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Another academic year is in full swing and Vanderbilt’s Peabody College is buzzing with new doctoral and professional students and an undergraduate population of over 1200. As always, I am impressed by our students’ intellectual qualifications and even more so by their ambition to have an impact on learners, children and families, and communities of all sizes.

I am glad that they have chosen Vanderbilt as the place to facilitate their own learning and mastery of skills. The Peabody faculty has the capacity to match our students’ desire for accomplishment with its own track record of success in research and publication and with plentiful opportunities for students to engage in close mentoring relationships. During just the last fiscal year, the college secured more than $54 million in external funding for research.

Ideas in Action devotes itself to highlighting a few of these research endeavors. In this issue we take a look at the “gold standard” adopted by the Institute of Education Sciences and the challenge it poses to education researchers. A number of Peabody faculty members have done quite well in securing grants for randomized control trials; as an institution, we are also contributing to building the necessary infrastructure for next-generation research.

Mathematics learning continues to be a prominent theme in the ongoing national dialogue about competitiveness, and this begs questions about teacher preparation and support in this discipline. Members of our faculty in the Departments of Teaching and Learning and Leadership, Policy and Organizations, themselves supported with grants from the National Science Foundation, are examining mathematics teaching from pre-service and induction perspectives.

Finally, two articles in this issue take a look at the difficulties sometimes faced by children and young people as well as the people charged with caring for and educating them. The Peabody Treatment Progress Battery, which debuted this spring, is a new tool available for use by counselors working with troubled youth. Meanwhile, members of our special education faculty are testing an intervention—through a randomized control trial—that focuses on creating more conducive classroom environments for younger students with behavioral problems.

These are just a few highlights drawn from our ongoing work. We look forward to sharing more with you as the 2007-08 year progresses.

With best wishes,

Camilla P. Benbow
Patricia and Rodes Hart Dean of Education and Human Development
Military Base Schools Boost Student Achievement by Supporting Whole Family

The Pentagon is not the first place to which policy makers look for ideas on increasing parental involvement in education, but they should, according to Vanderbilt Peabody professor Claire Smrekar.

Smrekar has found that the high academic achievement of students at military schools has its roots in an approach to education that supports the whole family.

“While some of the elements that lead to these schools’ success are unique to the general structure, safety and discipline of life on a military base, the schools’ approach to putting themselves at the center of family life and reacting to community stressors can and should be replicated outside of the military,” Smrekar said.

“What we found could provide a roadmap for public education systems, even in the era of No Child Left Behind,” she wrote in a report of her findings available on the Teachers College Record Web site, www.tcrecord.org.

Smrekar found that teachers, counselors and administrators at military base schools follow a model that places the schools at the center of family life and takes into account the stresses and changes affecting their students’ families, including the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. The schools maintain high academic benchmarks and are generally small in size, ensuring that no child is overlooked. Specifically:

• The structure of military life on post supports engagement in children’s lives.
• A corporate commitment to schools engenders strong family-school relationships.
• Teachers and school counselors are perceived as caring, committed professionals who support student and family engagement.

The new findings are a follow-up to a 2001 report by Smrekar and her colleagues at the Peabody Center for Education Policy commissioned by the now-dissolved National Education Goals Panel. The earlier report identified several administrative, strategic, budgetary and programmatic factors leading to high student achievement in military base schools.

“The missing piece in the 2001 report was the role that parents, the neighborhoods and military culture play in these students’ success,” Smrekar said. “To understand these issues, we interviewed parents and examined other social factors on military bases.”

Smrekar found that in contrast to the popular image of the close-knit military community, enlisted soldiers’ housing areas were shabby, transitory, subject to crime and lacking the social support of officers’ living areas. The school is the primary place where neighbors in enlisted housing interact.

“Most enlisted members and their spouses reported that if they knew any parents on post, they knew them best from interaction at their children’s school,” Smrekar wrote. “Indeed, more than any other place or program on post, the schools emerged as the most critical institutional support and social sanctuary for families.”

Smrekar conducted the new study at one elementary and one middle school at Fort Campbell, Ky. She interviewed parents with children in the schools who included military truck drivers, Black Hawk helicopter pilots, aviation technicians, truck mechanics, military police officers, drill sergeants, tank and armored vehicle drivers, platoon leaders and commanders, as well as their spouses.

“We found that parents structured and enforced quiet time and space for homework and reinforced the high academic standards at home that are set by teachers at school,” Smrekar said. “Much of the parental involvement takes place in the home.”

Over 102,600 students are currently enrolled in Department of Defense Education Activity schools in the United States and abroad. The students’ parents or caregivers are military personnel who live on military bases. Approximately 40 percent of the DoDEA enrollees are African American or Hispanic.


For more information on Claire Smrekar, visit http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/x5668.xml.

Education Professionals Attend Summer School on Peabody Campus

A host of higher education and K-12 professionals descended on the Vanderbilt Peabody campus in June and July for their own form of summer school, the Peabody Professional Institutes.

“The institutes are an intensive learning experience taught by Vanderbilt faculty and external experts for professional educators, administrators, directors, executives and managers from across the nation and around the world,” said Timothy Caboni, PPI director and Peabody associate dean for external relations and professional education. “This summer’s institutes focused on higher education management, fundraising, charter and independent schools, and academic libraries.” Attendees, who were selected through a competitive application process, came from 32 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Philippines, he said.

New to PPI this summer was a partnership with the state of Tennessee in which 12 Tennessee charter school leaders attended the Charter School Leadership Institute. Institute instructors will conduct follow-up visits to each of the schools to help the leaders implement what they learned.

“This institute gave charter school leaders strategies and tools that they could take back to their schools to improve teaching, learning and administration,” Caboni said. “The focus of all of the institutes is to empower education leaders with the latest research and practice in the field so that they can be more effective when they return to their school or university.”

PPI also partnered with the Institute for Museum and Library Services to make scholarships available for 10 participants of the Academic Library Leadership Institute.

To learn more about the Peabody Professional Institutes, visit peabody.vanderbilt.edu/mpi.xml
College Student Success: It’s More Than Graduation Rates
Ask most faculty, administrators, staff and students if they are interested in helping students succeed in college and the answer is likely to be a resounding yes. Ask them what exactly they mean by student success and the answer will probably be much more muddled.

“Student success is a term you see a lot in the literature – I counted thousands of references to it in peer-reviewed papers over the past 10 years – but it is something that has really defied description,” John M. Braxton, professor of education in the Department of Leadership, Policy and Organizations, said.

To help provide that description, Braxton was commissioned by the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative to write a report on student success and what must be done to promote it. He was one of five scholars selected through a competitive process to present their findings at that organization’s fall conference in Washington, D.C. The cooperative is financed by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Braxton identified eight discrete domains that constitute student success: academic attainment, acquisition of general education, development of academic competence, development of cognitive skills and intellectual dispositions, occupational attainment, preparation for adulthood and citizenship, personal accomplishments, and personal development.

“One of the big conclusions that came out of this delineation is that student success is much more complex than just year-to-year perseverance or graduation rates,” Braxton said.

He does not, however, discount the importance of completing a degree.

“The first area, academic attainment, or graduation, is the portal to the rest of the measures of success,” Braxton said. “If you don’t persist and you don’t graduate, you aren’t as likely to experience these other benefits. You are more likely to see the maximum return on your education if you graduate and persist year to year.”

Although much of a student’s success relies upon his or her own efforts, Braxton argues that both faculty and policymakers play a critical role and that both need to shift their traditional emphasis from lectures and grades to helping students get the full benefits of their time at college.

“Six of the eight domains depend primarily on student course learning. This is where faculty come in – individual faculty members play a direct and highly significant role in fostering student success,” Braxton said. “This is particularly important in aspects of teaching that are distinct from lecturing. Faculty must be motivated to make professional choices to use pedagogically based tools, methods and approaches with their students that go beyond lecturing, and these all require effort, commitment and focus.”

Policymakers also have a role to play in fostering an environment that supports a more comprehensive approach to supporting students’ success, particularly at public universities, Braxton said.

“State policymakers can help ensure that faculty are making the professional choices needed to best serve students by having clear performance expectations,” he said. “Some tools to do this include funding policies linked to student performance, state-funded faculty development seminars and workshops, academic program reviews and more.”

To read Professor Braxton’s commissioned paper and the other papers presented at the fall NPEC symposium, go to nces.ed.gov/npec/symposium.asp.

Policy Center Takes Pulse of Education in Tennessee
The Peabody Center for Education Policy is undertaking an ongoing initiative to generate, share, debate and discuss the latest information on the state of education in Tennessee.

“In keeping with Vanderbilt University and Peabody College’s longstanding commitment to enhancing education in our home state, we’re leading a variety of projects to sharpen the debate about what our students, teachers, administrators and school communities need to thrive,” James Guthrie, center director and professor of public policy and education, said.

Guthrie hopes the poll, to gauge Tennesseans’ attitudes toward education, will be conducted annually.

“Our poll found that Tennesseans do not see education as the paramount public policy issue,” Guthrie said of the December 2006 poll. “Even so, Tennesseans appear to be concerned about their K-12 education system. They do not give it a high grade and they are not sure it is on the right track.

“They are not eager to spend more money on the system, yet they would like teachers to be better paid. And interestingly, a majority blame parents for the state’s education problems,” he continued. “More than anything, this poll points toward a need to increase discussion and insight into education issues in Tennessee. Our goal is to provide research-based information that all interested parties can use to have that discussion and make decisions that benefit our students and our communities.”

Some specific poll findings were:
Education is a second tier issue for Tennessee voters, with 44 percent identifying it as the most important issue among a list of seven. Fifty-four percent said health care is most important.

A majority of Tennesseans believe the state is doing a mediocre to poor job in educating its students, with 60 percent...
Voters blame parents most for education failure, with 71 percent saying parents’ lack of commitment to their children’s education is the primary problem. After parents, voters identified teacher pay (59 percent), students themselves (49 percent) and inadequate state standards (38 percent) as major education problems. (Those polled were able to identify more than one issue as being a problem in their response).

Voters do not necessarily see increasing the state budget as an answer, with 44 percent saying state government should divert money from other resources to fund education improvements. And while 43 percent said new money should be added to the existing education budget, 59 percent opposed raising state or local taxes to increase education spending.

Even with this hesitancy to spend more money, 70 percent stated that teacher pay is too low, and 43 percent said they should be paid “a lot more.”

The poll surveyed 601 Tennesseans who reported voting in the 2006 election. The margin of error was plus or minus 4 points.

Center researchers also presented detailed findings on state education conditions and policy recommendations to the Tennessee State Board of Education in January.

The Peabody Center for Education Policy was founded in 1994 as a research and development agency devoted to understanding and advancing education reform. PCEP has organized national forums and research conferences involving policy-makers, researchers and practitioners. Its research findings have been used to redesign state school funding sys-

---

**Faculty Notes and Honors**

**Timothy C. Caboni** has been promoted to associate dean for external relations and professional education. Caboni also presented “My Early Years in Advancement: What I Wish Someone Had Told Me” at the 2007 CASE District III conference held in Nashville.

**Mark D. Cannon** has been promoted to associate professor of leadership and organizational studies.

**R. Wilburn Clouse**, associate professor of education, presented “Learning in Action! (LIA): A Problem-Based Learning Experience for Developing the Entrepreneurial Spirit” at the national conference of the United States Association of Small Business and Entrepreneurship held in Orlando, Fla. Clouse also presented “The Santa Fe Case: Using the Arts to Redevelop Ghost Towns.”

**David Dickinson**, professor of education, will serve as interim chair of the Department of Teaching and Learning.

**Stephen N. Elliott**, Dunn Family Professor of Educational and Psychological Assessment, has been appointed interim director of Vanderbilt’s Learning Sciences Institute.

**Andrew J. Finch** has been promoted to Assistant Clinical Professor of Human and Organizational Development. Finch also supervises the school counseling track for the master’s program in human development counseling.

**Donna Y. Ford**, Betts Professor of Education and Human Development, was awarded the 2007 Senior Scholar in Gifted Education Award by the American Educational Research Association.

**Douglas H. Fuchs** and **Lynn S. Fuchs**, Nicholas Hobbs Professors of Special Education and Human Development, presented “Responsiveness-To-Intervention as a Means of Providing Early Intervention and More Valid Disability Identification” at the 10th Annual National Technical Assistance Alliance for Parents Centers Conference held in Washington, D.C.

**Ellen B. Goldring**, professor of education policy and leadership, was honored by the American Educational Research Association for her work as co-editor of *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*.

**H. Carl Haywood**, professor of psychology, emeritus, received the Achievement Award of the National Alumni Association of the University of West Georgia in Carrollton, Ga. Haywood was honored for his “professional achievements in improving the human condition for individuals with developmental disabilities.”

**Craig Anne Hefflinger** has been promoted to associate dean for graduate education.

**Carolyn Hughes**, professor of special education, was named the 2007 spring Professor of the Semester by the Vanderbilt Panhellenic Council.

**Craig H. Kennedy**, professor of special education and chair of the Department of Special Education, was elected to the Board of Trustees for the Society for the Experimental Analysis of Behavior (SEAB). SEAB oversees the publication of the *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* and *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*.

**John Reiser**, professor of psychology, will serve as interim chair of the Department of Psychology and Human Development.

**Sharon L. Shields**, professor of the practice of human and organizational development, received the 2007 Mary Jane Werthan Award from the Margaret Cuninggim Women’s Center at Vanderbilt. The award is given annually to a campus member in recognition of vision, persistence and extraordinary skill in interpersonal and institutional relations at the university.

**Claire E. Smrekar**, associate professor of public policy and education, and doctoral candidate Kristin McGraner have been awarded a grant from Peabody’s Center for Community Studies to explore the impact of HOPE VI neighborhood revitalization on Nashville neighborhood schools.

**Matthew G. Springer**, research assistant professor of public policy and education, and Warren Langevin, a Harold Stirling Vanderbilt Scholar and research assistant at the National Center on Performance Incentives, presented “The Political Economy of Teacher Certification and Compensation” at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association held in Chicago.

**Wendy Stone**, director of the Treatment and Research Institute for Autism Spectrum Disorders (TRIAD), received the 2006 Agency Award from the Mayor’s Advisory Committee for People with Disabilities at its 25th Annual Awards and Reception for Artists with Disabilities held at the Adventure Science Center. TRIAD is a program of the Vanderbilt Kennedy Center for Research on Human Development and the Monroe Carell Jr. Children’s Hospital at Vanderbilt.

**Georgene L. Troseth** has been promoted to associate professor of psychology.
tems, to improve urban school governance and to implement institutional change in higher education systems.

To learn more about the Peabody Center for Education Policy visit peabody.vanderbilt.edu/pcep.xml

New Group Launched to Create Food Security

A doctoral student in Peabody’s community research and action program is behind a new organization with a goal of making healthy food reliably available to all Middle Tennesseans.

The organization, Food Security Partners of Middle Tennessee, was founded in August 2006 with support from the Life-Works Foundation and the Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies.

“Food Security Partners was created to connect the dots between the myriad parts of our local food system, from farm to fork,” said Darcy Freedman, the student who is the group’s founding director.

“Becoming a connected system that facilitates communication and collaboration between farmers and consumers, between food warehouses and community-based organizations, is an important step to ensuring all people in Middle Tennessee have ready access to healthy foods.”

The organization comprises more than 40 partners from all parts of the food system, including farmers, community gardeners, food processors, food distributors, farmers’ markets, grocery stores, food banks, food advocates, nutrition and health experts, schools and universities, government, faith-based groups, volunteer groups, neighborhoods and concerned individuals. All have the goal of creating food security for Middle Tennessee.

To learn more about Food Security Partners visit www.foodsecuritypartners.org
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Educational researchers have long been criticized for emphasizing qualitative over quantitative research. More importantly, observers lament the faddishness of education reforms and view the research coming out of education think tanks as justifying pre-established political agendas. In turn, policy-makers pick and choose among research studies and run with the results that most closely match their own biases.

In recent years, however, the landscape has begun to change. Among current topics in education research, few garner so strong a reaction as the subject of research methodology itself. In the U.S. Department of Education, when it comes to sponsored research, a new day has dawned.

These changes took form with the Education Sciences Reform Act passed by Congress in 2002. The act created within the Department of Education the Institute of Education Sciences, with a mission "to bring rigorous and relevant research, evaluation and statistics to our nation’s education system.” IES has been headed since its founding by Grover J. (Russ) Whitehurst. Whitehurst has worked assiduously to move federal involvement in education toward evidence-based practice, and in doing so he has prioritized answering questions about “what works in education.” IES views this as a causal question that is best answered with the same “gold standard” applied to medicine and related fields.

So what exactly is the gold standard? David Cordray, professor of public policy and psychology and director of Peabody College’s Experimental Education Research Training (ExpERT) program, says, “The gold standard is the randomized control trial (RCT). This is the only class of research design capable of producing adequate evidence for making decisions about the effects of educational practices, about policies, about programs.”

The most prominent characteristic of research meeting the gold standard is the randomization of individuals, teachers or schools to conditions. As in the sciences or medicine, experiments involve two or more conditions, one of which is a control group that represents the status quo. According to Dale Farran, professor of education and psychology, “An intervention condition is anything imposed in an education setting that is designed to change the behaviors of the recipients. A new curriculum could be an intervention, or professional development for teachers. Any time education scientists propose doing something different from business as usual, that is an intervention.”

Through random assignment to conditions, two similar groups are assembled. One receives the intervention to be tested, while the other does not. Comparison of the outcomes from these two conditions enables investigators to more accurately determine the effectiveness of a given intervention while controlling the influence of numerous sources of personal and technical biases. “Because of its ability to control biases, the RCT is a gold standard when we want to estimate the causal effect of interventions,” says Cordray. “And you’re taking out all of the biases that emerge when you let people just choose the condition they want.”

As Cordray acknowledges, conducting RCTs in real-world settings can be difficult: “You are dealing with children, and children are in classes, and classes are in schools. It’s not always possible to randomize the kids or the conditions because of basic practical problems like contamination. Teachers talk,
“The gold standard is the randomized control trial (RCT). This is the only class of research design capable of producing adequate evidence for making decisions about the effects of educational practices, about policies, about programs.”

David Cordray
Professor of Public Policy and Psychology and
Director of Peabody College’s Experimental Education Research Training (ExpERT) program

materials get shared, so it isn’t a good idea to randomize at that level.” Instead, Cordray says, researchers need to conduct what are called cluster RCTs. These call for working with large numbers of schools, and randomizing teachers or schools.

According to Cordray, “It’s become clear that an RCT is the best tool for knowing what works. It is an important first step. Ultimately, we want to answer questions not only about what works, but under what circumstances does it work, for whom does it work, how does it work, and why does it work. These questions require additional statistical and research methods within an RCT. Although these methods are no longer considered experimental, the answers they produce are important because those are the ones that practitioners and policy makers are also interested in.”

**ExpERTs Wanted**

While investigators nationwide have been scrambling to make their grant applications and research designs more competitive, education schools have also begun to address the question of how to prepare the next generation of education scholars. At Vanderbilt, Cordray and 27 Peabody faculty members have developed a program intended to equip future education scholars with the requisite skills. In 2004, Peabody was among the first of 10 institutions nationwide to receive grants from IES under its predoctoral research training program. Peabody’s Experimental Education Research Training (ExpERT) is the result.

Doctoral applicants who have been accepted for admission, as well as doctoral students still in their first year of study, are eligible to apply for a predoctoral fellowship in the ExpERT program. Fellows undertake an integrated sequence of graduate courses in statistics, measurement and design, along with courses in educational practices, contexts, pedagogy and learning. The courses may go beyond the requirements of their doctoral curricula. Research, and how to conduct it, is strongly emphasized, and students take part in extensive field research working collaboratively with one or more of the college’s faculty members. They also attend monthly interdisciplinary lectures and colloquia, teach classes and attend professional conferences. Most importantly, they acquire direct expertise in planning, executing and analyzing RCTs firmly grounded in theoretical frameworks and supported by empirical evidence.

The program offers full-tuition support for up to five years of study, a generous 12-month living stipend, and

icators, and research methods within an RCT. Although these methods are no longer considered experimental, the answers they produce are important because those are the ones that practitioners and policy makers are also interested in.”

**Team Players**

Dale Farran, professor of education and psychology, was one of the first Peabody faculty members to become involved with the current IES push to fund more randomized control trials. With Mark Lipsey, director of the Center for Evaluation Research and Methodology and a senior research associate at the Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies, Farran conducted her first RCT in 2002, while IES was still getting under-way.

“Mark and I began working together in our Preschool Curriculum Evaluation Research (PCER) grant. Seven Middle Tennessee school systems agreed to work with us in a randomized control trial comparing the effects of two alternative curricula and a business-as-usual control group,” Farran said. “Our project was one of seven projects funded nationally in the first round of IES’ PCER awards. We’re following these students through third grade, and we’re starting to get their latest scores in now.”

At the time the grant was awarded, Farran says, Russ Whitehurst wanted to show Congress that RCTs could be done in education, that educational research could be done in a rigorous way that would justify the government’s continued investment. IES chose early childhood curricula as its first initiative. Competition was tough, Farran recalls, “You had to have good designs. You had to have good ideas but you had to have good designs. You had to know something about power, something about effect sizes and something about how many subjects you would need to see an effect. Mark brought this to the table.”

Farran sees collaboration between methodologists and researchers who are content experts as essential to successful research to establish evidence-based practices. “We have extraordinarily strong content people here. And you want the methodological approach not to be external. You want them to be melded in with these people. We have really terrific methodologists. We have Dave [Cordray]; we have Mark Lipsey; we have Dale Ballou. Lynn Okagaki, the commissioner for education research, has begun to call this ‘the Vanderbilt model.’”

Like David Cordray, Farran sees Peabody’s ExpERT program as an essential part of the mix, as well. “One of the things the ExpERT students have helped to do is bring some of that methodological knowledge and consciousness into the department to be a part of teams that include these strong content people. ExpERT has brought people together. It’s too complex a world for any one person to know it all, so you need to have teams,” she says.
funds for research and travel to professional conferences. Forty students spread evenly across four of the college’s departments are participating. “Dean Benbow has been especially supportive of ExpERT, including providing tuition and stipends for two of the five years,” says Cordray. He says that most of the fellows are working with multiple faculty members on several projects, or they may work with one faculty member on an extended series of papers. Over half of the fellows have contributed at least one paper or poster.

In 2005, Vanderbilt won a second grant from IES for postdoctoral research training. The program provides funding for up to four fellows for two years apiece. Three postdocs are currently participating, and a fourth just completed his fellowship. ExpERT will run through 2010. With up to 40 Ph.D. graduates having received the ExpERT training, Cordray believes that Vanderbilt will assert considerable influence on education research and practice: “IES wanted to know what works, for whom, and under what circumstances. We’ve added the how and the why questions to that. And we’re creating our program around the methodologies that are necessary to answer those questions. Our graduates will be right at the forefront of being able to tell superintendents the circumstances under which a given kind of program is effective, for what kinds of schools, what kinds of teachers, what kinds of kids, and they’ll be able to do that in a way that is state of the art.”

The Fidelity Hurdle

One thorny problem with RCTs has to do with the question of intervention fidelity. Put simply, this means the degree to which the intervention tested is faithfully applied in the real-world setting during field trials. According to Cordray, few current projects measure fidelity in their evaluation of a trial’s outcomes. “People will just do a simple assessment of whether or not the intervention itself is put in place, but they don’t really check to see if what was put in place actually differs from what was in practice already. We need to be much clearer about what to measure in terms of what was actually received by kids in all conditions. IES is basically making that a requirement of their research grants,” he says.

A third grant from IES, at just under $1.5 million dollars, will enable Cordray; Mark Lipsey, of the Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies; and Dale Farran to develop a reliable set of measures by which fidelity can be measured. The grant involves several components. First is a synthesis of the existing literature on prior attempts to assess the integrity or fidelity of interventions. The second component will examine established databases that have incorporated fidelity assessments of some sort into their data collection. The team will apply new techniques of either measuring or scaling the fidelity index and looking at its correspondence with outcomes.

The last piece involves collection of new data in Nashville for the Building Blocks program, a pre-K math program being installed in about 60 classes or Head Start centers. Cordray, Farran and Lipsey will collect and review data to determine whether Building Blocks is delivered as intended and, if not, the consequences of deviation from that. The Building Blocks curriculum was developed by Douglas Clements and Julie Sarama of the State University of New York at Buffalo and is currently undergoing scale-up. Says Cordray, “We’re trying to develop indices that are as closely aligned with the Building Blocks theory as possible. But we’re also testing whether or not it matters that you become more and more meticulous and focused on the elements of Building Blocks or whether you can use indices that are less costly and easier to measure. Do you get the same set of relationships when you use a simple measure versus a complicated measure?”

Establishing simple indicators of fidelity is especially important when interventions reach the scale-up stage, Cordray believes. This is the stage in which investigators ask whether an intervention will work in a wide array of schools. The teachers implementing an intervention may no longer be volunteers, so they may be more or less interested in participating. As a result, scale-up becomes the setting in which infidelity is more likely to creep in.

“You can’t spend all of your money getting at the nitty gritty details of what transpires in the class; you just don’t have the luxury or resources for that. So you have to have indicators that are well connected but not expensive,” Cordray says. In addition to the Building Blocks project, he is conducting a similar evaluation for the Midwest Regional...
Education Lab that involves 18 schools and about 75 teachers. The teachers are being randomly assigned to receive (or not) the Measuring Academic Progress program, an intervention that provides information on student progress to enable teachers to reconfigure instructional strategies to optimize students’ performance on high stakes tests. “We’re trying to test whether or not the teachers actually differentiate instruction—that’s one of the critical fidelity components in our assessment. If student outcomes improve, it is important to demonstrate that differentiated instruction also improved, otherwise we are still in the dark about the what of our what works claim.”

Opposition

Not everyone agrees with the seeming primacy afforded randomized control trials by IES. In April, a committee of the American Educational Research Association released a report encouraging greater use of large data sets maintained by the Department of Education to analyze cause and effect questions. The authors argued that technological advances and research techniques used in other fields can move educational research beyond correlational studies. AERA’s grants board, which authored the report, also questioned whether the use of RCTs—where some students are randomly assigned to a control group and may not receive important educational benefits—is always ethical.

More recently, a report from an interagency panel chaired by Education Secretary Margaret Spellings—the Academic Competitiveness Council—met with criticism for overemphasizing RCTs. In Science magazine (June 2007), Jere Confrey, of Washington University, said, “They missed the idea of multiple evaluations, using multiple methods, to come up with a theory of change.”

Dale Farran thinks there is still plenty of room in the education community for traditional research. “If you look at the proportion of RCTs published in education journals versus others, it’s still a tiny percentage. There are a lot of other things that people might want to do in research, things people want to know, including descriptive research. There need to be other mechanisms for that, whether through foundations or the NSF. RCTs frighten people because they’re just so hard to do. But they are certainly not the dominant paradigm.”

For his part, Cordray acknowledges the resistance but sees an underlying issue. Many educators are just not trained in the methods necessary to do experimental work. “If you want to answer causal questions, you need different kinds of methods. For answering other questions, the people who work in education are doing a fine job. The question is: Is the result of the work they’re doing answering practical questions about how to make the educational experience better for kids? That’s where the battles get enjoined—the nature of the evidence.”

Cordray is also quick to point out that the current emphasis on evidence-based practice is not new. “Most of us around Peabody have been talking the same line for years,” he says. He points for example to the research of Douglas and Lynn Fuchs in the Department of Special Education.

Nor is the Department of Education unique among federal agencies in adopting more rigorous research standards. As Cordray says, “Across the board the idea of doing well controlled studies of the effectiveness of products, and processes and policies is something that’s here to stay.”

For more on Peabody’s ExpERT program, visit www.vanderbilt.edu/lis/expert.html
The increased focus on K-12 math and science has made U.S. colleges of education acutely aware of the need for improved teacher preparation in these areas. As the No. 3 graduate school of education in the nation (U.S. News and World Report), Vanderbilt’s Peabody College has long led the way in progressive teacher training. Now the awarding of several major National Science Foundation (NSF) grants to Peabody faculty has placed the college at the forefront of research examining every stage of teacher preparation, from preservice to induction to professional development.

What NSF refers to as the “teacher professional continuum” begins with a teacher candidate’s own training in math and science. This initial exposure to the subject area, along with subsequent content training, is the focus of a five-year, NSF-funded project led by Marcy Singer-Gabella, research assistant professor of education, and colleagues. The researchers are examining two of the basic concepts emphasized in Peabody’s own teacher education programs: the development of mathematics and science content knowledge and the ability to examine students’ mathematical and scientific thinking to inform instructional practice.

Though it’s agreed these fundamentals are essential to good teaching, says Singer-Gabella, there is little guidance in how best to achieve them. “Prior research on preservice teacher education has not focused on this,” she says, “but we need to understand how to prepare teachers who are familiar with important disciplinary ideas and practices, have a view of student learning in relation to this disciplinary content, and who continually make sense of student thinking as they make instructional decisions.”

In following preservice teachers from undergraduate math and science courses to education courses and then into their first years of teaching grades two through six, Singer-Gabella hopes to gain a better understanding of how teachers develop these understandings over time and how these skills are connected to improved student achievement. Along with Peabody faculty members Amy Palmeri, assistant professor of the practice of education; Rich Lehrer, professor of science education; and Leona Schauble, professor of education; associates Molly Bolger and Ann Kindfield; and researchers at the University of Pittsburgh, Singer-Gabella began with an examination of the introductory undergraduate math and science courses preservice teachers typically take. She and her colleagues discovered that these courses’ approach to the topic differed from the methods teachers are expected to use in the classroom.

“Introductory courses are hard to teach,” she notes. “It’s challenging for faculty, as experts in the field, to define a reasonable chunk to study. What typically happens is that they take a swath across a lot of topics and, rightly, link these topics with current issues.” There is little opportunity, however, to introduce undergraduates to ways of thinking about disciplinary ideas and practices that will aid them in teaching math or science. As a result, most preservice teachers’ first introduction to these concepts is in foundational math and science education courses, which focus on helping them develop both an understanding of key practices in the subject area and an insight into student thinking. “We’re entering into the discipline with them from a very different point of view than in the introductory classes,” Singer-Gabella says.

After students graduate from their teacher preparation program, Singer-Gabella and colleagues intend to follow them into the first few years of teaching. “This is going to be a critical phase for us,” she says of the period known as “induction.” Because the teaching and learning environment varies from school district to school district, researchers are very interested in discovering how new teachers implement what they have learned in these different contexts.

“We’ve seen them try to enact [their training] in controlled circumstances in classrooms and student teaching,”
Singer-Gabella says, “but when they leave us and they’re out in districts that may or may not be partners with us, we need to understand what the friction is. What are the forces that will enable them to enact the ideas and approaches our programs have emphasized, and what does it look like as these get transformed because the environment is not totally supportive of these approaches?”

**Induced Labors**

This difference in contexts and how it affects new teachers’ practice and content knowledge is also the focus of a project directed by Peabody researcher Thomas Smith, assistant professor of public policy and education, and researcher Laura Desimone at the University of Pennsylvania. Along with project coordinator Kristen McGraner and research associates Marisa Cannata and Erin Henrick, they are following 120 new seventh- and eighth-grade math teachers in nine school districts in Tennessee and Kentucky through their first three years in the profession. The goal is to learn what resources are available to new teachers and which of these resources improve their content knowledge.

“We are very interested in how the district context shapes both what’s offered for new teachers and how they respond to it,” says Smith. “We have hypotheses about the kinds of supports that are useful—a mentor in the same field, collaboration with colleagues, access to professional development, a supportive principal—but we also want to get a handle on what supports the different districts think they are providing, and why. We are also looking at it from the teachers’ perspective—what kinds of supports do they see themselves as actually receiving?”

After examining the number and type of resources available, Smith and colleagues will assess new teachers’ understanding and development of content knowledge in these different contexts. “Our main interests are in looking at how both their content knowledge for math and the quality of their instruction changes,” Smith explains. “We’ll look at teachers who had access to different kinds of resources—a mentor with math background, more professional development opportunities in the district, or they just came in knowing more math to begin with—to see how that affects these trajectories.” This information will be shared with school districts, who will be able use it to improve their induction programs.

Both Smith and Singer-Gabella intend to create instruments that can be used by other researchers to understand how teachers develop content knowledge over time.

“There’s such a press for schools of education to show they make a difference in student learning,” says Singer-Gabella, “but the measures that are commonly used don’t help you make sense of teachers’ knowledge. Standardized test scores are not a reasonable proxy for what teachers know. We want to dig deeper into what teachers understand and how that may play out in their classrooms—what it might look like in terms of student learning.”

Smith agrees. “Ultimately we are interested in whether or not there’s change in the achievement of students in these teachers’ classes. But we’re in some ways more interested in how interactions with mentors and colleagues influence student learning by changing both teachers’ own knowledge of how to teach math and their instructional practices in the classroom. We want to understand how different kinds of supports for teachers might be influencing student achievement.”

For additional information on teacher preparation at Peabody, visit http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/x3895.xml.
Consider a classroom’s “problem child.” If we have not experienced them ourselves, we have certainly heard of them. The student doesn’t listen, doesn’t follow the rules, or do what the teacher tells them to do. Perhaps they disrupt or distract the class verbally. They may even be physically aggressive toward the teacher or their classmates. It’s a classroom nightmare that subverts learning for everyone.

Our instinctive reaction may be to blame the student. Joseph Wehby, associate professor of special education, thinks the question is worth a closer look. With his co-principal investigator, Craig Kennedy, professor of special education, Wehby is currently in the third year of a $4.3 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education, “Reducing Severe Problem Behavior in Schools,” that is examining the complex dynamic of problem behavior in classrooms. The goal is to create more supportive environments for children with problem behavior as well as for their peers who may be showing risk for developing these problems.

The multi-site project is being run in 25 public elementary schools in three cities. “Approximately half the sample is in the Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools,” says Wehby. “One quarter of the sample is in Richmond, Va., and the other quarter is in Minneapolis.” The intervention is being tested in classrooms grades K-4, though the majority is in first through third grade, says Wehby.

Each of the schools has at least one self-contained classroom for students receiving special education services for behavior problems and one or more general education classrooms in which the intervention is also being tested. Half the students are typical students in the general education curriculum and half have already been identified as having severe behavioral disorders or showing early signs of them. “We have worked with about 400 students to date,” Wehby says, “and 100-plus teachers.”

In keeping with the emphasis on rigorous experimental design under the Department of Education’s “gold standard” for research, schools participating in the project were randomly assigned to either the treatment group or a control group also being tracked. Teachers participating in the study have a variety of educational backgrounds and levels of experience.

One trait the teachers probably all share is a desire to create classroom environments conducive to learning. “Managing behavior is always rated highly as a top concern of teachers,” says Wehby. In some cases this can mean that a teacher develops a low tolerance for children who act out. “We know from the literature that adults are impacted by child behavior. The natural reaction is to want them out.” Once placed in a special education classroom, however, it can be difficult for a child to return to a general education class. And special education classes tend to require more economic resources.

Wehby emphasizes, however, that he does not want simply to shift the blame from the child to his or her teacher. The factors that lead to such behaviors are not entirely clear and are probably multifaceted, though economic backgrounds do appear to play a role. “We do know that a significant portion of students with these behaviors receive free or reduced price lunch,” Wehby says. “Generally speaking, these students come ill prepared for school, and schools are ill equipped to deal with them.”
In looking for school-based solutions, Wehby wants to emphasize best practices and to educate teachers about how to create better functioning classrooms. "Our suspicion is that a lot of it has to do with teacher preparation—that teachers have not been exposed to methods or techniques that would help them manage these children’s behavior. Or teachers are inadvertently shaped out of quality instruction with these children. It becomes such a chore to interact with them that they sometimes ignore or overreact to their behavior," he says. "Our intervention shifts the focus. We’re focusing on teachers and giving teachers tools. We’ve taken a number of components that we have either demonstrated or have evidence for and put together a package of behavior supports."

Among the elements of the intervention being tested:

**Training.** Training teachers on basic classic management skills using the Classroom Organization and Management Program (COMP) developed by Peabody Professor Emerita Carolyn Everston.

**The Good Behavior Game.** A behavior contingency game where children are placed in teams and compete to have the fewest behavioral infractions. Rewards are kept simple: acknowledgment by the teachers, a free period, going to the lunchroom first, or a token prize.

**Self monitoring.** Perhaps the most critical element of the intervention, Wehby believes the dynamic between the teacher and the child often shapes the nature of the problem and perhaps furthers it. Teachers may give the child with problem behavior fewer opportunities to respond, or may offer the child less than optimal praise for behaving correctly. To better understand how they might create a more positive relationship, teachers participating in the intervention are asked to audiotape themselves once a week for 15 minutes. They then listen to a sample of that tape and count the number of positive interactions and opportunities they’ve given problem students. They also graph the results and measure them against previously established goals.

**Consulting.** Members of the project team, typically doctoral or master’s degree students, visit classrooms once each week to monitor interactions and provide ongoing support. "They are there to support the teachers. Many teachers who deal with these children feel isolated," Wehby notes. "Ongoing support is key to behavior change."

**Tutoring.** "We know there is a strong relationship between academic achievement and behavior problems, and this shows up particularly in reading," Wehby says. Students, either master’s-level or undergraduates, are recruited to tutor students in reading three times each week. "We’re using a direct instruction program called Horizons. It’s very scripted and very engaging and requires lots of responding by children," says Wehby.

In fact, engagement is critical. As Wehby says, students can’t be actively engaged and behaving inappropriately at the same time. The combination of more praise from the teacher, more opportunities for interactions, and hands-on tutoring are all geared toward keeping these students actively engaged with learning. "If you don’t keep them engaged, school becomes very difficult for these children as they get older."

Although the project has another year and half to run, Wehby and his team have been analyzing preliminary data collected during the first year of behavioral observations. While he cautions that they are operating under the assumption that results won’t be immediate, he says "We’re seeing significantly higher levels of praise, more opportunities to respond, lower levels of reprimands, and higher levels of child engagement."

---

To learn more about special education research at Peabody, visit: http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/spedresearch.xml
I magine archers trying to improve their accuracy by practicing blindfolded, never seeing how close they are to hitting the target, never getting any information to help correct their aim.

Doctors and clinicians treating teens with mental health concerns have been in much the same position, providing services week after week with no objective and systematic feedback about the effects of their treatment. But a new tool developed by Peabody College researchers will remove that blindfold by providing ongoing feedback to service providers, with a goal of enabling mid-course treatment corrections. The tool is called the Peabody Treatment Progress Battery, or PTPB. The battery is available to qualified clinicians for free on the Web.

“There are laboratory studies that show treatments are very effective with youth who have mental health concerns, but when we look in the real treatment world we are hard pressed to identify services that are effective. Mental health professionals need to know if they are succeeding during treatment and, if they are not, they need to know what to change. The PTPB gives them that information.”

There are laboratory studies that show treatments are very effective with youth who have mental health concerns, but when we look in the real treatment world we are hard pressed to identify services that are effective. Mental health professionals need to know if they are succeeding during treatment and, if they are not, they need to know what to change. The PTPB gives them that information.”

—Leonard Bickman

Peabody researchers develop a new tool to improve teen mental health services

The PTPB is intended primarily for use in school-based or home-based settings for youths aged 11-18 years. Often, these are children in foster care situations or whose mental health care has been court-ordered.

The battery includes 10 measures by which to assess how teens are responding to treatment. All were rigorously evaluated to ensure their clinical relevance. The measures include a symptoms and functioning severity scale, a life satisfaction scale, a hopefulness scale, an outcome expectations scale, a therapeutic alliance scale (which focuses on the quality of the relationship between the client and therapist), a counseling impact scale (as reported by the client), and a motivation for treatment scale.

“What we’re trying to do is use measures other than pathology to look at progress. So we examine the factors that are common to any treatment situation,” says Bickman. “Many of our measures are strength-based.” Hopefulness, for example, has been rarely measured with youths, though increasingly it is measured in adults.

“Without hope,” Bickman notes, “it is less likely that there will be improvement.” Bickman points out that for some clients effective treatment may not mean improvement but preventing the youth from getting worse.

In addition to monitoring the teens’ responses to treatment, the PTPB also asks for information from their caregivers, including how they are managing stress, their own life satisfaction, treatment expectations, and perceptions of the child’s motivation and treatment progress. “If the caregiver isn’t invested,” said Bickman, “they’re less likely to keep appointments and more likely to drop out of treatment. Some of these treatments require cooperation from the family; treatment is less likely to be helpful if there is not a good relationship between the caregiver and the therapist. We think caregivers are an integral part of the team and need to be involved in the youth’s treatment.”

The clinician, too, completes measures for symptoms and severity and therapeutic alliance. It is this comparison of what the clinician thinks is effective with what the child
and caregiver report that Bickman believes makes the battery an especially powerful tool. “If the therapist thinks treatment is going great and the teen thinks it’s going terribly, then the therapist is probably not going to be very helpful to that youth.”

“The therapist needs to collect systematic feedback concurrent with treatment,” Bickman says. “The PTPB will provide feedback that is hard to disregard and will also insert some accountability for producing results into the mental health system.”

Abram Rosenblatt, professor and researcher in the Department of Psychiatry at University of California, San Francisco, sees the PTPB as an important development. “Providers of children’s mental health services have long expressed their frustration to the research community at the lack of a comprehensive, feasible and scientifically developed set of measures for assessing process and outcome. Existing measures have been too time consuming, too limited in the domains and perspectives assessed, too costly, or insufficient with regard to scientific validity,” he said. “The PTPB is the first comprehensive set of measures that can be used routinely to assess process and outcomes of treatment services across multiple domains and perspectives, and it meets the highest level of scientific rigor. This is a landmark contribution to children’s mental health services and research.”

The PTPB takes approximately five to eight minutes weekly to complete per patient. It was designed to apply to most types of treatment and was written at a fourth-grade reading level, both in English and Spanish. Bickman has already received an offer to translate it to Portuguese. Development of the PTPB was partially funded by the National Institute of Mental Health.

“What we’ve done is license it with a registration,” Bickman says. So far, over 300 individuals or organizations have completed the registration. In the meantime, Bickman and his team are anxious to implement a computerized version that will automate much of the process of administering the measures, scoring them and providing reports to the clinician and clinical supervisor. They are working with a computer application service provider to develop and test the PTPB. Bickman says, “Thanks to Providence, we’re in 12 different states and almost 40 different locations.

Natasha S. Walsh, vice president of clinical services for Providence, speaks highly of the results. Says Walsh, “Our clinicians are getting information they are able to use to inform and enhance treatment. Our supervisors are getting information they can use to help the clinicians grow into better clinicians. Our agency is getting the information on clinical outcomes and processes needed to improve the quality of our services. Our counselors have said it’s giving me information I never would have gotten.”

The manual and measurement forms for the PTPB are available online free of charge, for qualified clinicians, from Vanderbilt at http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/PTPB

PTPB in Action: Feedback and Flexibility

The digital version of the Peabody Treatment Progress Battery goes by the name Contextualized Feedback Intervention and Training (CFIT). While still under development, the program is being piloted by the Providence Service Corporation in 12 states.

Len Bickman, who led the team that created it, acknowledges that introducing it into an organization poses a variety of challenges. “This needs the strong support of the institution going into it, because CFIT adds significant new responsibilities for the organization, especially supervisors and therapists. We knew there was not much time for data collection so we focused on developing short and brief measures. But short and valid measures are difficult to develop. It was also important that we develop weekly feedback reports that were useful.”

Barry Beagles, a therapeutic foster care counselor in Springfield, Illinois, is an enthusiastic adopter.

According to Beagles, “The feedback reports give me insight into the kids I’m working with. I had a kid who was internalizing a lot of feelings that he was not talking about. The item alert on the symptoms and functioning scale came up several times. The child kept writing about his self esteem issues which led to his hope declining. When I got the feedback report, I dug deeper and talked with him one on one without the foster parents present. The child let loose and said he was thinking about hurting himself, having violent nightmares and hearing voices.

“We had the child screened, and he was admitted into the hospital for two weeks and placed on medications. Now, the child keeps a journal and talks with me openly. The foster parent has a different outlook too and doesn’t think the child is being manipulative. I’m very thankful for CFIT. It led me in a different direction.”

Beagles has years of experience as a high school and college teacher of psychology and sociology, and twelve years in the Illinois Department of Human Services, working with abused and neglected children.

“Evolutionary revolutionary” is how Bickman describes this interplay between therapist, child and data. “We don’t tell the therapist what to do. We don’t say, ‘Here’s our manual: do what it says.’ We give them information and they have to decide what actions to take. We give them some guidance about that, but there’s no set program, per se. However, we are testing a training program designed to enhance factors common to all treatments such as the therapeutic relationships and motivation to improve.”
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