative of Social Studies demands, except that it specifically *drops* the behavioral sciences portion (anthropology, psychology, sociology) and ties to the PA Academic Standards in history, geography, civics and government, and economics, two of which do not exist as of yet.

The immediate response one has to this is " Why this proposed, new Citizenship Education certificate ?" Could it be an attempt to not only duplicate, but, ultimately to eliminate the social studies in PA teacher training institutions and high schools. Because there are no developed standadars for the behavioral sciences,some seem to see this as an opportunity to impose their view of social sciences and history on the state, in direct opposition to the concept and practice of social studies. If this is so, you will find this disturbing at the least, but look at some of the obvious problems: The "certificate" carries no portability; nowhere else is there such a certificate. The students of Pennsylvania will be certified for essentially nothingapplicable. elsewhere. The redundancy with social studies is obvious. There is probably no high school in Pennsylvania that does not teach at least one of the behavioral science courses, and many are some of the most popular course offerings, yet this plan would eventually render those courses meaningless as social studies courses and make them electives, unable to be used for graduation credit in "Citizenship Education". Of course, there's also the testing matter, in that a new test for Citizenship Education would have to be developed. Never mind the likelihood that IHEs now offering Social Studies certification, would hardly be interested in stretching their limited resources even further by offering a program that, in many respects duplicates the existing Social Studies program.

So, this clearly seems to be a flawed, duplicative, superfluous initiative, and the PDE needs to hear this 'from the field.'

Please do what you can to make this proposed action known and encourage readers to contact Cliff Edwards at PDE (cedwards@state.pa.us) with comments expressing your reaction.

Note that the PDE deadline for input is Nov. 1, 2000

Horst von Dorpowski, Assistant Dean
College of Education, Penn State University
278 Chambers Bldg., University Park, Pa. 16802-3206
Ph: 814 865 2524 Fax: 814 865 0555 <http://www.ed.psu.edu>

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION: CELEBRATING OVER 75 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE !

Testimony delivered at Pennsylvania State Board of Education Meeting
November 16, 2000

My name is Terry Blue. I'm the chair of the Education department at Elizabethtown College. I have been asked by the officers and Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Teacher Educators to speak for them this morning on two issues. I am pleased and privileged to do so.

As you all know, Chapter 354 was published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin on October 7, 2000. The procedures and issues we worked with so long now officially have a legal life of their own. The final form of these was no real surprise to many of us because we had been intimately involved in the developments that led to it. That is, there were no surprises in the language that we encountered on October 7. There still was uncertainty, however, regarding interpretations of the procedures presented in the Chapter.

As you may not know, PACTE's annual meeting was held in Grantville from October 25 through October 27. It was at this meeting that representatives of the Bureau of Teacher Certification and Preparation joined us to try to explain how the new requirements would be implemented. The openness and sensitivity of these persons from the Bureau cannot be commended too much. It was clear that they shared our confusion. They were caught up in the same problem that we had - trying to move from what we prefer to think of as well-intentioned motives to the practical application of a less than convenient or straightforward implementation plan. That is, many practical issues remained to be decided within the legal constraints of the Chapter. They could have been decided by departmental fiat. Instead, members of the Bureau offered their preliminary plan for moving to the new requirements and then solicited questions and concerns from those in attendance, at that time and via e-mail and phone, that would be used to design a strategy for implementation that all could understand and work with. Again, their openness and sensitivity were greatly appreciated.

Those of us in teacher education, in what you probably have figured out by now is our own strange way, had been looking forward to the publication of Chapter 354. Our professional and institutional lives had been put on hold a number of times in recent years because of delays in passing Chapters 49 and 354 and because the regular program approval process had been brought to a halt because of these deliberations. In the meantime, much was changing in the context in which we worked. Testing frenzy, teacher shortages, continuing societal changes, and the general criticism of all things educational are some examples of that. We were ready to move on with our chosen work. The passage of Chapter 354 was one less barrier to that, even if all elements of it would not have found their place on our wish lists.

Life is never totally filled with good news, though. The three weeks since our meetings in Grantville have been busy ones. Those of us in positions of leadership in schools, colleges, and departments of Education have had to be the messengers of change to our institution's administrative leaders, to colleagues in our and other departments, to curriculum committees, to records offices, to program support staff, and, most of all, to our students and their families. We have tried to explain the new programmatic and GPA requirements of Chapter 354. That was the easy part, even if it wasn't

always warmly received by all. We also had to try to explain the implementation plan for the new requirements. If the gradual steps toward the eventual 3.0 standard were meant to ease the transition, they turned out to have an opposite effect. Many could not understand why changes in requirements were necessary and even possible in programs students had already begun under other specifications. They had no trouble understanding that the change has a sound legal base. They did have difficulty comprehending why anyone would want to complicate things so greatly in the process of applying the new requirements. They wanted to know why the changes couldn't have started with the class entering next year, even if it meant insisting on a 3.0 GPA throughout their entire program.

The meetings with other departments have been and still are being scheduled. Copy of proposed revisions for curriculum committees is being prepared. Plans for tracking students whose identity and requirements are determined by their date of entry into a program and not their class standing are being developed by those charged with that task. Visits to our offices by students caught in the middle of the sudden changes are increasing in number, as are the phone calls from parents concerned about their son's or daughter's future.

We will work our way through all of this. You should be aware, though, that small decisions can have significant impact. We'll be reminded of it every day for some time to come.

A second issue warrants comment at this time. At yesterday's Council of Higher Education meeting, Deputy Secretary Shevlin described the process that led to the development of the professional education program approval guidelines. As part of that presentation, he announced the changes related to what now is the social studies certificate area. If you don't already know, that plan is to discontinue the Social Studies certificate and replace it with two separate certificates - one in Citizenship Education and one in Social Sciences.

We have many concerns regarding this.

We are unconvinced that the full process of review was followed for each of these certificates. The Social Sciences guidelines weren't even a part of the August 2000 draft, the latest one until the November 2000 version was released recently. By the way, the Social Studies guidelines were part of the August draft, but now are gone.

We are concerned that the new Citizenship Education certificate will not serve the basic schools of Pennsylvania well in light of their (the schools') varied offerings in all of the social sciences and humanities. We are concerned that our students will be forced to complete both certificates in order to be hired both within and beyond the state boundaries. We have not determined whether this can be accomplished in the four year term set by Chapter 354.

As hinted at above, we are concerned that reciprocity among states will be confused regarding this certification area. Many of us have large numbers of students with interest in teaching in other states. In a time of national teacher shortage, we would like to encourage, not restrict reciprocity.

We are concerned that Pennsylvania Academic Standards, described yesterday as the prime motivating force for this change, are not currently available for all discipline areas included in

these two certificates. To the best of my knowledge, they aren't even planned for some of the content areas.

Finally, we are concerned that the changes at the secondary level only signal the need for closer attention to the social studies component at the elementary level, especially for the primary grades where neither the pattern followed in the Citizenship Education guidelines nor the Pennsylvania Academic Standards seems to inform teaching well.

We are asking the Board to give some attention to this matter, even though we understand that the Guidelines may be and probably will be advanced without your approval.

Those of us in PAC-TE remain ready to be of assistance in any of the existing and new initiatives you have chosen. I hope you all know that you may call on us at any time.

Thank you.



Elizabethtown College

November 17, 2000

Mr. Karl R. Girton
P.O. Box 200
Millville, PA 17846

Dear Karl,

At your request, I am providing a summary of the major issues PAC-TE sees as part of the proposed change in social studies education requirements for certification in Pennsylvania. Our concerns include:

1. The Citizenship Education certificate was a late addition to the lengthy review process that was to lead to the definition of the new Professional Education Program Approval Guidelines. It first appeared in a form that others could react and respond to in late August of this year. At that time, Social Studies still was included among the certificates, causing many questions about the new Citizenship Education certificate and its purpose. The November draft of the Guidelines showed that Social Studies was eliminated altogether. A new certificate, Social Sciences, which to the best of our knowledge never went through any of the review process, was added as a second certificate to help cover social studies teaching in the Commonwealth. We are concerned that the full review process was not followed for either of these certificates. We are even more disturbed by what this seems to signify.
2. We are not convinced that the new Citizenship Education certificate will serve the needs of the basic schools of Pennsylvania well. The curriculum organization that is social studies education has been dominant in Pennsylvania and the United States since the turn of the previous century, and there is no movement to change that. The curriculum standards of the National Council for the Social Studies fully make clear that citizenship education is the dominant emphasis in such teaching, but they also indicate that the other content areas are critical to a full understanding of the social sciences and their impact on human life. The curriculum offerings of all schools, K-12, are geared to follow this organization. A change in Pennsylvania will do nothing to modify that pattern. Instead, it will put us at odds with all others who have considered this issue thoughtfully.
3. Related to number 2 above, are the problems this change would cause in staffing schools of the Commonwealth, on one hand, and in providing opportunities for teachers prepared in Pennsylvania to seek employment in other states. The new certificates complicate the former. They will only make it more difficult for school districts to hire teachers who can meet their current and changing needs. The latter is a concern to those of us who attract and prepare certification candidates who plan to teach in other states. The change will only confuse the reciprocity agreements already in place.
4. As stated in my oral testimony on Thursday, we also are concerned that the Pennsylvania Academic Standards, described by Deputy Secretary Shevlin as the motivating force for this change, currently are not available for all disciplines included in these two certificates. Neither, do we think that there are plans in place to develop standards for some of the content areas, especially those of the Social Sciences certificate.

I hope the above are helpful to you. My colleagues and I remain willing to be of whatever assistance we can be as you explore this important issue.

Sincerely,

Terry W. Blue, Ph.D.
Chair, Education



Elizabethtown College

December 22, 2000

Mr. Karl R. Girton
P.O. Box 200
Millville, PA 17846

Dear Karl,

I spent some time today thinking about and working on the Social Studies/Citizenship Education debate. I ended up with a modest study and some recommendations. I thought I would share them with you.

I want to thank you for arranging and leading the meeting on Wednesday. I thought it was very valuable and informative. More important, it gave all an opportunity to talk and hear. It will be interesting to see what comes of it all.

Please enjoy the holiday season and have a healthy and happy start to the new year.

Sincerely,

Terry W. Blue, Ph.D.
Chair, Education

State	Certificate(s)	Praxis Test Required Y=yes; N=no	Name of Required Praxis Test (see code key at bottom)	Information from Praxis Registration booklet	Information from State web page
Arkansas	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSAE	X	
Connecticut	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK	X	
Georgia	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSIM	X	
Hawaii	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSP	X	
Indiana	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK	X	
Kentucky	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSIM	X	
Louisiana	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSIM	X	
Maryland	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSP	X	
Mississippi	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK	X	
Missouri	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK	X	
New Hampshire	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSAE	X	
Nevada	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSAE	X	
New Jersey	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK	X	
North Carolina	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSP	X	
Ohio	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK	X	
Oregon	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSAE SSIM	X	
Pennsylvania	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK	X	
South Carolina	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSIM	X	
Virginia	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK	X	
Washington, DC	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK SSP	X	
West Virginia	Social Studies	Yes	SSCK	X	
Colorado	Social Studies	No	None		X
Delaware	Social Studies	No	None		X
Maine	Social Studies	No	None		X
Minnesota	Social Studies	No	None		X
Montana	Social Studies	No	None		X
New Mexico	Social Studies	No	None		X
New York	Social Studies	No	None		X
California	Social Science	Yes	SSAE SSIM	X	
Florida	Social Science	Yes	SSCK	X	
Kentucky	Social Studies Economics Econ-Sociology Geography History Hist-Pol.Science Political Science Psychology Sociology	Yes	All take SSCK and SSIM	X	

Maryland	Social Studies History Geography Political Science	Yes	All take SSCK and SSP	X	
Nevada	Social Studies History Psychology	Yes	World & US Hist Psychology	X	
North Carolina	Social Studies Geography History Political Science Sociology	Yes	All take SSCK and SSP	X	
South Carolina	Social Studies Economics Geography Government History Psychology	Yes	SSCK & SSIM SSCK & SSIM SSCK & SSIM SSCK & SSIM Psychology	X	
Tennessee	Geography History Psychology	Yes	Geography World & US Hist Psychology	X	
Alabama	History Geography Political Science	No	None		X
Alaska	Social Studies History	No	None		X
Arizona	Social Studies Economics Geography History Political Science	No	None		X
Massachusetts	Social Studies History	No	None		X
Washington	Social Studies History	No	None		X
Idaho	Generalist with Endorsement?	No	None		X
Illinois	Generalist with Endorsement?	No	None		X
Michigan	Generalist with Endorsement?	No	None		X
North Dakota	Generalist with Endorsement?	No	None		X
South Dakota	Generalist with Endorsement?	No	None		X
Wyoming	Generalist with Endorsement?	No	None		X
Nebraska	Unknown	No	None		X
Rhode Island	Unknown	No	None		X
Texas	Unknown	No	None		X
Iowa	Unknown	No	None		X

SSCK = Social Studies: Content Knowledge
SSIM = Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials
SSAE = Social Studies: Analytical Essays
SSP = Social Studies: Pedagogy

Summary and Analysis of the Data

Fairly dependable data was found for 41 of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia from the 2000-2001 Praxis Registration Bulletin and the better of the states' web pages. There's no good reason not to think that the other states would be comparable to those where information was available.

29 of the 41 states labeled their certification area "Social Studies". Two used the label "Social Science". Nine of the states had a "Social Studies" certification, but also had one or more separate discipline certifications as well. Only two states had separate subject certification only (no comprehensive social studies certification).

The Praxis Social Studies: Content Knowledge test was by far the most popular instrument used to measure one's qualification for a teaching role. 26 of 29 states with Praxis tests used this exam. The description provided by ETS for the test gives the following distribution of content

U.S. history	22%
World history	22%
Government, political science, & civics	16%
Geography	15%
Economics	15%
Behavioral Sciences (Sociology, anthropology, and psychology)	10%

Eight states used the Praxis Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials test as part of their evaluation process. It always was used with some other test, usually the Social Studies: Content Knowledge exam. The Interpretation of Materials test consists of five two-part questions that are interdisciplinary in nature. One each is largely based on U.S. history, world history, geography, economics, and government, political science, and civics.

Six states employ the Social Studies: Pedagogy test as part of their required evaluations. In every case it is used with the Social Studies: Content Knowledge exam. The description by ETS of this test is that it consists of two case studies. One emphasizes U.S. or world history while the other stresses geography, economics, or government, political science, and civics.

Five states have adopted the Social Studies: Analytical Essays exam. In all but one instance, it too is used with the Social Studies: Content Knowledge test. ETS offers that this test consists of two questions that are interdisciplinary in nature. Each question draws upon at least two of the following: U.S. history, world history, geography, economics, and government, political science, and civics. Questions may include material from sociology, anthropology, and/or psychology.

Other Praxis tests are used by three states. These are World and U.S. History, Psychology, and Geography.

ETS currently has the above tests available, plus exams dealing with Economics, Sociology, and Government and Political Science. The Social Studies: Content Knowledge test is of two hours duration. The other three Social Studies tests are one hour long. All of the separate subject tests are two hours in length. The two hour test fee is \$70 and the one hour test charge is \$55. The registration fee for each testing experience is an additional \$35.

If a Social Sciences certificate is adopted for Pennsylvania, it is clear that none of the general social studies tests would match its intended design well. The Sociology exam comes the closest but would only measure a part of the preparation.

The Citizenship Education certificate clearly would stand out as unusual on the list of certificates for treating social studies content. No state examined for this modest study has used this terminology. It's not likely to be found among the ten that were not available. This will do little to facilitate reciprocity with other states. The design of this certificate would not allow the state to use the most popular of the evaluation tools, the Social Studies: Content Knowledge test, to evaluate certification candidates. To do so would be unfair since that test includes content from sociology, anthropology, and psychology. This same problem applies to the Social Studies: Analytical Essay exam. This leaves the Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials and Social Studies: Pedagogy exams among the currently available offerings. The former does seem to be a test of content in the Citizenship Education discipline areas. The latter has much less to do with the heavy emphasis on content. Each of these tests is a one-hour exam, and each therefore is less comprehensive than the Content Knowledge exam.

It would be possible to require students to take and pass the World and U.S. History, the Geography, the Government and Political Science, and the Economics tests. This would be eight hours of testing at a significant cost. The remaining choice is to commission ETS to develop a separate Citizenship Education test for Pennsylvania's test takers. The folks at ETS probably would be delighted to do so, both to reap the profits of that effort and to collect double payments from students who needed to take the Pennsylvania test and the test they must have to transfer their certification to another state, should that be their desire.

It is clear that the Praxis tests do mean something to students. At the very least, they mean the difference between moving into their intended professional life or not. Whether it is reasonable and defensible or not, the Praxis tests are a major determinant of success both for pre-service teachers and now for the institutions from which they graduate. Title II has made sure that the blame, if there is any, will be shared.

Those who participate in the writing of program specific guidelines, the selecting of appropriate Praxis tests, and the setting of passing scores on such tests must assume some of the responsibility as well. Great care must be exercised in making adjustments to the Social Studies configuration. A change that could be based more on politics and public relations than pedagogy is not what the schools, school boards, administrators, teachers, and children of the Commonwealth need. It contributes little, if anything, that is positive to the schools, colleges, and departments of Education of Pennsylvania. It only further complicates the lives of the students who are completing teacher education programs.

If it is critical to match the program specific guidelines to the Pennsylvania Academic Standards that have been and likely will be approved in the social science and humanities areas covered by "Social Studies", then some compromise should be made. It is possible that social studies education students currently are completing programs that devote less time than they could to the four featured Standards areas. They usually do this by choice, knowing that concentrating in psychology or sociology, for example, will limit their job market even more and increase the risk of not reaching a passing score on a Praxis exam dominated by history. They take this chance because they love this content and are willing to find a place where a social studies department chair or building principal needs their particular collection of knowledge and skills.

While it seems unfair to such students, a compromise could be to revise the Social Studies guidelines in such a way to make clear that content emphasis should be directed to history, geography, economics, and civics and government. This could be done following the model that now appears in the Elementary Education guidelines. That is, separate sections on citizenship and social sciences education recently were written into those guidelines to make the previous passage on social studies now match the plan to have two separate certificates. That combining of Citizenship Education and Social Sciences could be handled the same way at the secondary level. The "Knowing the Content" elements of the two certificates could be combined, suggesting clearly that social studies instruction in our schools is an interdisciplinary activity. The difference between this and the current Social Studies certificate would be that it would be necessary for students' programs to give the preponderance of the preparation to coursework in the four areas stated in the current Citizenship Education guidelines. The section introducing the Social Sciences content should emphasize its role in supporting and enriching the other work in the overall certificate program and not in being the central focus of one's study (unless that is done in addition to meeting the Citizenship Education goals).

Such a move also would make it possible to retain the Social Studies: Content Knowledge exam as the Praxis test of choice for Pennsylvania – as it is in so many other states. As a matter of fact, the percentage of questions in each content area might serve as a source of realistic guidance for program design.

For this to work, a flaw already in the Citizenship Education guidelines should be corrected. Applying the notion of a single subject major to English or Biology does work. It still doesn't work for social studies content, whether one calls it Citizenship Education or whatever. One cannot complete a full major in one of the four areas, do "significant collateral work in the three remaining content areas", complete the institution's general education program, do a bit of exploring and enriching, and still graduate within four years or with a credit total reflective of four years of regular full-time work. Requiring this is equivalent to mandating a program that runs deeply into a fifth year, something that violates the spirit and letter of the law in Chapter 354. This can and should be changed. A draft of how it might be changed follows, based on what already is in place in the Citizenship and Social Sciences guidelines:

Social Studies

I. Knowing the Content

The professional education program provides evidence that each Social Studies certification candidate completes a program of courses and required electives designed in such a manner to significantly cover the content areas of the certificate as described in these guidelines. The program shall require each certification candidate to complete specially designed concentrations in two of the four following areas: history, geography, civics and government, or economics. Certification candidates also should complete a concentration in anthropology, sociology, or psychology, or they should complete an additional concentration in one of the two remaining previous areas. Significant collateral course work should be completed in the other remaining content areas as necessary for required teacher examinations. This program shall require the candidates to demonstrate the competencies necessary to teach Pennsylvania Academic Standards grades 7-12 for history, geography, civics and government, and economics and to teach behavioral science courses in areas of concentration.

I.A. through I.D. would be included here from the Citizenship Education guidelines. I.A. through I.C. of the Social Sciences guidelines would be added to them as I.E through I.G. I.D. of the Social Sciences guidelines (Archeology) would be deleted.

II. Performances

This section could be included either in the form used currently for Citizenship Education (with small addition of language calling attention to the behavioral sciences) or in the form used for Social Sciences Education (adding mention of the Pennsylvania Academic Standards).

III. Professionalism

Again, either the content from the Citizenship Education or Social Sciences guidelines could be used here.

It seems clear that school boards and administrators are anxious to retain the flexibility they need to staff their schools with the best teachers available within the constraints that supply, practicality, and funding place on them. The current Social Studies certificate has helped them meet their needs for teachers well prepared to teach history, economics, political science, and geography, the heart of the secondary curriculum. At the same time, it has allowed them carefully to select individuals who are well prepared to offer elective courses in psychology, sociology, and anthropology and to enrich middle school a educational experiences. We can retain that flexibility while still strengthening the preparation of our certification candidates by "tightening up" the content guidelines for social studies. And, while doing that, we can link preparation even more closely with the written Pennsylvania Academic Standards and with those that should be developed someday for anthropology, psychology, and sociology.

Frank Meehan, Director
Bureau of Teacher Certification and Preparation
Department of Education
333 Market St.
Harrisburg, PA 19126-0333

January 10, 2001

Dear Mr. Meehan:

The committee commissioned to provide program guidelines for Social Sciences will not be providing a report that enumerates content in the disciplines identified in the Draft for the following reasons:

- The proposed segmentation between Citizenship Education and Social Sciences devalues the social sciences and pragmatically eliminates their viability as a certification area.
- The separation of the Social Sciences and Citizenship Education Certification is contrary to the overall integration of Social Studies disciplines.
- Most of the members of the committee were brought to the meeting without an understanding that they were to provide content for a separate Social Science certification program.

Thus, we feel it is professionally irresponsible to undertake the task of developing standards for Social Sciences when the viability of the certification area is in question for the following reasons:

- The division of Social Studies into two separate certification areas would create socio-economic inequity, where only the most affluent districts could afford to employ someone certified only in Social Sciences.
- Practically, there would be very few positions available, which would result in few students opting to obtain certification in the Social Sciences.
- There would be limited opportunities for student teaching in the areas of Social Science certification.
- The portability of certifications to other states in both Citizenship Education and Social Sciences would be extremely limited.
- Dual certification in both areas could not be completed in four years, thereby rendering it incompatible with current Chapter 354 regulations.

We appreciate your invitation to discuss these issues and recognize the importance of structuring improved standards for the preparation of teachers of Social Studies; therefore, all of the members of the committee are willing to participate in a future focus group that would examine and strengthen the existing integrated, comprehensive Social Studies certification program.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Cross

Anthony Glascock

William Starsinic

Jerry McMullen

James R. Flynn

Diane C. McCusker

Steven Warfel

C: Eugene Hickock, Secretary of Education
James Gallagher, President, State Board of Education
James Rhoads, Chair, PA Senate Education Committee
Jess Stairs, Chair, PA House Education Committee

Comments on History, Civics and Government, Economics, and Geography Standards
Prepared for the Pennsylvania State Board of Education
March 8, 2002

Prepared by Terry W. Blue, Ph.D.
Chair, Education Department
Elizabethtown College
One Alpha Drive
Elizabethtown, PA 17022-2298

I feel a bit like a vanquished warrior as I offer the following written remarks. That is, I was among the group that worked hard to redirect and redesign the academic standards related to the teaching of the various social sciences and humanities included in the social studies area. Along with virtually all others with whom I have talked and worked, I favored a set of interdisciplinary standards for the real world teaching field of social studies that would best serve the needs of the majority of teachers interacting with students in this area, one that is taught at all grade levels in all schools across the Commonwealth. Further, all of us favored the retention of the Social Studies certificate for secondary schools because it retained that interdisciplinary focus. Both of these powerful tools have been denied to us.

The standards that were being developed for the social sciences during the earlier discussions, essentially the standards you have before you today, displayed a different orientation from the one my colleagues and I would favor. They were individual subject specific standards for four of the areas included under the social studies label. They gave at least the sense of compartmentalizing and isolating each area in an effort to list key concepts and facts. The Economics, Geography, and Civics and Government standards, I must confess, did a good job of identifying a fairly extensive list of important understandings and concepts. The History standards, while they shared this same structure, also contained long lists of specific facts that seemed to turn the standards into a detailed outline for one studying for a trivia game.

The problem with the new standards, though, was not in their individual quality. Instead, it was in the vision that they offered for social studies instruction in Pennsylvania. While they detailed what should be done in each area, they did little to inform teachers on how this extensive body of social science and humanities content could be organized into an effective program that meets the needs of students living in a modern and ever-changing world. Such a structure was available in the National Council for the Social Studies' Expectations for Excellence, their Curriculum Standards for Social Studies. It detailed ten thematic strands describing what students should know, value, and be able to do if they were to be well-informed and effective participants in our democracy. They emphasized the inter-relationship of the social sciences and humanities routinely grouped under the social studies label. They offered a clear pattern of investigation that emphasized the important content, the critical beliefs, and the basic skills that students need to make sense of what goes on around them in their daily lives.

Again, the four separate and proposed sets of Pennsylvania Academic Standards could have some value. They probably would serve high school teachers reasonably well, especially for elective and specialized honors courses. At least, they could do this for the four areas for which standards have been developed. They wouldn't inform teachers well at all regarding specialized courses in sociology, anthropology, and psychology.

The weakness of the specialized standards is most apparent at the elementary and middle school level where real interdisciplinary social studies courses and teaching have been offered for some time. For these grades, the new standards do little to inform teaching that couldn't be done more effectively and efficiently through interdisciplinary standards and guidelines for instruction such as those promulgated by the National Council for the Social Studies. A key example of this is at the primary level where much content is drawn from sociology, psychology, and anthropology. History, civics and government, economics, and geography certainly have their place there, but they are used as examples to explain the actions of individuals and groups as they struggle to live and work together in the ever-expanding world seen through the eyes of the students. Content for these investigations is drawn from other parts of the curriculum, notably through trade books and other rich resources increasingly available to us, in an effort to integrate and maximize student learning so as to make it meaningful, memorable, and efficient. Students in these primary grades do not have history, political science, economics, and geography courses. Their teachers, especially the good ones and those who can be encouraged to work and think this way, design instruction to get at this content by using the methods of inquiry and content each discipline brings to this general exploration.

Much the same is true at the intermediate and middle school level. There simply isn't time to do all that is important through one specialized course at a time. Issues of interest and importance to students don't come in such convenient packages. They blend together just as all the elements of our lives do. Fourth or eighth graders cannot study the history of the important canal period in Pennsylvania, for example, without considering such concerns as the economic conditions that stimulated the need for transportation across the state, the nature of the land here and the barrier it presented when the canal reached Hollidaysburg, the technology citizens were inspired to develop to get to Johnstown, the immigrant and other groups that played a major part in its construction and operation, the sense of rugged individualism that helped open and settle the new territory, the role of the government and individuals in making the canal possible, and the ideals that the effort exemplified. If teachers need help in pulling all of these related elements together, they will have to move beyond four separate and incomplete sets of standards to get it. On the other hand, they already have a model to follow in the NCSS standards framework. That, in my view and in the view of other teacher educators and teachers I talk and work with, is the preferred and better guide for social studies instruction in the Commonwealth.

It is important for all of us to have goals and ideals toward which to strive. Well-designed standards can be a vehicle for putting those goals into practice. The teachers I see and interact with are interested in improving the learning of their students in any way they can. They have taken the earlier standards seriously both because they believe in their purpose and they are under pressure to conform to them. I visit schools to supervise student teachers and other students in their early field experiences at least two to three days per week. I know what teachers are trying to do to meet the Math and Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening standards. I know how caught up they are in the testing pressures they feel. I see groups of them huddled in corners of

the school working on standards alignment while substitutes try to keep their students moving along toward acceptable test scores. I know how much more of a challenge this is in schools where high poverty demographics work their own special brand of hardship on the students, teachers, and administrators.

All of this reminds me of a grand race where the state government in its various forms is in the driver's seat of the pace car. The teachers are trying their very best to keep up. In the case of social studies instruction, though, they are given a poorly tuned car in which to do so. The teachers and school leaders are traveling as fast as they can, but they are forced to participate in the race from the disadvantage of having to conform to the four sets of standards while developing their own organization for the four curricular areas to make their coverage efficient. Their resources and energy already are stretched thin by their other curricular work and their regular duties. It would be nice if their race car at least came with an engine that would facilitate, not hinder, their efforts. The National Council for the Social Studies Curriculum Standards is such a driving force. The proposed Pennsylvania Academic Standards just add another layer onto what teachers already have to do to meet others' expectations.

I teach a social studies methods class for preservice elementary teachers. As required by law, we have been working with the Pennsylvania Academic Standards for History, Civics and Government, Economics, and Geography, even though they have not been approved officially as yet. At the same time, my course is organized to assist my students in helping their prospective students meet these standards by organizing their work according to the NCSS Standards. I use the NCSS standards because they are the best way I have found to conceptualize and organize the work of an effective social studies educator. I use the Pennsylvania Academic Standards despite the fact that they splinter and at times trivialize the important content, values, and skills important to that same instruction.

We have waited a long time for Social Studies standards in Pennsylvania. We still will be waiting if you approve the proposed History, Civics and Government, Economics, and Geography Academic Standards. What I would propose is that the model put in place for the Language Arts standards be used for Social Studies. That is, one set of standards, not four, should be sent to the field, and it should include important organizational content to show both the interrelatedness of the various social sciences and humanities taught in the Social Studies curriculum and the clear interest of the leaders of the Commonwealth in encouraging the organization of such content in this manner to facilitate student learning.

Other states have done this. The best example probably is the Social Studies Curriculum Framework developed in 1998 by the Connecticut Department of Education. In one page, it summarizes the goals of the program, and in two pages, it lists the most important themes for each of four areas: History, Civics and Government, Geography, and Economics. If the four areas seem familiar, so will the themes. They virtually are identical to those used in the Pennsylvania standards for these areas. The document then goes on to list the performance standards for each of these major themes. It does all of this in 28 pages as compared to the 70 pages needed to present the four separate Pennsylvania Academic Standards.

What is more important is that the preliminary information follows the National Council for the Social Studies thematic structure. It offers the organizing structure for teachers to employ as

they work to align standards with curriculum in an integrated and efficient way. This removes one of the steps teachers must take in order to design effective instructional maps. It is a service to teachers that can only improve their opportunity to use the standards for your stated purposes. The limited time this will require for additional writing and some editing of the current proposed standards will save thousands of hours and much frustration in the field while still allowing teachers and school districts the flexibility and creativity they deserve. Combining the four areas into one coherent document will confirm the need to integrate content in the Social Studies, a lesson that cannot be reinforced too often.

I know you are anxious to move ahead with your plans to approve the proposed four sets of standards in this area and to move on to other items of business. I would ask you to make the work done to date even better by taking just a little more time to pull it together all the more tightly and clearly. As always, my colleagues and I in teacher education will be glad to help in this effort.

Thank you for your attention to this.

EMBARGOED MATERIAL

Central Dauphin School District
South Side Elementary School Primary (Grades K-3)
 4525 Union Deposit Road
 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17111
 (717) 657-3204 Fax (717) 657-9757

Original: 2252

Shane Hotchkiss
 shotchkiss@cddsd.k12.pa.us
 Principal

***** "SUCCESS IS EVERYWHERE AT SOUTH SIDE!" *****

November 20, 2002

Mr. John McGinley, Jr, Chairman
 Independent Regulatory Review Commission
 353 Market Street
 14th Floor
 Harrisburg, PA 17101

Dear Mr. McGinley,

On March 11, 2002 the Elementary Social Studies Committee that represents the Central Dauphin School District submitted comments to the State Board of Education regarding the proposed standards for Civics and Government, Economics, Geography, and History.

We would like to reiterate some of the comments we submitted. Our committee still feels that the standards are too "open for interpretation." Our fear is that this will lead to varying curriculum expectations from school district to school district. We have offered other standard specific comments below:

Standards in History

- We are concerned about the impact of the overall curriculum at the various grade levels and how children from K-6 would understand many of these concepts.
- We are concerned that there are specific examples given for the benchmarks for grades six, nine, and twelve, however, the benchmarks set in grade three have very vague examples.
- We do not like the fact that contemporary religion is included in section 8.2

Standards in Geography

- We feel that using "mental maps" to describe human and physical features of local areas is a difficult concept for primary children.

Standards in Civics and Government

- We feel the following terms should be included in the glossary: framers, direct democracy, representative democracy, limited government, and unlimited government.
- Is it possible to create an "elementary level" glossary for teachers who do not have the experience of working in political science and are not familiar with the terminology?

Standards in Economics

- The expectations of elementary children are extremely demanding. We feel that some of these standards would be extremely difficult to meet in elementary setting.

Our committee is concerned at the amount of material that is expected to be covered in our schools. The following is an example of our concern:

- The **Reading, Writing, and Listening Standards** are condensed into **21 pages**.
- The **Mathematics Standards** are condensed into **29 pages**.
- The **Social Studies Standards** encompass **73 pages**.

Is it possible to condense the four sets of standards in one document? There are several standards that are repeated and could be eliminated from a content strand. With the time constraints facing our educators, how will it be possible to cover all of this material?

On Monday, November 18th, our committee met with the junior high committee from our district. We reviewed all of our concerns with the standards with them and they shared the same concerns. In addition, they felt that they are now deprived of the opportunity to determine which social studies courses are appropriate for the various grade levels. The High School Committee expressed a sincere concern regarding the economic standards and their ability to meet the needs of all students.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our comments and suggestions. If you have any questions for our committee, please direct them to Shane Hotchkiss, Primary Principal, South Side Elementary, 4525 Union Deposit Road, Harrisburg, PA 17111

Respectfully,

*Elementary Social Studies Committee
Central Dauphin School District*

4525 Union Deposit Road
Harrisburg, PA 17111
(717) 857-3204
FAX (717) 214-5171

Shane Hotchkiss
Primary Principal

South Side
Elementary School

NOV 20 02 11:51

EMBARGOED MATERIAL

Fax

To: Mr. John McGinley	From: Shane Hotchkiss
Fax: 783-2664	Pages: 3 (including cover sheet)
Phone:	Date: November 18, 2002
Re: Social Studies Standards	CC:

Urgent
 For Review
 Please Comment
 Please Reply
 Please Recycle

Mr. McGinley,

Please find our comments concerning the proposed Social Studies Standards with this document.

Sincerely,

Shane Hotchkiss
Primary Principal
South Side Elementary

State Board of Education
Regulation #6-275 (2252)
Academic Standards and Assessment for Civics and
Government; Economics; Geography and History

James Buckheit, Acting Executive Director

Signature: *Susan BenKovic*

Date: 11/21/02 9:16 AM