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DEDICATION

This work

is dedicated to Elizabeth Wolf:

mom, teacher, friend, and life-long learner.

She had an insatiable love of life and learning.

These are the lessons her family, friends, and students hold close:

- Never lose your sense of wonder. Wherever she went she examined and discussed the flora, fauna, and geology. She talked to people. She was often heard saying, “Oh, I did not know I needed to come here!”
- Examine different points of view. You always knew that you had her full attention and you could see the “wheels” turning as she processed the information.
- Do your best. If you do not know how to do something, find out; and, if that does not work, improvise. She advocated duct tape before it was fashionable. One time we were appalled to find a very large microwave on top of her refrigerator; when questioned, she smiled her little smile and said, “Don’t ask”. We never did find out why.
- The mark of leadership is to adjust. Her cup was always full. She said that things did not always turn out the way she desired, but she took what was given and did the best she could with it.
- Accept that change is part of life. She began her teaching career in a one-room school house with slate boards and ended it gathering information and recording it in a digital format.
- Embrace every challenge and opportunity. She encouraged us to inspire and be inspired, dream, find our passion, and seek others who have similar visions and make things happen.

She set the bar high,

and we continue to measure ourselves by it.
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ABSTRACT

The *National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences (Standards)* (Appendix A), adopted in 2004, provide an integrated set of standards which form a framework for program development, implementation and assessment for Family and Consumer Sciences teacher preparation. Periodic review of standards is recommended by organizations involved in standards setting (ISO, 2009; NSTA, 2003). This study explored implementation of the *Standards* by states and their respective teacher preparation programs and reviewed the 2004 *Standards* (NSTFCS, 2004). As a result of this investigation, changes to update the *Standards* were conveyed to the *Standards* team. A survey methodology was used to determine the status of implementation of the *Standards*. A modified Delphi technique was used in order to gain consensus on the alignment of the standards with current content and pedagogy. The modified Delphi panel was stratified to include FCS teachers, teacher educators, specialists and administrators from two organizations- National Association of Teacher Educators of Family and Consumer Sciences and National Association of State Administrators of Family and Consumer Sciences. The findings provide recommendations for a *Standards* update and strategies for sharing, integrating and implementing the *Standards* at the state and institutional level.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1998 the *National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences* were adopted by the National Association of State Administrators of Family & Consumer Sciences (NASAFACS). The development of these standards, directed through NASAFACS, was a result of thinking, collaborating, and planning by many Family & Consumer Sciences (FCS) professionals and members of the FCS business community at the national, regional, state, and local levels. These standards have provided a framework for delivering programs for students of FCS in middle school and high school programs at the local and state level across the United States (NASAFACS, 1998a). States and institutions also used these student standards to develop the curricular framework for teacher preparation programs in FCS, yet there were no recognized standards to identify best teacher preparation and professional practices for FCS.

The project to develop *The National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences (Standards)* began with an information session at the Association of Career and Technical Educators (ACTE) annual meeting in December 2002. This project was lead by the National Association of Teacher Educators of Family and Consumer Sciences (NATEFACS). A development panel comprised of teacher educators, university administrators, state supervisors, teachers, and related professionals was formed and met in the fall of 2003. The criteria for development of the *Standards*, as stated by Fox (2003), were to:

1. Serve as an overarching model of excellence that describes what a beginning family and consumer sciences teacher should know and be able to do.
2. Delineate a core set of “essential standards” that are as concise and non-redundant and for which there is a high degree of national consensus among FCS teacher educators, FCS content specialists, FCS teachers, and other stakeholders.

3. Provide a basis for national continuity while reflecting state variations and future directions within family and consumer sciences content, teacher standards, licensure, initial preparation, professional development, school settings, and teacher responsibilities.

4. Ensure broad-based involvement by family and consumer sciences educators and other stakeholders who represent various local, state, and national roles, professional organizations, and perspectives (p. 2).

The initial work of the development panel was shared at the ACTE annual meeting in December 2003. Nearly 300 individuals, including panel members, teacher educators, and state supervisors, were invited to participate in an online survey to provide input on a draft version of the Standards in late summer 2004. The development panel met October 2004 in Indianapolis to examine the results of the survey and come to consensus on a final draft of the Standards. A final draft was reviewed by development panel members. An outside group, knowledgeable of the accreditation process, also reviewed the draft to insure that it met various accreditation requirements. The leadership team consisting of Wanda Fox, Daisy Stewart and Patricia Erickson prepared the final version of the Standards. The Standards were presented at ACTE in Las Vegas in December 2004 and approved by members of NATEFACS, the primary sponsoring organization. The Standards (NATEFACS, 2004), provide a precept for what a beginning Family and Consumer Sciences teacher should know and be able to do. This integrated set of standards form a framework for development and delivery of FCS teacher education programs. Standards one through four emphasize FCS content and standards five through 10 direct professional practices. To meet these standards a beginning teacher must demonstrate knowledge, skills, and attitudes to enable him/her to facilitate student learning in FCS. Thinking, communication, leadership,
and management are integrated in the Standards. The Standards, as adopted in December 2004, are found in Appendix A.

Redick (1995) cited the lack of research and knowledge in the practice of teaching, specifically, what comprises quality teacher preparation programs. The Standards document created a framework for developing and implementing an effective teacher preparation program in FCS. Redick (1998) further stated that research needed to be focused on measurement of skills and knowledge rather than beliefs and perceptions. The Standards focused on the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed as a Family and Consumer Sciences teacher. The Standards described the agreed upon content, knowledge and skills needed to deliver a quality and comprehensive teacher education program in FCS in 2004. Fox (2003) reported that prior to the development of these Standards, knowledge and skills required of a FCS teacher had not been addressed nationally. Though the Standards were nationally adopted, variance has occurred in their integration into individual teacher preparation curriculum. Dialogue and collaboration continues today under the direction of the national development team at professional meetings and conferences. Family and Consumer Sciences teacher educators and professionals have collaborated to publish a series of articles in the Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences addressing Standards implementation. A thorough review of the literature revealed that research has not been conducted on how states and institutions are using the Standards in their teacher preparation programs. Research has also not been conducted to update the standards.
Research Questions

This research was designed to answer the following questions:

1. How have the 2004 Standards been implemented by states and institutions in FCS teacher preparation programs?
   a. What strategies have been successful in the implementation process?
   b. If implementation is not taking place, what are the barriers?
   c. What strategies can be used to share, integrate and implement the Standards?

2. Do the 2004 Standards reflect the current content, trends, and pedagogy of the discipline?

3. Are the meanings of the Standards sufficiently clear and concise?

4. Should the 2004 Standards be revised and, if so, what should those revisions be?

Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined for use in the study:

*Academic Standard:* A measure of what a student should know and be able to do at the end of a course or program. It also indicates how student knowledge and skills should be measured (Ed. Gov., 1996a).

*Family and Consumer Sciences Education:* A discipline where individuals and families are empowered to manage the challenges of living and working in a diverse world.

*Goal:* A specific, measurable end point (Ravich, 2007).

*Great Plains IDEA:* Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance. A consortium of universities offering distance education programs.
National Standards: Standards developed, at the national level, as a guide, measure of expectation and quality for a group across the nation.

National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences: Standards which provide the framework for content and pedagogy for Family and Consumer Sciences elementary and secondary programs.

National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences (Standards): Standards forming the framework for content and pedagogy for FCS teacher preparation.

Outcome: The end product of the lesson or unit or course (King & Evans 1991).

Outcome-based education: A program model that focused on attitudes, values, and beliefs (Ravich, 2007).

Pedagogy: The art, science, or profession of teaching (Merriam-Webster, 2010).

Pre-professionals: Undergraduate students who have declared their major and are preparing for a profession.

Standard: Something that is established by authority, custom, or general consent which may serve as a model or an example (Merriam-Webster, 2010).

Teacher Educator: A person involved in the program planning, preparation, and assessment of pre-professionals seeking teacher licensure.

Importance of the Study

The case for national teacher education standards in FCS is strong. In 1984, there were 281 pre-service FCS programs in the United States (Hall & Miller, 1989). According to the National Directory of the Family and Consumer Sciences Division of the Association for Career and Technical Education (Kruetzer, 1999-2000), only 168 pre-service FCS teacher
education programs existed in 2000. The number of teacher education programs has continued to decrease; in 2003 there were 150 programs (ACTE, 2003-2004). The latest report reveals that the number has dropped to 128 (FCSEA, 2010). This is a decrease of 55 percent of the FCS teacher preparation programs across the country in 25 years. The resulting dilemma is that nine states, including Alaska, Connecticut, Florida, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming require FCS teacher certification, but they do not have an institution offering FCS teacher certification.

The lack of access to certification programs has led to the development of shared programs. Five institutions including Central Washington University, North Dakota State University, South Dakota State University, Texas Tech University, and University of Nebraska-Lincoln have partnered to offer an online Master’s program through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (Great Plains IDEA). This program provides the teaching pedagogy which leads to teacher certification in FCS (Great Plains IDEA, 2010a). Students are accepted to one of the partner institutions and the institutions share the teaching of the courses. The Great Plains IDEA (2010b) also provides a bank of online courses for non matriculating students who are seeking FCS content courses. Nationally recognized standards for content, instructional strategies and assessments increase the opportunity for sharing of courses and content among institutions and across states.

Content and pedagogy are constantly evolving in education. Standards, which determine curricular goals, learner outcomes, and accountability (Bales, 2007), need updating as technology changes, as new methods are adopted and as new materials are available (ISO, 2009). Standards should reflect the current trends, content and pedagogy of a discipline. The Standards were presented and first accepted by NATEFACS in 2004. How are these
standards currently being used by states and institutions to prepare their candidates for licensure? Have the implementation strategies created by the Standards development team, under the auspices of NATEFACS, provided the tools and resources necessary for change? Periodic review of standards of a discipline insures that they reflect the current trends and beliefs of the profession. The National Sciences Teachers Standards were developed in 1996 and updated in 2000 and 2008. The Technology Standards were developed in 2003 and updated in 2009.

The current investigation documents how states and institutions are using the 2004 Standards and offers an opportunity for a panel of experts to review, confirm and, if necessary, to suggest changes to the 2004 Standards. The research better informs the national standards development team as they continue to direct implementation of the Standards and support a 2012 update of the Standards to insure that the Standards are clear and concise, that they reflect the current content, current trends, pedagogy, and beliefs about the profession.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to document how states and institutions are using the 2004 Standards and offer an opportunity for a panel of experts to review, confirm and, if necessary, to suggest changes to the 2004 Standards. The literature review examines teacher preparation and the change process as it relates to education in the United States.

Teacher Preparation

Teacher preparation is at the center of the quest to improve education in the United States. Much research has been done regarding preparing excellent teachers and on raising standards for teachers. “Promising Practice” lists characteristics of promising teacher education programs (Ed.Gov, 1998). Those characteristics which lead to the improvement of teacher preparation include a teacher education program that emphasizes content knowledge and pedagogy relevant to the content area; and assessments of future teacher’s content knowledge and their ability to teach the content in a classroom environment.

A National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) summary on teacher effectiveness, teacher quality, and teacher qualification indicated that students are more successful and teachers are more effective if they are fully prepared (NCATE, 2010). The importance of teaching and learning is reflected in the 2012-2013 priority performance goals for the U.S. Department of Education, which included goals to improve student learning by evaluating and supporting teachers to improve quality instruction for all students (Ed.Gov, 2012).

“Teaching the Teachers: Different Settings, Different Results” (ETS, 2000), an Educational Testing Service (ETS) policy information report, concluded that aligning
standards for teacher preparation, student standards, and licensing exams will benefit teachers and students. These reports emphasize that the preparation of quality teachers should include in depth preparation in content knowledge and the practice of teaching which is aligned with teacher preparation standards and student standards. Furthermore the preparation should be framed by effective assessment of necessary knowledge and skills and opportunities for continued learning.

In the national education goals and objectives, “Teachers and GOALS” congress supported objectives for teacher education to include continuing opportunities for teachers to improve their skills and knowledge to prepare for quality instruction for all students (Ed. Gov., 1996 b). Improvement in teacher preparation, directed from the national level, occurs through the availability and flow of federal funds (Bales, 2007). In an effort to focus on high standards and accountability in education the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed by the U.S. Congress in 1965. This national education policy directed education reform at the state and local level by offering funding incentives to those who met the requirements of the Act. Congress reauthorized the act as the “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) Act in 2002. The NCLB Act further sought to establish a stronger accountability for teaching results and the use of proven teaching methods for all students (US Dept. Ed., 2004). These two parts of the NCLB Act have had strong implications for what and how teachers teach, which in turn has had implications on teacher preparation programs. The Act, which is again being referred to as the ESEA Act, was reauthorized in January 2012. The focus of this reauthorization is on raising standards while allowing states and institutions to use resources in a way that will have the greatest impact for their students (Ed.Gov., 2012).
Title II of the ESEA act addresses preparing, training and recruiting high quality teachers (OSPI, 2010). This reauthorization continues the focus of strengthening teacher preparation and training. In 1998, amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 included Title II teacher quality enhancement grants for states and partnerships. The purpose of these grants was wide ranging, but they included improving the preparation of teacher candidates and holding institutions accountable for teacher preparation (U.S. Dept Ed., 2006). States could apply for grant money to improve teacher preparation, create alternate routes to teacher licensure and improve the licensure in the respective state. This provided for a wide range of approaches to improving the preparation of teacher candidates and holding institutions accountable for teacher preparation.

**Change in Education**

There is a wide variety of literature related to change in education. At the root of this change is the quest for high standards, high achievement, and accountability. Historically the best known theory of change was presented by Lewin (2008) in 1947, which over time has been expressed in simplified form as unfreeze, change, and freeze (Bargal, 2006). The process, in practice, is much more complicated.

The first part of Lewin’s theory was the preparation for change, the process of understanding the necessity of the change. The need for change might be caused by dissatisfaction with a result or product or new information or beliefs. What triggers might move an individual or group from a current habit or belief or custom? Fullan (1991) suggested that building pressure can result in action for change. The pressure may come
from government agencies in the form of policies or mandates. It may also come from accreditating agencies or from professional organizations.

The second part of Lewin’s theory was the change itself. Lewin described this as the move or re education phase (Bargal, 2006). This part of the change process involves changes in the perception of what is important and a resulting change in behavior (Lewin 2008; Fullan 1991). To plan and affect the change, support is necessary as the pressure to change is applied (Fullan, 1991; Moffett, 2000). The third part of Lewin’s theory was accepting and using the change as the new way of operating. This step in the change process is more permanent if the stakeholders take ownership of the change (Fullan, 2001).

The change process, as seen through the lens of teachers, administrators, parents, community members, education professionals and governing agencies, is complex. Teacher education operates in the context of national standards and accrediting organizations; state standards and accrediting policies; and institutional and local district policies (Grossman & McDonald, 2008). National content standards have been developed by professional content organizations such as the National Association of Science Teachers (NSTA), the International Society for Technology Education (ISTE), and the National Association of Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences Education (NATEFACS). Teacher preparation accrediting organizations such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teachers Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) have developed teacher competencies. They have provided accreditation which denotes a known level of mastery for teacher preparation candidates. These two councils have voted to combine to become Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). This will take place January 2013 (NCATE, 2012). States have had state-specific standards for teacher
preparation directed by boards. One example of this is the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) in Washington State. Developing and implementing change in teacher preparation programs has demanded careful planning to meet diverse standards and policies.

**Language of Education**

Communication is an important factor in the planning, implementing and sustaining change. It has been reported that the lack of a common vocabulary has lead to confusion as stakeholders participate in conversation regarding the practice of teaching (Education Commission for the States, 1995; Grossman & McDonald, 2006). For example, the terms goal, outcome, and standard have been used interchangeably to denote end points in education (ECS, 1995). A goal has been defined as a specific, measurable end to work toward (Ravich, 2007). Institutions or agencies or professional groups have set goals for improving curriculum. The word outcome has been used to denote the concept of outcome-based education or it has been used to denote an outcome-based education program model. This review will be limited to outcomes as a concept. King and Evans (1991) defined an outcome, as a concept, as the end product of the lesson or unit or course. Outcomes were expressed for content, which indicated what a student should know and be able to do at the end of a lesson, unit or course. Outcomes were expressed for performance which indicated what and how well a student could complete particular activity (ECS, 1995). The outcome-based education was popularized in the 1990’s. This way of developing curriculum required that strategies be shifted from outcomes based on text to outcomes representing what a student should know or how they should act as a result of the curriculum (King & Evans, 1991). Outcome based education was attractive because outcomes could be expressed in a
way that could be measured and there was some flexibility as to how a student arrived at the outcome (King & Evans, 1991). Some opponents of outcomes, as a way of expressing end points, were concerned that they expressed feelings and beliefs and were therefore difficult to assess (ECS, 1995).

Today’s genre, as a result of the movement to create a more professional view of teaching, uses the term “Standard” to express content or the level of expectation or to measure performance (Barton, 2010). A standard provides a common measure for establishing goals for curriculum, setting learning outcomes, promoting change, and assessing the outcomes (Bales, 2007; Solomon, 2009). For this study an educational standard describes what a student should know and be able to do at the end of a unit or course or program.

Standards

Ravitch (1992) delivered a report to The American Sociological Association 1992 annual meeting on the development of national standards in education. This report indicated that the development of national standards began a significant shift in the way the U.S. education system operated. Content standards, standards development, and adoption at the state and federal government have, in turn, affected how institutions teach and assess their students.

As educational disciplines developed standards for content and pedagogy, the movement to national standards has driven changes in teacher licensure across the United States (NCATE, 2010). Various stakeholders determine the standards, licensure requirements, and the assessment of teacher candidates. The Interstate New Teachers and
Support Consortium (InTASC) (Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), 2011) was formed in 1987 to develop models for assessing what a teacher should know and be able to do. These models were based on standards which form a basis for assessing knowledge and dispositions and performance expected of a beginning teacher. INTASC standards have driven education programs and licensure in many states.

A new movement toward common core state standards for college and career readiness is now being jointly sponsored by the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) (NGA, 2012). This initiative paves the way for 50 states and territories and the District of Columbia to develop language arts and math standards for kindergarten through 12th grade students. It will be interesting to see how widely this initiative is embraced by states and how these core standards can be woven into specific content areas such as science and math and FCS. Will these core standards lead to the development of core state standards in specific disciplines in teacher education?

Barton (2010) detailed three concerns that should be addressed in the development and implementation of national standards in education. One concern is the varying views on the purpose of the standards. Do the standards set the content and knowledge for a grade or subject? Do the standards assist teachers in improving and raising the level of instruction? Do the standards serve as a measure for evaluating or testing? The second concern is how to manage the national standards within the diverse education system. The third concern is the assessment of the national standards. Who will manage and assess the success of the national standards? Barton (2010) reported that “(1) the content of instruction from place to place, (2) the performance standards states set, and (3) student achievement” are areas to consider as
national standards are developed (p. 25). Additionally Darling-Hammond (2001) reported that there are weaknesses in the use of standards that need to be considered:

Standards, like all other reforms, hold their own dangers. Standard setting in all professions must be vigilant against the possibility that practice could become constrained by the codification of knowledge that does not sufficiently acknowledge legitimate diversity of approaches or advances in the field, that access to practice could become overly restricted on the grounds not directly related to competence, or adequate learning opportunities for candidates to meet the standards may not emerge on an equitable basis. (p. 773)

These concerns outline issues that need to be addressed as standards are developed, implemented and updated.

**National Standards for Teacher Education**

*Model Core Teaching Standards* were developed by INTASC in 1992. An update of the standards was done in 2010 and published in 2011 (CCSSO, 2011). These standards described what a teacher should know and be able to do. They listed the *standard* or principle, outlined the *knowledge* needed for the principle, showed the *dispositions* for the principle and lastly gave the *performances* required by the student to demonstrate the principle. They provided a framework for development and delivery of teacher education programs, as well as, assessment strategies to show teacher mastery of the standards.

The general movement toward standards based teacher education brought the development of teacher education standards for specific education programs. NCATE has published standards for twenty specialty program areas. Specific content areas included early child education, English language education, arts education, environmental education, foreign language education, health education, math education, physical education, science education, social studies education, and technology education (NCATE, 2010).
The National Sciences Teachers Standards were developed over a four year period and published in 1996. A revision of the teacher standards was published in 2003 (NSTA 2003). The Educational Technology Standards for Teachers were developed and published in 2000 and were revised in 2008 (ISTE/NETS 2009). These standards provided a framework for course content and teaching pedagogy in teacher education programs. The national standards for teachers of FCS were accepted and published in 2004. These standards are not part of the NCATE published specialty areas, but they provide a common vision and common expectation of what a teacher candidate should know and be able to do.

**Implementation**

Implementation of national standards in any discipline requires a framework and strategies for communicating the standards to states and institutions. How is the implementation of the standards directed? Is it top down or bottom up or something between? It is evident that the state and national policies direct change from the top down and the institutional and local policies direct the change from the bottom up. Fullan, in “The New Meaning of Educational Change” (2007) indicated that it is important to combine both top down and bottom up strategies to facilitate effective change. He further stated that ownership, commitment and clear understanding of the change are critical components for success. Hall and Hord (2001) stated that, rather than combining top down and bottom up strategies, a horizontal structure is best. In a horizontal structure, all levels are equally represented. Whatever the structure, implementing changes at the national, state and local level requires a framework for involvement and support (Moffett, 2000). Stakeholders need to have a clear understanding of the change and they need to be committed to the change and
they need to feel ownership of the change. For example, implementation of change in national education standards could be framed horizontally by groups of teachers, parents, administrators, professionals, and content specialists at the school, district, state, regional, and national level.

In *Leading Change*, John Kotter (1996) posited an eight stage process for affecting change:

1. Establishing a Sense of Urgency
2. Creating a Guiding Coalition
3. Developing a Vision and Strategy
4. Communicating a Change Action
5. Empowering Broad-Based Action
6. Generating Short-Term Wins
7. Consolidating Gains and Producing More Change
8. Anchoring New Approaches in the Culture. (p. 21)

Kotter’s stages illustrate that the process for successful change addresses the need for the change, a group to lead the change, a vision and a plan, a strategy for sharing input and progress of the change process. Moffett (2000) added that building a professional community of learning, retaining staff and inclusion of outside change agents are necessary for continued change. Advances in technology offer a variety of networking options for research, planning, disseminating, sharing and assessing these changes.

Implementation of the *Standards* project for teachers of FCS, sponsored by NATEFACS, was the subject of breakout sessions at both the annual meetings of the American Association of Family of Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) and the Association of Career and Technical Educators (ACTE). Technology provided a platform for the standards framework to be shared in a timely manner to a wide audience. NATEFACS provided, and continues to provide, online access to the *Standards* and the *Journal of Family and
Consumer Sciences. The Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences devoted 4 journal editions, published in 2008 and 2009, to the National Standards of Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences. Development panel members and other experts in the field were asked to submit articles reflecting trends and interpretation of the Standards. Articles received and published represented the ten Standards.

- **Standard 1**: Career, Community, and Family Connections were addressed by two articles. “Addressing the Complexities of Life Work in Family and Consumer Sciences Education” (Way, 2008) looked at the connections of career, family and community to the content of the discipline and suggested frameworks, strategies and resources needed to implement the Standard. “Career, Community and Family Connections: Implementation in Family and Consumer Sciences Education” (Kelly & Filbeck, 2009) focused on the importance of creating partnerships to connect course content to life skills.

- **Standard 2**: Consumer Economics and Family Resources were addressed by two articles. “Internet Delivery of Consumer Economics and Family Resource Management Courses” (Pickard & Reichelt, 2008) focused on the internet as an alternate way of delivering consumer economics and resource management. “Consumer Economics and Family Resources: Importance of Financial Literacy” (Mimbs-Johnson & Lewis, 2009) focused on the essential skills and process skills needed by a beginning teacher in the context of financial literacy.

- **Standard 3**: Family and Human Development were addressed by two articles. “Developing Pre service Teacher Competencies” (Klein & Moore, 2008) clarified the expectations for beginning teachers including strategies for implementing and

- **Standard 4:** Nutrition, Food and Wellness were addressed by two articles. “Current Benchmarks, Trends, and Challenges in an Ever Changing Environment” (Friesen, Spangler, & McFadden, 2008) emphasized the importance of having current nutrition information for curriculum design and strategies for implementing the standard. “Rationale and Resources for Implementation in Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Preparation Programs” (Myers & Pope, 2009) focused on the relevance of the standard, as well as, information for implementation and assessment.

- **Standard 5:** Curriculum Development was addressed by one article. “Curriculum: A Critical Science Perspective” (Montgomery, 2008) addressed critical science as an approach to problem-based curriculum development.

- **Standard 6:** Instructional Strategies and Resources were addressed by two articles. “Utilizing the Internet as a Technology Tool in Family and Consumer Sciences Classroom” (Reichelt & Pickard, 2008) focused on the use of the internet as an instructional technique and program resource. “Instructional Strategies and Resources: Exploring the Use of Technology” (Mosenson & Johnson, 2008) addressed the integration of technology methods and curriculum.

- **Standard 7:** Learning Environment was addressed by three articles. “Learning Environment: An Overview” (Fox, 2009) was an overview of the Learning Environment Standard. “Learning Environment: Creating and Implementing a Safe, Supportive Learning Environment” (Thompson & Wheeler, 2008) addressed
physical, intellectual and emotional factors which impact the creation and implementation of a safe, supportive learning environment. “Learning Environment: Respecting Diversity and Exceptionality” (Swafford & Dainty, 2009) focused on the respect of diversity and exceptionality in the learning environment.

- **Standard 8**: Professionalism was addressed by three articles. “Professionalism: Ethical Professional Practice for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences” (Couch & Alexander, 2009) promoted understanding of and strategies for implementing the Standard. “Professionalism: Ethical Decision Making as a Foundation for Professional Practice” (Roubanis, Garner & Purcell, 2008) focused on the ethics of the profession. Professionalism: History, Philosophy, Ethics and Public Policy” (Rehm, Jensen & Rowley, 2009) focused on building a foundation for professional practice and advocacy.

- **Standard 9**: Student and Program Assessment were addressed by two articles. “Student and Program Assessment: Effective Preparation of Teacher Candidates” (Keino & Hausafus, 2009) explored strategies for assessing student content and curriculum, as well as, teacher self evaluation. “Student and Program Assessment: Assessment Literacy, the Basis for Student Assessment” (Torrie & Van Buren, 2008) explored assessment literacy, strategies and competencies in assessment for teacher candidates.

- **Standard 10**: Student Organizations was addressed by two articles. “Student Organizations Integration: Initiatives for Positive Youth Development- The Ultimate Leadership Experience” (Ambrose & Goar, 2009) focused on the role of the advisor in student leadership development in FCS curriculum. “Student Organization
Integration: Comparison of Two Models for Implementing FCCLA in Teacher Preparation” (DeBates & Pickard, 2008) focused on the development of a specialized course or the integration of FCCLA into pedagogy course as models for providing student leadership experience to teacher candidates.

These articles offered understanding of the Standards and possible models for using the standards from the lens of a variety of FCS experts. They further offer opportunities for sharing input and progress in the change process (Moffett, 2000), as well as, a professional community of learning (Kotter, 1996). Although these standards were carefully crafted to meet the diverse needs of states and institutions in 2004, this study will determine the extent to which they are being used and if an update and revision of these standards is necessary.

Assessment

In the evaluation of national student content standards, Ravitch (2006) stated that it is important to have clear goals and clear accountability. Clear goals and clear accountability are necessary for standards for teachers as well.

A clearly written standard, which reflects outcomes or performance indicators, can be assessed in the context of outcomes and the performance of students. Standards should reflect current knowledge about what a beginning teacher should know and be like. The Family and Consumer Sciences teacher Standards were written with painstaking attention to creating clear, concise, descriptive language. Fox (2009, pp. 144-145) indicated that it is important to include criteria for performance validity. There should be alignment of standards with goals, a fit between the standards and classroom tasks and a review by
experienced teachers. When considering validity, it is important to know if the knowledge and skills expressed in a standard are relevant and representative of the intent of the standard.

Periodic assessment of national standards is necessary to insure that the knowledge and skills expressed in a standard are relevant and representative of the intent of the standards. Criteria for the assessment and a method for assessing the standards must be developed. Disciplines have updated their national standards for teachers in a variety of ways. The National Science Teacher Association (NSTA, 2003) developed National Standards for Science Teachers in 1998 and revised those standards in 2003. The criteria for the development of the updated standards included standards which:

- were consistent with the vision of the discipline;
- created a foundation for performance assessment of knowledge, skills and pedagogy
- addressed the knowledge, skills and dispositions considered necessary by the experts in the field; and
- aligned with the National Science Education Standards (NSES), the Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

As they began to assess the 1998 standards, they found concerns about the vagueness of some of the standards. The standards also seemed to be too broad and tended to be interpreted in different ways by institutions and instructors. Five of the standards were rewritten, adding information to help define the focus and meaning of the standards. Knowledge, skills and dispositions were added to further clarify the standards.

The National Society for Technology in Education developed the National Educational Technology Standards in 2000 (ISTE, 2009). The standards focused on the
understanding of the use of technology in effective learning environments, professional practice, social, ethical and legal issues related to the use of technology in education, methods and strategies for incorporating technology in curriculum and assessment. The standards were revised in 2008 (ISTE, 2009). This revision reflects increased access to and knowledge of technology. The 2008 revision focused on using content knowledge and knowledge of technology to design and implement learning experiences and assessments to advance student learning, modeling working and learning in a digital world, promoting, and modeling responsibility in a digital world and engaging in continued professional growth.

A clearly written standard, which reflects outcomes or performance indicators, can be assessed in the context of outcomes and the performance of students. Standards should reflect current knowledge about what a beginning teacher should know and be like. The Family and Consumer Sciences teacher Standards were written with painstaking attention to creating clear, concise, descriptive language. There should be alignment of standards with goals, a fit between the standards and classroom tasks and a review by experienced teachers. In considering validity it is important to know if the knowledge and skills expressed in a standard are relevant and representative of the intent of the standard.

**Research in Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Education**

NCLB sought to provide well prepared teachers in all phases of education. The ESEA reauthorization continues that effort. Shulman (2004) emphasized that teachers must be able to integrate their content knowledge and their knowledge about how to teach. Grossman & McDonald (2008) believed that the preparation of teachers and the practice of teaching are very complex. They further state that research on the content of teaching must
have a stronger connection to research on the context in which teaching is done in order to move research in teaching forward. The Standards refocus FCS teacher education on content knowledge and the practice of teaching. What recent research has focused on FCS teacher education? Lichty & Stewart (2000) reported on the socialization of new college faculty in FCS teacher education. The goal of the study was to create strategies that would provide smoother transition to their positions. In 2003, Lichty & Robles reported on the teaching experiences of new FCS emergency teachers in an effort to decrease attrition of this special group. In 2004, Jensen and Rowley reported on knowledge growth in pre-service out-of-field teaching. Andrea Mosenson (2006) investigated the barriers encountered by individuals seeking FCS teacher certification. Mosenson concluded that the most significant barriers were the declining number of pre service programs for FCS teacher certification, as well as, the small number of available online classes for teacher certification. Klemme (2007) conducted a survey of Wisconsin and Minnesota teacher’s understandings and perceptions about the Standards. The results were presented at the ACTE meeting in Las Vegas in December 2008. This work was conducted through self evaluation and focused on how much time was spent on the Standards. The study did not focus on validity of the Standards. Klemme (2008) reported in the Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education on new directions in FCS teacher preparation. Many FCS programs are moving toward assessment based on standards and benchmarks. In her study, she found that 34 states are using the PRAXIS II to assess exit content knowledge in Family and Consumer Sciences teacher candidates. The PRAXIS II tests subject area knowledge with the use of constructed response and multiple choice questions.
The focus of the *National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences* was less on technical homemaking skills and more on process-based learning and purposeful integration with academic content (Fox, 2000). Research by Moran (2003) reinforced the idea that research knowledge should be used to inform and change practice; and that practice must be evaluated, and research be conducted for further revision and reevaluation. Olson and Montgomery (2000) studied the expectations of Family and Consumer Sciences undergraduate interns. The focus of this work was to look at the experiences of students in the internship and the extent to which the experience exceeded, matched or mismatched their expectations. This study intimated that further research might be conducted on identification of FCS professional competencies and unique skills and an examination of the role of the site supervisor in facilitating professional skills.

**Summary**

When reviewing the literature it was evident that the impetus to create high quality teachers is strong. The work of improving teacher preparation continues to be directed by federal funding, national and regional accreditation agencies, and state policies. The improvement involves a complex change process which occurs in the context of national standards, state licensure and institutional policy. The change process involves input and leadership at the national, state and local level, a clearly stated vision, a plan and a process for implementing the desired change. Stakeholders need to understand the change and take ownership of the change in order for the change to be sustained. Changes in teacher preparation involve careful planning to meet the diversity of content, expectations for student achievement and assessment requirements across the U.S.
Standards are set at the local, state, and national levels to provide a common measure for content, performance and proficiency in education. Standards developed for teacher preparation and aligning these standards with student standards and licensure requirements will improve the quality of teaching and student learning. As standards are developed it is important to consider the purpose, the management, and the assessment strategies for these standards. Clear goals and clear accountability are important components of national standards. Federal acts such as the ESEA have created an accounting system for measuring teaching results and proven teaching strategies to enhance student learning.

National standards for teacher education are developed and directed by professional education organizations such as NATEFACS, NSTA and ISTE and accreditation organizations such as NCATE, INTASC and NBPTS. As disciplines have updated their standards, they have evaluated them in a variety of ways. The ISTE evaluated their standards and created a new set of standards that reflected new technology and teacher/student knowledge. The NSTA used a set of criteria for evaluating their standards and the changes addressed the clarity of the standards. NASAFACS (2008b) used expert panels to bring members to consensus for the update of the student National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences. Characteristics of an expert panel are anonymity of panel members, the opportunity of panelists to revise and refine opinions, feedback of other panelists to enable participants to change view, and the possibility of quantitative interpretation of the data.

The review of FCS education research revealed that there has been research conducted on socialization of new teachers, the effects of out-of-field teaching, attrition of emergency teachers, knowledge growth of out-of-field teachers, expectations of FCS interns, barriers to FCS certification, and new directions in teacher certification. One research study
was conducted on teacher perceptions of the *Standards*. There has not been recent research on the practice, content knowledge, and preparation of FCS teachers. Research on the implementation of the *Standards* and a possible update of the *Standards* has not been done and would add valuable information to the literature.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study of the 2004 National Standards for Teachers of FCS was twofold. First, the study examined the implementation of the Standards in teacher preparation programs within states and institutions by seeking answers to these questions:

- How have states and institutions implemented the Standards?
- What strategies have been successful in the implementation process?
- If implementation is not taking place, what are the barriers?
- How might implementation be improved to facilitate inclusion of the Standards in teacher preparation programs?

Second, the study examined the 2004 National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences (Standards) and considered the following questions:

- Do the 2004 Standards reflect the current content, trends, and pedagogy of the discipline?
- Are the meanings of the Standards sufficiently clear and concise?
- Should the 2004 Standards be revised and if so what should those revisions be?

Implementation of the Standards: Research Method

Examining how states and institutions have implemented the Standards in FCS teacher preparation programs necessitated gathering information from individuals who were spread over a wide geographic area. A descriptive survey method was chosen for this study. Descriptive survey is a useful tool for gathering data and describing the responses to create a picture of what exists (Jackson, 2012). A descriptive study can utilize either open-ended,
semi-open, and closed questions or statements to gather information, facts and opinions. Closed questions or statements can be used to gather demographic facts, semi open questions or statements may be used to gather facts and opinions, and open ended questions or statements can be used to gather facts or opinions about implementation, strategies, facilitation, barriers, and concerns (Jackson, 2012).

Until recently it was perceived that the population of an online survey might be limited by the ability of a sample to access a computer and the web. Dillman, Smyth and Christian (2009) reported that increased access to computers and the web has made the use of online surveys more realistic. They further stated that a population made up of teachers and members of professional organizations would have the resources and knowledge to complete online surveys and made this a viable choice. Online surveys are an inexpensive, time saving method for conducting research. They are an excellent way to gather information from a population that is spread over a wide area. An online survey was the preferred design for this study because the population for the study resided in all regions of the U.S.

Data from the survey were collected using the cross sectional design. As defined by Creswell (2009), cross sectional design means that the data are collected at one point in time. There a variety of online survey programs available. The online survey tool for this work was selected for ease in creating the survey, the opportunity to create and implement multiple surveys, and the ability to tabulate results in a variety of ways.

**Standards Review**

In order to review the 2004 *Standards*, the researcher considered a series of methods. A focus group is a type of group interview conducted to quickly gather a quantity of
information (Jackson, 2012). The researcher can use questions or statements, followed by a Likert-type or other rating scale to gather information and provide the basis for focus group dialogue. The rating scale might consist of five levels such as strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, and strongly disagree. Descriptive documentation of a focus group dialogue can be used to narrow concerns and assist the researcher in the development of questions for the review. A focus group is a valuable tool to gather data on a topic or question. Focus group’s data relies on the spoken word and data is transcribed to record the views and interactions of the group.

One method for developing consensus during the development and subsequent updating of standards is the use of a panel of experts. The Delphi method was originally developed for the RAND Corporation to gather expert opinion for a military project in the 1950’s (Linstone & Turoff, 1977). The characteristic which differentiates the Delphi method using a panel of experts from a simple polling system is the fact that information is collected from the panel. The information is analyzed and reported back to the panel; the panel then has the opportunity to support, change, or refine their responses (Mitroff & Turoff, 1977). The method is adaptable, but Rowe and Wright (1999) posited that a true classical Delphi study contains four characteristics: (a) anonymity of panel members, (b) opportunity of panelists to revise and refine opinions, (c) feedback of other panelists to allow participants to change view, and (d) the possibility of quantitative interpretation of the data. A three-round Delphi study would include the following steps:

- Development of research questions
- Design of the research method
- Select the sample
- Develop the first round questions
- Send the round one questions
• Analyze round one questions
• Develop the round two questions
• Send the round two questions
• Analyze the round two questions
• Develop round three questions
• Send round three questions
• Analyze the round three questions
• Compile the results (Skulmoski, Hartman & Krahn, 2007)

Tigelaar, Dolmans, Wolfhagen, and Van Der Vleuten (2004) chose the Delphi technique to develop and validate a framework for teaching competencies. The study panel was comprised of 63 educational experts with a background in policy making, training and investigating. The study utilized a current competency framework and 134 questions were designed in 7 domains. The questions were rated on a Likert-type scale. In addition the panel was allowed to revise questions and provide additional information if necessary. Round one was completed and compiled. In round two the panel members received the results of the Likert scores, as well as, the overall means and standard deviations. Each panel member was asked to rerate or confirm the original rating of the questions. The researchers determined that consensus was met when 75% of the panel agreed on a question. Consensus was met after two rounds.

A modified Delphi technique was used to complete the 2008 update of the 16 National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences (National Standards). These standards are the content standards for the discipline (P. Wild, personal communication, September 1, 2009). Initially recommendations for the update of the National Standards were completed by more than 1,000 reviewers. The reviewers included FCS educators, content specialists, business and industry representatives, agencies and organizations connected with FCS. Under the direction of National Association of State Administrators for
Family and Consumer Sciences (NASAFACS) leadership, participants considered if each of the Standards should be kept as written, deleted, or revised. If changes were recommended, they were listed for each standard. Groups of experts were formed to analyze the reviews, revise, and update the standards and the competencies. The National Standards were then approved or changed to reflect current trends and issues of the discipline. Two rounds were used to reach consensus. Consensus in access of 80 percent was reached (P. Wild, personal communication, March 1, 2011).

A similar modified Delphi technique was used to validate the Pre-professional Assessment and Certification Program for FCS. This work was done under the direction of the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). The content areas currently ready are Broad Field FCS, Early Child Education, Personal and Family Finance. Certifications in development are Culinary Arts, Education Careers, Family Services, Nutrition, Fashion, Textiles, and Apparel (AAFCS, nd). A panel of experts was selected for each content assessment. The panels for the pre professional assessment and certification were weighted more heavily with business and industry as they were developed to indicate career, post high school knowledge and readiness (L. Meyers, personal communication, December 2, 2009). Expert panels have been successfully used to assess the National Standards for FCS and for Pre professional Assessment and Certification for FCS.

A panel of experts can be appointed to participate in a series of rounds using modified Delphi methodology to reach consensus regarding an issue or series of questions. Balanced representation of the population can be achieved by a stratification process. Modified Delphi methodology is an appropriate strategy for gathering data not currently known, examining the pros and cons of a policy option, and for putting together the structure of a model. It can
also be used for making collective judgments, when experience or expertise will add to the knowledge, and when time and proximity preclude face to face meetings (Linstone & Turoff, 1977). The number of rounds is determined by the ability of the panel to come to consensus and the level of consensus required. An 80% consensus was sought for this study. Restrictive travel budgets precluded the gathering of a panel of experts to examine the 2004 Standards.

**Population of the Study**

The members of the National Association of Teacher Educators of Family and Consumer Sciences (NATEFACS) and the National Association of State Administrators of Family and Consumer Sciences (NASAFACS) comprised the population for the implementation study and the standards review study. The combined membership of the two organizations included FCS administrators, content specialists, teacher educators, and FCS related professionals representing institutions of varying sizes. Each organization had a listserv on the web. Each listserv was regularly used for communication, networking, and research. Access to the listserv was available to members of the organizations. The rationale for this choice was that NATEFACS was the sponsoring organization for the development of the Standards and NASAFACS was the sponsoring organization for the development of the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences. The National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences provide a framework for planning and delivering Family and Consumer Sciences programs for students. NATEFACS and NASAFACS members comprised the original panel of participants. The members of the two organizations have
knowledge of the standards and have vested time and energy into the development and implementation of the standards.

**Institutional Review Board Approval**

Approval for the study was sought through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Iowa State University. The IRB form was filed with the graduate office to gain approval for the study. A copy of the approval is located in Appendix B. An IRB statement was included in the invitation to participate in the Implementation survey, the focus groups and the Delphi-type panel distributed by the researcher.

**Implementation of the Standards – Part A**

**Procedure and Data Collection**

Questions for the descriptive survey to examine the status of implementation of the *Standards* in teacher preparation programs in states and institutions were developed using information from the literature review and from survey questions used in the original development of the 2004 *Standards* (Fox, Stewart, & Erickson, 2008). The researcher gathered demographic information which painted a picture of the respondents and their professional relationship to and work with the *Standards*. The survey used an instrument composed of closed and open-ended questions to examine the implementation of the *Standards* in teacher preparation programs within states and institutions, seeking answers to these questions:

- How have states and institutions implemented the *Standards*?
- What strategies have been successful in the implementation process?
• If implementation is not taking place, what are the barriers?
• What strategies can be used to share, integrate and implement the Standards?

The online survey, sent to current members of NATEFACS and NASAFACS, included an introduction, informed consent, and a link to the survey. Two reminders were sent to the members of NASAFACS and NATEFACS. Data collected from the survey were compiled by the researcher. Closed questions were tabulated and recorded. Open-ended questions were coded and the results were recorded in narrative by the researcher.

Standards Review

In preparation for the review of the Standards, a focus group was convened at the annual meeting of NASAFACS, May 2011. A second focus group was convened at a session for NATEFACS at the annual meeting of the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences, June 2011. There were a total of 32 participants in the two focus groups. The purpose of the focus groups was to gather information about the Standards to shape the work of the panel. The focus group format included:

• 5 minutes for introduction and sharing the purpose of the Standards study;
• 10 minutes for individuals to rate the standards on a 5-part Likert-type scale using the following statement for each of the 10 standards: “The standard as stated provides a useful framework for designing or refining beginning FCS teacher education programs and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of a beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard”. The instrument replicated the survey instrument used to survey
teacher educators, teachers, state administrators and specialists and university administrators in the final validation process for the 2004 Standards.

- 5 minutes to look at the standards which elicit disagree or strongly disagree, allowing the group to narrow discussion to areas that need attention;
- 25 minutes for discussion; and
- 5 minutes for wrap up.

Two recorders took notes of the discussion. The researcher tabulated the Likert-type questions and compiled the notes from the surveys and discussion. These focus groups provided information to develop the modified Delphi instrument. The instrument was reviewed by two FCS professionals and adjusted.

An invitation to participate in a Delphi-type panel to review the 2004 Standards was sent to the membership of NATEFACS and NASAFACS. The invitation explained the scope and the process for the study. A link to a panel application was provided. The application included informed consent, demographic information, a survey examining the status of implementation of the Standards in teacher preparation programs in states and institutions and the invitation to join a panel of experts to review the Standards as presented and approved in 2004. The presidents of NASAFACS and NATEFACS were consulted and a panel of 12 was selected from the survey respondents and additional suggestions from the respective presidents. The panel was comprised of five teacher educators representing both public and private institutions both large and small, six administrators representing state agencies and institutions, and one member of an organization providing educational training and resources for teachers, teacher educators, and teacher candidates. In order to protect the anonymity of the respondents, they were given an anonymous survey link.
The assembled panel participated in two online rounds to determine if the Standards address current trends and pedagogy in FCS teacher education and, if not, what changes to the 2004 Standards should be made. Responses from round one were gathered, tabulated, and compiled by the researcher. In round two, the compilation was shared with the panel. Members of the panel were given an opportunity to share views, revise or refine opinions, and change their views as they moved toward consensus in round two. Consensus of 80% was sought on a rating scale which required the participants to select between the following choices: “leave as written”, “delete”, “revise”, and “no opinion”. Additional rounds were not necessary to bring the group to consensus. The participants will receive the results of the work. Information from this study including strategies for continuing the implementation, as well as, suggestions for the 2012 update of the Standards will be shared with the leadership of NATEFACS, the sponsoring entity of the Standards.

Implementation of the Standards – Part B

Methods of Analysis

Results were tabulated, coded, and compiled by the researcher. The results of the closed questions were tabulated. The open ended questions were coded, by the researcher, into themes and patterns and compiled to create a picture of implementation of the Standards by states and institutions. The results from this data were compiled for sharing with the NATEFACS Standards team.

Standards Review

Results of the focus groups survey and discussion were compiled. A 5-part Likert-type scale and open ended questions regarding the Standards were tabulated. The groups
were then given the opportunity to discuss the *Standards*. Two recorders compiled group discussion. This was transcribed by the researcher. Results of the focus groups revealed issues and concerns and shaped the direction of the panel of experts as they reviewed the *Standards*.

A panel of 12 experts was assembled. A packet of information, compiled from the focus group survey and discussion provided background for the panel members. The packet included the following (also see Appendix C):

- Criteria for the development of the *National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences*
- The *National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences* document
- Expectation Statements for the *National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences*
- Focus Group findings for the *National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences*

The panel communicated by e-mail. A modified Delphi method was used to move toward consensus. The panel was asked two questions about each of the *Standards*. The Likert-type scale was tabulated and the open ended questions were compiled. The panel received the results of their work and they were given the opportunity to support, clarify or make additional remarks for each *Standard*. These results were tabulated and coded by the researcher. This information will be used for the 2012 update of the *Standards*. 
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Implementation of the Standards

To explore the implementation of the Standards in teacher preparation programs within states and institutions, an online descriptive survey was sent to members of NASAFACS and NATEFACS. Members were invited to participate in the study and were provided with an explanation of the study, background information about development of the Standards, and a copy of the Standards. Eighty-nine (89) implementation surveys were distributed to the current memberships of NASAFACS and NATEFACS. Two reminders were sent to complete the survey. Forty-seven (47) participants completed the survey for a 53% return.

The introduction and implementation survey is located in Appendix D. Timing for a survey is important. Survey participants associated with institutions have blocks of time between sessions when they are not available. This survey was sent to coincide with the beginning of the fall term for institutions. It was frustrating to note that even with an eye on appropriate timing, many “out of office notices” were received.

Part 1 of the survey gathered information about the respondents. Question one and two asked respondents to record the number of years they had been in the profession and all of the roles they perform in their present position. As indicated in Table 1, the majority of the respondents had been in the profession for more than 15 years.

Participants reported all positions or roles that applied to their current position. As indicated in Table 2, the respondents included FCS teachers, teacher educators, state advisors, administrators, and department chairs. The responses revealed the highest
Table 1. Years in the profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Professional roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCS Teacher Educator</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS Teacher</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS State Administrator</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS Department Chair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS State Advisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percentages being those roles of teacher educator, teacher and state administrators. The respondents for this survey were experienced in their positions and represented both teacher education and administration.

In part two of the survey, respondents were asked to indicate their knowledge, extent of involvement in the development, and the extent of involvement in the implementation of the standards. As indicated in Table 3, 93% of the respondents were very or moderately knowledgeable and involved in the Standards work.

A large portion of the development of the Standards occurred during national meetings and development conferences (Fox et al., 2008). Respondents indicated that they were less involved in the development of the Standards, as indicated in Table 4.
Table 3. Knowledge and involvement with the *Standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge/Involvement</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable and involved</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately knowledgeable and involved</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only slightly knowledgeable and involved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No knowledge or involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Involvement in *Standards* development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended “Standards” meetings at conferences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in “Standards” development panel(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in development activities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard about the development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation of the *Standards* took place at state and national conferences, as well as through publication of articles in the *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences.*

Respondents had multiple opportunities to participate and indicated high involvement in this process (see Table 5).

Table 5. Involvement in *Standards* implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in implementation</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended “Standards” meetings at conferences</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in “Standards” development panel(s)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in development activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard about the development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to report their areas of expertise related to the four content standards and six pedagogy standards in the *Standards* document. The results indicated that they were well versed in the 10 standards as a group.

Respondents were also asked to report information about teacher competencies and alignment of the *Standards* to those teacher competencies. When asked, 90% of the respondents indicated that their state or institution has teacher competences and standards for FCS teacher certification. Alignment of competencies and standards for FCS teacher preparation by their state or institution was reported as complete by 72% of the respondents.

Respondents were asked to report how their state or institution has accomplished the alignment of the *Standards*. This open-ended question was compiled and coded by the researcher. Two themes emerged: (1) who accomplished the alignment and, (2) how the competencies and standards were aligned. Two respondents did not know how this was accomplished and one respondent came to the position after the implementation process had occurred. All remaining participants reported that alignment was accomplished collaboratively by state staff and teacher educators or by individuals at the institutional level. In all cases they reported that the standards were cross walked with course outcomes and if necessary courses were added or content of existing courses. One reported using the standards for NCATE compliance. Another reported that the *Standards* were successfully implemented as objectives in a methods class.

Respondents were asked to indicate if their state or institution used the *Standards* as a tool for developing and assessing teacher preparation programs in FCS. The use of the *Standards* as a tool was reported by 69% of the respondents and 31% of the respondents reported that they did not use the *Standards* as a tool.
Respondents were asked to describe the strategies their state or institution has used to implement the *Standards* in the development and assessment of teacher preparation programs in FCS. The written responses revealed a single pattern. The development and assessment is done at the institutional level rather than the state level. Institutions develop curriculum that is aligned to the *Standards*, producing course requirements, learning experiences and assessments. Students must demonstrate proficiency as a requirement for graduation. The *Standards* are linked to institutional education requirements and state requirements for teacher certification and graduation.

Participants were asked who was involved in the implementation and how they became involved. Respondents reported that state supervisors, teacher educators, FCS professionals, and FCS teachers were most involved in the implementation and that they became involved through participation in State and national meetings, through professional networking and professional publications.

Respondents were asked if the *Standards* are a useful tool in planning and developing curriculum for FCS teacher preparation in their state or institution. As noted in Table 6, on a 5-point Likert-type scale, 91% strongly agreed or agreed. The participants reported that there was a wide variety of ways that the states and institutions used the *Standards*.

Table 6. *Standards* are a useful tool in planning curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool for developing curriculum</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked if they believed that the 2004 *Standards* reflect current trends and best practices in FCS teacher education in their state or institution. As indicated in Table 7, 87% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed.

Participants were also given the opportunity to add comments. The comments were coded and two themes stood out. First, the *Standards* need to be revised and updated to reflect current content, trends, and pedagogy. State and national standards have not been successfully aligned in some states and institutions and the relationship between the *National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences* and the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences should be addressed.

Table 7. *Standards* reflect current trends and best practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflect trends and best practices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked if they believed that the 2004 *Standards* support current FCS teacher preparation in their state or institution. As noted in Table 8, the respondents showed strong agreement to the statement but the comments were mixed and qualified the response. One respondent replied that they were a strong and useful framework. Another replied that they had worked on the development and that they keep the *Standards* in mind as they prepare teacher candidates. One respondent stated that the *Standards* are not specific
Table 8. *Standards* support current FCS teacher preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support FCS teacher preparation</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

enough, and another thought that the *Standards* needed to place more focus on specific content such as Nutrition, Food Science, Culinary Arts, and Childhood Education.

Participants were asked to discuss issues which block implementation of standards in their state or institution. The most prevalent theme was lack of control. All respondents indicated that the implementation of the *Standards* requires interfacing them with a wide variety of certification standards, requirements, and exit tests which are managed by states and institutions. States also vary in the way control of curriculum is managed. Some states tie certification standards to secondary curriculum and some states give schools local control for curriculum development. There is a lack of coordination by state leaders in some states. The lack of specificity and detail was mentioned again. One respondent suggested that the cycle of revision of both the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences and the *Standards* be coordinated.

Participants were asked to describe recurring comments or concerns that they have with the *Standards*. The comments and concerns fell into three categories: (1) need for updating the *Standards* for clarification and current content; (2) need for a platform for communication and collaboration in the implementation process; and (3) continued concern
for distinguishing between or making a bridge between the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences and the Standards.

Standards Review

Focus Groups

A focus group was convened at the annual meeting of NASAFACS, May 2011. A second focus group was convened at a session for NATEFACS at the annual meeting of the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS), June 2011. The two focus groups totaled 32 participants. Participants rated the degree to which the Standards address current trends, content and pedagogy using a Likert-type scale. Participants were also given the opportunity to make written comments. The survey was followed with focus group discussion. Two recorders tracked the discussion. The following statement formed the lens for the rating scale: “The standard as stated provides a useful framework for designing or refining beginning FCS teacher education programs and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments for a beginning FCS teacher’s knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to this standard”. Participants were asked to select between the following options: strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, or strongly disagree. The rating for each standard was tabulated. A summary of the focus group ratings appears in Table 9.

The focus group participants rated the Standards high on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Focus group participants were given the opportunity to provide written comments and participate in group discussion. Although the Standards were rated high, written comments and discussion revealed that they had suggestions for refining the Standards. The written
comments, as well as, the oral discussion was recorded and coded and compiled. The findings are summarized as follows.

**Standard #1. Career, Community, and Family Connections:** Analyze family, community, and work interrelationships; investigate career paths; examine family and consumer sciences careers; and apply career decision making and transitioning processes.

The majority of focus group members rated Standard #1 as strongly agree (57%) or agree (28%). The focus group discussed strengthening the focus on careers and career pathways and their relationships to life decisions, as well as, clarifying language of the standard.

**Standard #2. Consumer Economics and Family Resources:** Use resources responsibly to address the diverse needs and goals of individuals, families, and communities in family and consumer sciences areas such as resource management, consumer economics, financial literacy, living environments, and textiles and apparel.

A majority of the focus group members rated Standard #2 as strongly agree (35%) or agree (53%). The focus group discussed the format of the Standards. A large number of

---

Table 9. Focus group *Standards* ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career, community, and family connections</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consumer economics and family resources</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family and human development</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Food, nutrition, and wellness</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instructional strategies and resources</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Learning environment</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Student and program assessment</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Student leadership</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distinct content areas were lumped into this standard. Should each content area have a standard? Should all FCS content areas be included in the enumeration? As an example, nutrition is missing from this standard. The group questioned where current trends and issues like sustainability and global society should be located. Terminology was an issue. Are topics represented with current terms and what do those topics include? Is consumer economics included in financial literacy?

**Standard #3. Family and Human Development:** *Apply principles of human development, interpersonal relationships, and family to strengthen individuals and families across the lifespan in contexts such as parenting, care giving, and the workplace.*

The majority of the focus group rated Standard #3 as strongly agree (38%) or agree (44%). The group agreed that edits were needed on the standard. Missing pieces, which denote current trends and issues, include diversity, the community connection, global society, and the early childhood education and careers focus.

**Standard #4. Nutrition, Food, and Wellness:** *Promote nutrition, food, and wellness practices that enhance individual and family well-being across the lifespan and address related concerns in a global society.*

The majority of the focus group rated Standard #4 as strongly agree (47%) or agree (38%). The group agreed that the standard should be connected with career clusters and occupations and be expanded to include culinary and hospitality. The group also discussed including socialization, global society, and sustainability in this standard.

**Standard #5. Curriculum Development:** *Develop, justify, and implement curricula that address perennial and evolving family, career, and community issues; reflect the integrative nature of family and consumer sciences; and integrate core academic areas.*

The majority of the focus group rated Standard #5 as strongly agree (22%) or agree (63%). As noted strongly agree was only 22% and the discussion produced many comments. Terminology was a concern. What does perennial mean? The group discussed key missing
pieces. Should technology be placed here? Should we include teaming with business and industry, other professionals and CTE areas? Should the standard include process skills, 21st century skills and critical science? The standard should be justified with data driven decision making that informs curriculum and instruction. Further, how does quality instruction happen?

**Standard #6. Instructional Strategies and Resources:** Facilitate students’ critical thinking and problem solving in family and consumer sciences through varied instructional strategies and technologies and through responsible management of resources in schools, communities, and the workplace.

The majority of the focus group rated Standard #6 as strongly agree (54%) or agree (31%). The focus group agreed that more instructional strategies should be addressed in the standard. An additional concern was terminology and whether this standard would be understood by other academic education disciplines?

**Standard #7. Learning Environment:** Create and implement a safe, supportive learning environment that shows sensitivity to diverse needs, values, and characteristics of students, families, and communities.

The majority of the focus group rated Standard #7 as strongly agree (41%) or agree (56%). The focus group agreed that the wording of this standard is weak. Alternate statements were suggested without a clear consensus. The group also suggested addressing the physical environment, classroom climate, classroom design, lab set up and equipment. There was also concern about the meaning of the word “values”.

**Standard #8. Professionalism:** Engage in ethical professional practice based on the history and philosophy of family and consumer sciences and career and technical education through civic engagement, advocacy, and ongoing professional development.

The majority of the focus group rated Standard #8 as strongly agree (44%) or agree (41%). The group discussed the wording of the standard. Some thought it too wordy and
others wanted more depth. Should service learning, professional organizations and networking be added? Is there a strong enough focus on ethics and professional practice? Does FCS need to be specified or should the standards just say professional?

**Standard #9. Student and Program Assessment: Assess, evaluate, and improve student learning and programs in family and consumer sciences using appropriate criteria, standards, and processes.**

The majority of the focus group rated Standard #9 as strongly agree (44%) or agree (47%). The group agreed that assessment is critical and that the standard needed rewriting. They also discussed the fact that every state is different in terms of assessing students and collecting class and program data and that complicates the development of a strong statement.

**Standard #10. Student Organization Integration: Integrate the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America student organization into the program to foster students’ academic growth, application of family and consumer sciences content, leadership, service learning, and career development.**

The majority of the focus group rated Standard #10 as strongly agree (69%) or agree (28%). The group agreed that a strong student leadership component in teacher preparation was important. The remainder of the discussion centered on the wording of the standard. Suggestions were made to create more clarity in the standard.

**Additional Topics**

The focus groups were asked if there were additional topics that should be included in the Standards and the researcher compiled these topics under each of the standards. The focus groups were also asked for any additional comments related to the Standards. The comments were compiled according to topics and listed as follows.
• The National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences have 16 content areas. The National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences has 10 standards and combines the content areas into four of the standards. Are the 16 areas of study reflected in the four content standards? It is time to collectively think about the Standards.
• Consideration should be given to creating a bridge between the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences and the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences for a better understanding of the depth of the content and a connection with education standards.
• I have utilized these standards to guide development and improvement of teacher education program. Expectations are crucial; the e-book publication for the Standards is helpful for justification and development of programs.
• The ten standards were well described and targeted. Important themes/strands relative for beginning FCS teacher Ed program. Content should include all FCS sections and pathways.
• As exit tests are revised, the Standards need to align with the tests. Many states use the Praxis- each area should be part of the test.
• Teacher Ed programs need to reflect current trends and issues so that teachers will be prepared.
• Add understanding of Perkins and use of advisory committees, articulation agreements working with post secondary.
• Teachers need to know they are part of a big- nationwide- community.
• While we’ve integrated standards content into courses, we’ve not used standards to organize program- we need to.
• NCATE looks at SPA’s to align teacher education.
• Teacher licensure: What do we do with post-baccalaureate people? What do we do to prep industry people and those who pick up fifth year teaching? How do we connect these to teacher licensure?

These mixed topics and concerns can be addressed either in conjunction with the update of the 2004 Standards or in conjunction with the implementation process. Some of the concerns do not directly relate to the Standards and will be addressed separately.

The results were used to frame and direct the work of the panel of experts who reviewed the standards. The complete focus group survey appears in Appendix E.

**Modified-Delphi Panel Rounds**

In round #1, the 12-member panel reviewed the 2004 Standards using an online format. The panel received an introductory letter explaining the process and a packet of
information including the results of the focus groups. This letter included an IRB statement and an anonymous link to the survey. Panel members were asked to review the packet to allow a common understanding of the development and purpose of the Standards, as well as, the accompanying Expectation Statements for each standard. As part of ongoing implementation strategies, expectations statements have been written to clarify each standard. The background information and focus group results were included as a zip file in the invitation.

The panel members were asked to review the results of the focus groups and identify:

- changes in wording which would indicate current trends and issues
- changes in wording which would clarify the meaning of the standard
- additional topics which should be included in the standards
- topics related to the standards which should be addressed in the future

Panel members were asked to rate each of the 10 Standards by selecting from a four-point scale. The panel members were asked to select from the following options: “leave as written”, “delete”, “revise”, or “no opinion”. If the panel member chose “revise” they were given the opportunity to comment on the standard.

In round #2, the round #1 rating scale was tabulated and comments were compiled. The panel was provided with this information. To move toward consensus in the second round the panel was asked to review the results of the first round and was offered the opportunity to support, expand or change responses to further clarify:

- changes in wording which would indicate current trends and issues
- changes in wording which would clarify the meaning of a standard
- additional topics which should be included in the standards
- topics related to the standards which should be addressed in the future

Eleven panel members participated in the second round. The ratings were tabulated and the responses were compiled. The results of round one and round two follow.
Standard #1. Career, Community, and Family Connections: Analyze family, community, and work interrelationships; investigate career paths; examine family and consumer sciences careers; and apply career decision making and transitioning processes.

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 31% of the panel members selected “leave as written” and 69% selected “revise”. The panel comments supported the focus group discussion, which centered around clarifying language of the standard, and focusing on careers and career pathways. Comments further suggested that the standards should address for whom the standard is meant and that may be a clarifying point for all the standards. Standards language should focus on timeless words.

Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 9% of the panel members selected “leave as written”, and 91% selected “revise”. Panel members supported previous suggestions to remove “transitioning process”. A suggestion to remove FCS from careers received a mixed review. Two comments stated that if we do not focus on our field, who will, and two comments stated that we need to focus on all careers. The focus group discussion regarding who the standard is meant for was supported by one panel member. They further reiterated that it applies to all the standards.

Standard #2. Consumer Economics and Family Resources: Use resources responsibly to address the diverse needs and goals of individuals, families, and communities in family and consumer sciences areas such as resource management, consumer economics, financial literacy, living environments, and textiles and apparel.

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 25% of the panel members selected “leave as written” and 75% selected “revise”. The panel supported the focus group discussion on the format of the Standards. It is important to compare the content of the 16 areas of the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences and the four content standards in the Standards document and make the parallels between the two sets of standards. The panel
supported the idea of including all areas of FCS in the standard or removing the enumeration “such as”. The panel members also supported sustainability and the responsible use of resources. Additionally one panel member suggested creating a category for Content Knowledge and placing Standard #2 in that category. Another panel member felt that literacy should be stressed in relationship to financial decision making, consumer rights and goal setting and roles and responsibilities.

Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 100% selected “revise”. Panel members supported shortening the standard either after “communities” or after “Family and Consumer Sciences”. Panel members supported investigating the creation of a bridge with the 16 areas in the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences. One panel member suggests that the underlying premise for the teacher standard be visited as revision and updating proceeds.

**Standard #3. Family and Human Development:** Apply principles of human development, interpersonal relationships, and family to strengthen individuals and families across the lifespan in contexts such as parenting, care giving, and the workplace.

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 33% of the panel members selected “leave as written” and 67% selected “revise”. The Panel supported the focus group discussion that diversity, the community connection, global society, and the early childhood focus was missing. One panel member further suggested that careers in families and human development should be incorporated. The need to incorporate technology into each of the standards was stated.

Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 100% selected “revise”. The panel agreed that edits were needed on the standard. The addition of diversity was needed. There was
disagreement as to whether contexts should be enumerated. It was stated that if one standard contains enumerations, then all of the standards should contain enumerations.

**Standard #4. Nutrition, Food, and Wellness:** *Promote nutrition, food, and wellness practices that enhance individual and family well-being across the lifespan and address related concerns in a global society.*

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 25% of the panel members selected “*leave as written*” and 75% selected “*revise*”. The panel agreed with the focus group that the standard should be expanded to include culinary and hospitality. The panel included food science in this comment. The panel also supported the focus group discussion which included global society, and sustainability here. Panel members also sought a community connection a focus on careers. The panel members further clarified the standard to add health maintenance, disease prevention and sanitation.

Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 91% selected “*revise*”, and 9% selected “*no opinion*”. The panel comments supported the addition of culinary arts and hospitality and food science to the standard. One panel member suggested that there be separate standards for career preparation such as culinary arts and hospitality. Safety and sanitation were supported as important parts of the standard.

**Standard #5. Curriculum Development:** *Develop, justify, and implement curricula that address perennial and evolving family, career, and community issues; reflect the integrative nature of family and consumer sciences; and integrate core academic areas.*

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 22% of the panel members selected “*leave as written*” and 78% selected “*revise*”. The panel concurred with the focus groups that wording of the standards was a concern. What does “perennial” and “evolving” mean? The rest of the comments were varied. One panel member suggested looking at how curriculum is addressed in academics. Another panel member suggested replacing ‘core academic areas’
to contemporary terminology such as “common core standards”. One panel member concurred with the focus group comment that the standard should be justified with data driven decision making that informs curriculum and instruction. One panel member suggested incorporating a critical science perspective.

Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 100% selected “revise”. The panel supported previous comments regarding words and terminology in the standard. There was a lack of consensus about appropriate words to use. One panel member suggested that the standard should project key tenants of the field but be understood by professionals outside the field.

Standard #6. Instructional Strategies and Resources: Facilitate students’ critical thinking and problem solving in family and consumer sciences through varied instructional strategies and technologies and through responsible management of resources in schools, communities, and the workplace.

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 33% of the panel members selected “leave as written”, 58% selected “revise”, and 8% selected “no opinion”. The panel comments for this standard focused on rewording the standard. One panel member suggested that family and consumer sciences be removed. Another panel member commented that a different opening phrase be used to take the emphasis off from critical thinking and problem solving. Another panel member suggested adding families, workplaces and communities to the standard. One panel member suggested incorporating a critical science perspective. It was also suggested that The Reasoning for Action Process from the National Standards for Family and Consumer sciences should be included in the standard. It was further suggested that this standard would fit under Instructional Practice (8) Instructional Strategies in the InTASC Model Teaching Standards.
Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 9% of the panel members selected “leave as written”, and 91% selected “revise”. The common theme was the diversity of the panel members’ comments. Two recurring comments relate to the use of the “Reasoning for Action Process” as the standards are refined and the use of expectation statements as a way of adding depth to a standard. It was suggested that in addition to critical thinking and problem solving, knowledge, skills, and dispositions are taught.

Standard #7. Learning Environment: Create and implement a safe, supportive learning environment that shows sensitivity to diverse needs, values, and characteristics of students, families, and communities.

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 50% of the panel members selected “leave as written”, and 50% selected “revise”. One panel member questioned the title of the standard. If the title is “Learning Environment”, does that mean the standard should include more about student learning? A panel member questioned whether “shows sensitivity” is a sufficient goal? It was suggested that this standard would fit under The Learner and Learning (3) Learning Environments in the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards. Panel suggestions for this standard focused on language and included removing “shows sensitivity to” and replacing the word “show” with “facilitates”.

Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 91% selected “revise”, and 9% selected “no opinion”. The panel members supported the comments in round #1, which indicated that the wording of the standard should be addressed.

Standard #8. Professionalism: Engage in ethical professional practice based on the history and philosophy of family and consumer sciences and career and technical education through civic engagement, advocacy, and ongoing professional development.

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 55% of the panel members selected “leave as written”, and 45% selected “revise”. The panel comments focused on wording to strengthen
the standard. Focus group discussion surrounding the importance of ethics and professional practice was supported by the panel members. One panel member stated that the *Standards* e-book chapters for this standard are strong. They would be important as the revision of this standard is attempted.

Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 91% selected “*revise*”, and 9% selected “*no opinion*”. The panel supported the comments from round #1 that ethical and professional practice should be a strong focus of the standard. It was the opinion of one panel member that “civic engagement” was personal and that advocacy might be enough.

*Standard #9. Student and Program Assessment: Assess, evaluate, and improve student learning and programs in family and consumer sciences using appropriate criteria, standards, and processes.*

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 40% of the panel members selected “*leave as written*”, 50% selected “*revise*”, and 10% selected “*no opinion*”. Panel comments focused on adding detail to the standards with words such as research-based criteria and “Continuous Improvement Model”. The need for both the words “assess” and “evaluate” was questioned. One panel member thought that the program management should be added.

Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 9% of the panel members selected “*Leave as Written*”, 73% selected “*revise*”, and 18% selected “*no opinion*”. The group agreed the standard needed rewriting. It was the opinion of one panel member that because some comments went beyond “student and program assessment” that the focus of the standard was not sufficiently clear. This standard did not reach the 80% consensus sought but consideration was given to the 18% “*no opinion*”. Also, this information will be used by small groups who will craft the revisions.
Standard #10. Student Organization Integration: Integrate the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America student organization into the program to foster students’ academic growth, application of family and consumer sciences content, leadership, service learning, and career development.

Round #1: On a 4-point rating scale, 67% of the panel members selected “Leave as Written”, and 33% selected “revise”. A strong message emerged from the panel. Family, Career, and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA) should be an integral part of the FCS program and it should be integrated into the curriculum. Panel comments reiterated that the word “curriculum” should replace “program”.

Additional Recommendations:

- Keep the standard statements brief and pay attention to wording that is understood by everyone.
- Clarify the audience for these standards and address questions and concerns expressed by focus group participants by developing an introduction explaining the purposes of the Standards, their relationship with the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences, the recommended uses of the Standards and the relationship of the “Expectation Statements”.
- Social media and communication should be addressed beyond technology.
- Sustainable living practices and environment issues may be a major theme to come.
- Should this aligned with the AAFCS professional assessment?
- A focus on student learning and learning modalities needs to be added.
- Consider adding the integration of core academics.
- How will this be recognized by alternative licensures?

Round #2: On a 4-point rating scale, 18% of the panel members selected “leave as written”, 73% selected “revise”, and 9% selected “no opinion”. The group supported the comments in round #1. This standard did not reach the 75% consensus sought but consideration was given to the 9% “no opinion”. Also this information will be used by small groups who will craft the revisions.
**Additional Recommendations:**

- It is important to keep in mind clarity, timelessness and simplicity when constructing the standards.
- The Standards are an important tool for guiding our work and keeping a clear focus on our field.
- Consider matching the Standards to InTASC standards.
- Clarifying the audience for the Standards is an important consideration.
- Updating the Standards to include current language and trends is needed.
- Do the ten standards cover what Family and Consumer Sciences teachers need to know and be able to do?
- This is an opportunity to tie the Standards to the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences.
- During the review and update process an introduction explaining the purposes of the Standards, their relationship with the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences, the recommended uses of the Standards and the relationship of the Expectation Statements.

After two rounds the panel had reached consensus of at least 80% that a revision should be addressed for standards one through eight. Standard nine reached a consensus of 73% that the standard should be revised with 18% indicating “no opinion”. Standard 10 reached a consensus of 73% that the standard should be revised with 9% indicating “no opinion”.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

Adopted in 2004, the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences (Standards (Appendix A) provide an integrated set of standards which form a framework for program development, implementation and assessment for Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Education. This online study examined how states and institutions have implemented the Standards and reviewed the 2004 Standards through descriptive survey methodology.

Overview of the Study

Teacher preparation is at the center of the goal to improve education in the United States. Teacher preparation programs that place emphasis on content knowledge and pedagogy in the context of the content area, as well as, strategies to assess the teacher candidate’s ability to deliver content lead to the improvement of teacher preparation programs. The focus of this study was to explore implementation of the Standards by states and their respective teacher preparation programs and review the 2004 Standards (NSTFCS, 2004) to provide information for a possible 2012 update. The population for this study was comprised of the memberships of NATEFACS and NASAFACS. The memberships include educators and administrators who are involved in teacher preparation on a daily basis. The implementation study invited the membership of the two organizations to respond to this study. The review of the Standards involved focus groups from each organization and a stratified panel representing teachers, teacher educators, administrators, state specialists, and professionals.
Limitations

This descriptive study used both face to face focus groups and online survey techniques to gather information from individuals over a wide area. The goal was to gather information that would move the project to implement the Standards and update the 2004 Standards forward. Participation was voluntary. Implementation respondents were invited by e-mail to take part in the study. Non respondents were contacted requesting participation two additional times. It is possible that contacting each institution and state department of education and professionals would have garnered a larger survey response for the implementation survey.

Face to face focus groups were convened at a meeting of NASAFACS and at a meeting of NATEFACS members at AAFCS annual meeting. The focus group at the AAFCS meeting was on the final afternoon of the conference and conflicted with a super session and the annual senate meeting. There was a smaller than anticipated attendance at that focus group. The researcher combined the results of the two focus groups and found that there was good representation from teachers, teacher educators, state administrators and professionals.

Two recorders took written notes of the discussion by the participants in the focus groups and the written survey completed by the participants was collected. The researcher reviewed and coded and compiled the transcripts and survey results. A second person was not employed to conduct this review.

The researcher acknowledges that her own knowledge and participation in the development of the Standards could have created bias. The researcher made every attempt to be a facilitator and listener and learner in this process. The participants in the study represent
a wide range of roles and reside in diverse geographic areas and will naturally view the tasks with their own unique lens. Perhaps that diversity should not be taken as a negative but an opportunity to share unique differences as collaboration continues.

Implementation of the Standards

Description of the Respondents

Respondents to the implementation survey, as a group, were experienced. Eighty-one percent of the respondents had been in the profession for more than 15 years. The majority of the respondents represented teachers, teacher educators and state administrators. 93% of the respondents reported that they were very or moderately knowledgeable and involved with the Standards. The majority of the respondents were involved in the development of the Standards through attendance at development meetings at conferences and various development activities. A smaller number participated in the development panel meetings. These meetings were held specifically for the development of the Standards rather than in conjunction with a conference. The researcher believes that this smaller number of participants may be due to time and travel constraints. A majority of the respondents indicated that they participated in implementation meetings and shared information at their institution or in their state. Expertise was reported in all 10 standards.

Questions

This discussion considers the four research questions:

1. How have the 2004 Standards been implemented by states and institutions in FCS teacher preparation programs?
   a. What strategies have been successful in the implementation process?
b. If implementation is not taking place, what are the barriers?

c. What strategies can be used to share, integrate and implement the Standards?

2. Do the 2004 Standards reflect the current content, trends, and pedagogy of the discipline?

3. Are the meanings of the Standards sufficiently clear and concise?

4. Should the 2004 Standards be revised and, if so, what should those revisions be?

Alignment and Strategies

A majority of the implementation study respondents indicated that their state or institution has teacher competencies and standards for teacher certification and that they have aligned these with their state or institution. The respondents also indicated that the Standards and the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences should be aligned. There is confusion about how to use the two sets of standards. Aligning or developing a bridge between them would strengthen both sets. Aligning standards for teacher preparation, student standards, and exit exams produces quality teacher preparation programs.

Sharing, networking and collaborating in the alignment process insure that the state and the institution are coordinated in their effort. In this study, the respondents reported that alignment was achieved collaboratively with state staff and teacher educators or by individuals at the institutional level. The collaborative process was facilitated in a variety of ways. In some instances a consultant was hired to review and revise state standards to be consistent with the Standards. Other states and institutions completed the work at joint meetings of teachers, teacher educators, and state leadership. In another case a small group, knowledgeable in the Standards, gathered to give input to the state standards.
One interesting note was the variety of ways the Standards were aligned. Some aligned them to state standards, others aligned them to state standards and frameworks, and still others cross-walked the Standards with state standards for FCS. One respondent reported that their state is considering aligning the Standards with pathways a teacher might teach, focusing on one or two pathways in addition to the pedagogy of teaching. There was also a variety of ways in which institutions approached how to organize the structure of their teacher preparation program. One respondent reported that they placed the required courses into the 10 Standards and it was found that most of the Standards were met. They then added a student leadership component. Another respondent reported that they matched the competences with the standards and frameworks. A third respondent reported that they cross-walked the Standards with the state standards and then used the Standards as an organizing structure for FCS teacher preparation program design, student assessments, and accreditation reports. It was evident that alignment was achieved in a wide variety of ways. One is left to wonder if the quality of the teacher preparation program is affected by the alignment strategy. Is the outcome the same if current courses are checked to see that they cover the Standards verses using the standards as the organizing structure for the design of the program, the student assessments and the accreditation reports?

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents reported that they use the Standards as a tool for development and assessment of teacher preparation programs. Content is aligned with the Standards and assessments are developed to demonstrate teacher candidate competency. Competencies are assessed in a variety of ways, including course assessments and on-site practicum evaluations. One respondent reported that teacher preparation programs are approved by NCATE and the state department of education. Another respondent reported
that the development and assessment is done at the institution level. Development and
assessment of teacher preparation programs has been done in various ways. Would it be
prudent to find a way to have wider collaboration and networking opportunities? FCS
professionals and NATEFACS produced an E-book which outlines the intent and purpose of
the Standards and serves as an excellent resource for teacher educators and FCS teacher
candidates. It was suggested that developing a platform for sharing implementation
strategies and Standards work would be beneficial. Technology has provided new
opportunities for sharing using digital media. An interactive digital platform would offer
ease of access for sharing Standards work in an ongoing process.

**Barriers**

National standards which set expectations for content and pedagogy have been
developed by many disciplines, but the implementation of these standards has been more
complex. Components of successful implementation are ownership of the standards,
commitment to implementing the standards and a clear understanding the change that will be
necessary. When national standards are developed for a field, they will be used by a wide
variety of people in diverse communities, institutions, and states. Respondents reported that
interfacing with state and institution standards and requirements was a challenge. The survey
revealed that the lack of control was the most difficult issue to overcome. This lack of
control involved timing. Respondents reported that revisions in states and institutions
occurred on a set schedule and coordinating states, institutions, and revisions or
implementation of national standards was difficult.
Leadership is an important component of implementation. One respondent reported a lack of coordination by state leaders. Local control of curriculum and “outdated” ideas of what “home economics” is and should be is a frustrating issue. Another respondent reported that state certification standards are tied to secondary curriculum and there has been no compelling reason to use the Standards.

Ongoing Process

Change is necessary as the search for high standards, high achievement, and accountability continues. This process which involves teachers, administrators, parents, the community, local and state education agencies, and institutions is complex. Standards need to be constantly reviewed and revised. Teacher licensure requirements, exit tests, accrediting agencies and state standards must be interfaced with content and pedagogy standards. It is important to developing leadership strategies for networking and sharing the ongoing Standards work. It is also important to address interfacing the Standards with NCATE, Common Core Standards, InTASC, and The National Standards for FCS. Although the respondents were in high agreement that the Standards reflect current content and pedagogy, the survey respondents indicated that they needed to be reviewed and updated to reflect clarity and current terminology and address current trends and topics.

Standards Review

Description of the Participants and Panel Members

Participants in the focus groups included state administrators, state FCS specialists for content and student leadership, teacher educators, institution administrators, and professionals from agencies and businesses. The modified-Delphi panel members included:
• five teacher educators representing both public and private institutions both large and small;
• six administrators representing state agencies and institutions; and
• one member of an organization providing educational training and resources for teachers, teacher educators, and teacher candidates

**Questions**

The focus group survey and discussion and the subsequent modified-Delphi panel examined the 2004 *Standards*. The discussion considered the following questions:

• Do the 2004 *Standards* reflect the current content, trends, and pedagogy of the discipline?
• Are the meanings of the *Standards* sufficiently clear and concise?
• Should the 2004 *Standards* be revised and if so what should those revisions be?

**Focus Group Work**

The focus group survey results and group discussion provided background for the modified-Delphi panel, regarding each of the 10 standards, as well as, comments and concerns about the *Standards* in general. The focus of discussion centered on wording and terminology, the addition of current trends and topics, and the inclusion of all content areas in the Standards.

Understanding that clearly and concisely written standards will provide a clear framework for quality teacher preparation programs, great care was taken in writing the 2004 *Standards*. It is evident that over time changes are necessary to any set of standards to reflect current terminology, trends, and topics. Common vocabulary is important to communicate
the practice of teaching across disciplines. Would the language used in the Standards be understood by another discipline? One example would be found in Standard #2. Consumer Economics and Family Resources: Use resources responsibly to address the diverse needs and goals of individuals, families, and communities in family and consumer sciences areas such as resource management, consumer economics, financial literacy, living environments, and textiles and apparel. The question is, for clarity and understanding, should we use the phrase “consumer economics” or should we use the phrase “financial literacy”? The participants indicated that inclusion of all content areas in the Standards was important to clarify the scope of each of the four content standards.

Additionally, there was discussion about the purpose of the National Standards for Teachers of FCS and the National Standards for FCS and how to use those two sets of standards. It would be prudent to collectively consider the two documents.

National standards must take into account the needs of a diverse education population. An issue that is important in the development of national standards is how to manage national standards within a complex education system. For example, InTASC (2008) standards are a model for beginning teachers. Many institutions use the InTASC model in their teacher preparation program and university teacher preparation programs may work with InTASC, state licensure requirements as well as the content and pedagogy standards for their discipline. Interfacing the Standards with various teacher education models should be addressed.
Modified-Delphi Panel Rounds

Using a packet of information including the 2004 Standards, background on the development of the Standards, the “Expectation Statements”, and a compilation of the results of the focus groups survey and discussion, the 12 modified-Delphi panel members were instructed to rate each of the standards using a 4 point system, choosing between “leave as written”, “delete”, “revise”, or “no opinion”. If they selected revise, the panel members were asked to identify:

- changes in wording which would indicate current trends and issues
- changes in wording which would clarify the meaning of the standard

Panel members were also given the opportunity to include additional topics which should be included in the standards and topics related to the standards which should be addressed in the future. The first round was compiled and returned to the panel members. They then had the opportunity to support or change their rating of each Standard and support or make additional comments. Through two rounds, the panel members supported the work of the focus group, indicating that clarity and brevity were important; Current trends and issues should be added to the Standards, and that bridging the National Standards for FCS and the National Standards for Teachers of FCS was necessary.

The panel members indicated that it was important to clarify the audience for the Standards. As an example, focus group participants and modified-Delphi panel members questioned whether Standard #1. Career, Community, and Family Connections: Analyze family, community, and work interrelationships; investigate career paths; examine family and consumer sciences careers; and apply career decision making and transitioning
processes, addressed what the teacher candidate should know or what they should be teaching the students. Further, some were not sure what “transitioning processes” meant.

The panel concurred with the focus group that, it is important to carefully craft the language used for pedagogy such as curriculum or assessment. Do those standards use language that would be understood by others in the education community in general? The respondents also indicated that the Standards and the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences should be aligned. There is confusion about how to use the two sets of standards. Aligning or developing a bridge between them would strengthen both sets. They addressed the focus groups concerns by suggesting that an introduction explaining the purpose of the Standards, the relationship of the Standards to the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences, the recommended uses for the Standards and role of the “Expectation Statements”. They addressed the focus groups concerns by suggesting that an introduction explaining the purpose of the Standards, the relationship of the Standards to the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences, the recommended uses for the Standards and role of the “Expectation Statements”.

This would bridge the disconnect between the 16 areas of study in the National Standards for FCS and the four content standards and 6 pedagogy of the National Standards for Teachers of FCS.

The panel also concurred that the wording of the Standards should be addressed to improve clarity, and that current trends, issues and terminology should be included in the Standards, and developing a platform to network and sharing the Standards work is important for continuing implementation.
Panel member expressed concern that states have a variety of ways of assessing teacher candidates. Aligning exit testing with content standards is important. Klemme (2008) reported in the Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences that 34 states are using the PRAXIS II as an exit test for content knowledge in Family and Consumer Sciences. Whether it is the PRAXIS II or another test, it is important for the chosen test to reflect the content and pedagogy of a discipline.

**Next Steps**

The results of this study to examine the implementation of the Standards by states and institutions and a review of the 2004 Standards will be shared with NATEFACS and the Standards leadership team. This information can be used to move the 2012 update of the Standards forward and to shape and direct the ongoing implementation process. Small writing groups could be formed to address each of the standards and accompanying “Expectation Statements”. A group could be formed to develop a strategy to bridge the two sets of standards. The suggested changes could be shared with teachers, teacher educators, and FCS administrators at the state and institution level. Resulting revisions could be adopted.

**Future Work**

The implementation respondents, focus group participants and modified-Delphi panel members expressed concern regarding three areas. First, they believed that there is confusion between the 16 National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences, which address program content for middle and secondary students and the 10 National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences (Standards) which address what a teacher should
know and be able to do. There was strong agreement that strategies should be developed to bridge the two sets of standards. Second, the wide variety of accreditation and assessment formats make it difficult to align the Standards at the state and institution level. There should be a concerted effort to interface with these formats. Third, the creation of a digital media platform for networking and sharing both implementation and Standards work is critical in the success of the implementation process.

While these findings are useful in the implementation and review of the 2004 Standards, larger questions loom. It is known that while the Standards provide a model of excellence and national continuity, what are the consequences of not implementing the Standards? Should we be focusing not just on making the Standards clear, concise, and current but on making the Standards required in the same way that implementation of CTE Standards are linked with Carl Perkins funding and teacher education standards and models are linked with institutional accreditation? Attaching funding or accreditation to standards would attach importance to the planning, development, implementation and assessment of the Standards by states and institutions. Common core standards are being developed and adopted by states. Common core standards for CTE are in the development stage under the direction of ACTE. Could common core standards be developed for the disciplines under the CTE umbrella or could they be used for NCATE compliance? These are important questions for future discussion.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study examined the implementation of the Standards by states and institutions and reviewed the 2004 Standards for a 2012 update. Interfacing state and national content
and pedagogy standards with licensure, exit testing and accrediting agencies is a complex task. The implementation and strategies for maintaining the implementation process of national content and pedagogy with standards is a critical piece of the standards process. Periodic review and updating of standards is essential. Suggestions for future research might include the following areas:

- A study of strategies for implementation of *Standards*
- A study and the development of platforms to share and sustain ongoing collaborative projects surrounding the implementation of the *Standards*.
- A study to explore and develop a bridge to connect the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences and the *Standards*.
- A study to explore the alignment of exit test for teacher preparation programs and the *Standards*. 
APPENDIX A. STANDARDS DOCUMENT

National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences
National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences – December 2004

The National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences provides an overarching model of excellence for what a beginning teacher in family and consumer sciences (FCS) should know and be able to do. The National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences led FCS educators and other stakeholders from across the country to develop the Standards. The two-year, highly participatory process yielded an integrated set of standards with a high degree of national consensus, while allowing for variations in state teacher preparation and licensure. These standards are unique to FCS teachers. In addition, the beginning FCS teacher has general education background and meets overall professional education standards. As presented, the first four standards focus on FCS content; the remaining six emphasize professional practice. In each of these two groups, the standards are arranged alphabetically. The FCS process areas of thinking, communication, leadership, and management are incorporated throughout. Across all ten standards, the beginning FCS teacher demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes to enable student learning.

1. Career, Community, and Family Connections
Analyze family, community, and work interrelationships; investigate career paths; examine family and consumer sciences careers; and apply career decision making and transitioning processes.

2. Consumer Economics and Family Resources
Use resources responsibly to address the diverse needs and goals of individuals, families, and communities in family and consumer sciences areas such as resource management, consumer economics, financial literacy, living environments, and textiles and apparel.

3. Family and Human Development
Apply principles of human development, interpersonal relationships, and family to strengthen individuals and families across the lifespan in contexts such as parenting, care giving, and the workplace.

4. Nutrition, Food, and Wellness
Promote nutrition, food, and wellness practices that enhance individual and family well being across the lifespan and address related concerns in a global society.

5. Curriculum Development
Develop, justify, and implement curricula that address perennial and evolving family, career, and community issues; reflect the integrative nature of family and consumer sciences; and integrate core academic areas.

6. Instructional Strategies and Resources
Facilitate students’ critical thinking and problem solving in family and consumer sciences through varied instructional strategies and technologies and through responsible management of resources in schools, communities, and the workplace.
7. Learning Environment
Create and implement a safe, supportive learning environment that shows sensitivity to diverse needs, values, and characteristics of students, families, and communities.

8. Professionalism
Engage in ethical professional practice based on the history and philosophy of family and consumer sciences and career and technical education through civic engagement, advocacy, and ongoing professional development.

9. Student and Program Assessment
Assess, evaluate, and improve student learning and programs in family and consumer sciences using appropriate criteria, standards, and processes.

10. Student Organization Integration
Integrate the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America student organization into the program to foster students’ academic growth, application of family and consumer sciences content, leadership, service learning, and career development.
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APPENDIX C. FOCUS GROUP SURVEY

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the focus group to examine the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences. The focus group will examine the Standards to determine if they address the current trends, content and best practice in FCS teacher preparation programs and if additional topics should be addressed in the Standards.

Your participation in this session is voluntary. You are free to skip any questions that you are uncomfortable answering. Your responses will remain confidential. No individual names will be used, and all data will be reported in aggregate. The results of this questionnaire will be used to develop an instrument the standards. Upon completion of the study, the results will be available by contacting Karen Bergh at 360-943-1974 or berghkm@gmail.com.

If you have any questions, please contact Karen Bergh. If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office for Responsible Research, 1138 Pearson Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

After reading the above statement, if you agree to participate in this session, please complete this questionnaire. By completing and submitting the questionnaire you are indicating your consent to participate. You are free to withdraw from the session at any time. Approved-IRB at Iowa State University April 26, 2011.

The National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences, as adopted in December 2004, consist of a set of highly integrated standards across ten areas and provide a model of excellence for what a beginning teacher in Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) should know and be able to do (NSTFCS, 2004).

In the development process it was determined that the “Standards” would:

1. Serve as an overarching model of excellence that describes what a beginning family and consumer sciences teacher should know and be able to do.

2. Delineate a core set of—essential standards that are as concise and non-redundant as possible and for which there is a high degree of national consensus among FCS teacher educators, FCS content specialists, FCS teachers, and other stakeholders.

3. Provide a basis for national continuity while reflecting state variations and future directions within family and consumer sciences content, teacher standards, licensure, initial preparation, professional development, school settings, and teacher responsibilities.
4. Be developed through broad-based involvement by family and consumer sciences educators and other stakeholders who represent various local, state, and national roles, professional organizations, and perspectives. (Fox, 2003, p. 2)

To determine if the Standards address current trends, content, and promising practice in FCS teacher education, this focus group will address the current usefulness of the standard in designing or redesigning teacher education programs and in assessing FCS teacher candidates related to the standard.

**Standard #1. Career, Community, and Family Connections: Analyze family, community, and work interrelationships; investigate career paths; examine family and consumer sciences careers; and apply career decision making and transitioning processes.**

1. The “Career Community, and Family Connections” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

   __ Strongly Agree
   __ Agree
   __ No Opinion/Neutral
   __ Disagree
   __ Strongly Disagree

2. Dialogue: Support the standard or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

**Standard #2. Consumer Economics and Family Resources: Use resources responsibly to address the diverse needs and goals of individuals, families, and communities in family and consumer sciences areas such as resource management, consumer economics, financial literacy, living environments, and textiles and apparel.**

3. The “Consumer Economics and Family Resources” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

   __ Strongly Agree
4. Dialogue: Support the standard or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

**Standard #3. Family and Human Development:** Apply principles of human development, interpersonal relationships, and family to strengthen individuals and families across the lifespan in contexts such as parenting, care giving, and the workplace.

5. The “Family and Human Development” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

6. Dialogue: Support the standard as stated or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

**Standard #4. Nutrition, Food, and Wellness:** Promote nutrition, food, and wellness practices that enhance individual and family well being across the lifespan and address related concerns in a global society.

7. The “Nutrition, Food, and Wellness” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.
12. Dialogue: Support the standard as stated or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

**Standard #5. Curriculum Development:** Develop, justify, and implement curricula that address perennial and evolving family, career, and community issues; reflect the integrative nature of family and consumer sciences; and integrate core academic areas.

8. The “Curriculum Development” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

   __ Strongly Agree
   __ Agree
   __ No Opinion/Neutral
   __ Disagree
   __ Strongly Disagree

9. Dialogue: Support the standard as stated or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

**Standard #6. Instructional Strategies and Resources:** Facilitate students’ critical thinking and problem solving in family and consumer sciences through varied instructional strategies and technologies and through responsible management of resources in schools, communities, and the workplace.

10. The “Instructional Strategies and Resources” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

   __ Strongly Agree
   __ Agree
   __ No Opinion/Neutral
   __ Disagree
   __ Strongly Disagree

11. Dialogue: Support the standard as stated or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

**Standard #7. Learning Environment:** Create and implement a safe, supportive learning environment that shows sensitivity to diverse needs, values, and characteristics of students, families, and communities.
12. Standard #7 – The “Learning Environment” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

  __ Strongly Agree
  __ Agree
  __ No Opinion/Neutral
  __ Disagree
  __ Strongly Disagree

12. Dialogue: Support the standard as stated or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

Standard #8. Professionalism: Engage in ethical professional practice based on the history and philosophy of family and consumer sciences and career and technical education through civic engagement, advocacy, and ongoing professional development.

13. The “Professionalism” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

  __ Strongly Agree
  __ Agree
  __ No Opinion/Neutral
  __ Disagree
  __ Strongly Disagree

14. Dialogue: Support the standard as stated or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

Standard #9. Student and Program Assessment: Assess, evaluate, and improve student learning and programs in family and consumer sciences using appropriate criteria, standards, and processes.

15. Standard #9 – The “Student and Program Assessment” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a
way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- No Opinion/Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

16. Dialogue: Support the standard as stated or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

Standard # 10. Student Organization Integration: Integrate the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America student organization into the program to foster students’ academic growth, application of family and consumer sciences content, leadership, service learning, and career development.

17. The “Student Organization Integration” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- No Opinion/Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

18. Dialogue: Support the standard as stated or make suggestions for changes in the standard.

19. Dialogue: Are there additional topics which should be included in the Standards?

20. Additional comments related to the standards:
APPENDIX D. INTRODUCTION AND IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY

The National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences (Standards) was presented at the Association of Career and Technical Educators (ACTE) in Las Vegas in December 2004 and approved by members of the National Association of Teacher Educators of Family and Consumer Sciences (NATEFACS), the primary sponsoring organization. The Standards (NATEFACS, 2004), provide a model for what a beginning family and consumer sciences teacher should know and be able to do. In the intervening time states and institutions have had the opportunity to implement the Standards into Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) teacher preparation programs. As a leader in your state and an expert in the field you are a key player in the task of identifying how states and institutions have utilized the Standards and evaluating the current validity of the Standards as adopted in December 2004.

The goal of this survey is to identify how states and institutions have utilized the Standards, specific implementation strategies that have been successful, and issues which block implementation of the Standards. The assessment will be online and can be completed in 30 minutes or less. Additionally a panel of experts is being assembled to evaluate the Standards as adopted in December 2004. The expert panel of teacher educators, state supervisors and FCS specialists will participate in a series of online rounds to determine if the Standards address current policy and best practice in FCS teacher education and, if not, what changes to the 2004 Standards should be recommended. For each round, the answers will be compiled and shared in aggregate fashion with the panel. Panel members will have an opportunity confirm or revise their views as they work toward consensus. A minimum of two rounds will be conducted. If you are willing to serve on the panel please indicate your interest at the end of this survey.

Your input is important for a complete picture of the assessment of the implementation of the Standards and an evaluation of the current validity of the Standards as adopted in December 2004.

Your participation in this project is voluntary. Your responses will remain confidential. No individual names will be used, and all data will be reported in aggregate. The results of this survey will be used to develop implementation strategies for implementing the standards. Upon completion of the study, the results will be available by contacting Karen Bergh at 360-943-1974 or berghkm@gmail.com.

If you have any questions, please contact Karen Bergh. If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-
Part I Demographics:
1. How many years have you been in the profession?
   __1-5 years
   __6-15 years
   __15-20 years
   __More than 30 years
2. Check all the Family and Consumer Sciences positions or roles that apply to you:
   ___FCS teacher
   ___FCS teacher educator
   ___FCS state advisor
   ___FCS state administrator
   ___FCS department chair
   ___other____________________
3. How many institutions (including on site and online programs) prepare FCS teachers in your state?
   __1
   __2
   __3
   __4
   __more than 4
   __do not know

Part II Survey
1. Overall, how would you indicate your level of knowledge and extent of involvement with the Standards?
   ___very knowledgeable and
   ___moderately knowledgeable and involved
2. Indicate your involvement in the development of the Standards? Check all that apply.
   - attended meetings at conferences
   - participated in the development panel(s)
   - participated in development activities
   - heard about the development
   - did not participate
   - other____________________

3. Indicate your involvement in the implementation of the Standards?
   - participated in implementation meetings
   - shared implementation activities at your institution or in your state
   - published an article on implementation of the Standards
   - other____________________

4. Indicate your specific area of expertise:
   - Career, Community, and Family Connections
   - Consumer Economics and Family Resources
   - Family and Human Development
   - Nutrition, Food, and Wellness
   - Curriculum Development
   - Instructional Strategies and Resources
   - Learning Environment
   - Professionalism
   - Student and Program Assessment
   - Student Organization Integration

5. Does your state have teacher competencies standards and requirements for FCS certification?
   - Yes
   - No
   Comment Box:

6. Have the teacher competencies for FCS teacher preparation and the Standards been aligned in your state or institution?
   - Yes
   - No
If so, describe how your state or institution accomplished this:

Comment Box:

7. Describe how your state or institution has used the Standards as a tool for developing and assessing teacher preparation programs in FCS?

Comment Box:

8. Who was involved in the implementation in your state or institution? Check all that apply

__ State supervisors or directors
__ Teacher educators
__ Teachers
__ FCS professionals
__ FCS teachers
__ Other____________
__ Don’t know

9. How did these people become involved? Check all that apply

__ National meetings
__ Professional publications
__ Professional networking
__ State meetings
__ Other_________

10. Describe the successful strategies your or institution has used to implement the Standards for FCS teacher preparation?

Comment Box:

11. The Standards are a useful tool in planning and developing curriculum for FCS teacher preparation in my state.

__ Strongly Agree
__ Agree
__ No Opinion/Neutral
__ Disagree
__ Strongly Disagree

Comment Box:

12. The Standards reflect current trends, issues and pedagogy in FCS teacher preparation in my state.

__ Strongly Agree
__ Agree
13. The *Standards* support current FCS teacher preparation in my state.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- No Opinion/Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Comment Box:

14. Issues which block implementation of the *Standards* in my state or institution include:

Comment Box:

15. Recurring concerns I have about the *Standards* are:

Comment Box

Thank you for your participation and professional service!

I am interested in serving on the expert panel to review the 2004 *Standards*. This commitment would involve two to three rounds spaced at two week intervals. Complete the following questions in the comment box:

Experiences and activities that place me in the expert category are.

My academic background, professional experience, specific leadership and work include:

Comment Box:
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The National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences:
An Implementation and Review Study
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This packet includes the following information:
Criteria for the development of the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences
The National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences
Expectation Statements for the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences
Focus Group findings for the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences

Criteria for development of the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences:

The National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences (Standards), as adopted in December 2004, consist of a set of highly integrated standards across ten areas and provide a model of excellence for what a beginning teacher in Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) should know and be able to do (NSTFCS, 2004).

In preparation for developing the “Standards”, it was determined that they would:
1. Serve as an overarching model of excellence that describes what a beginning family and consumer sciences teacher should know and be able to do.
2. Delineate a core set of—essential standards that are as concise and non-redundant as possible and for which there is a high degree of national consensus among FCS teacher educators, FCS content specialists, FCS teachers, and other stakeholders.
3. Provide a basis for national continuity while reflecting state variations and future directions within family and consumer sciences content, teacher standards, licensure, initial preparation, professional development, school settings, and teacher responsibilities.
4. Be developed through broad-based involvement by family and consumer sciences educators and other stakeholders who represent various local, state, and national roles, professional organizations, and perspectives. (Fox, 2003, p. 2)

National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences
National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences
Approved 12/04

The National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences provides an overarching model of excellence for what a beginning teacher in family and consumer sciences (FCS) should know and be able to do. The National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences led FCS educators and other stakeholders from across the country to develop the Standards. The two-year, highly participatory process yielded an integrated set of standards with a high degree of national consensus, while allowing for variations in state teacher preparation and licensure. These
standards are unique to FCS teachers. In addition, the beginning FCS teacher has general education background and meets overall professional education standards. As presented, the first four standards focus on FCS content; the remaining six emphasize professional practice. In each of these two groups, the standards are arranged alphabetically. The FCS process areas of thinking, communication, leadership, and management are incorporated throughout. Across all ten standards, the beginning FCS teacher demonstrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes to enable student learning.

1. Career, Community, and Family Connections
Analyze family, community, and work interrelationships; investigate career paths; examine family and consumer sciences careers; and apply career decision making and transitioning processes.

2. Consumer Economics and Family Resources
Use resources responsibly to address the diverse needs and goals of individuals, families, and communities in family and consumer sciences areas such as resource management, consumer economics, financial literacy, living environments, and textiles and apparel.

3. Family and Human Development
Apply principles of human development, interpersonal relationships, and family to strengthen individuals and families across the lifespan in contexts such as parenting, care giving, and the workplace.

4. Nutrition, Food, and Wellness
Promote nutrition, food, and wellness practices that enhance individual and family well being across the lifespan and address related concerns in a global society.

5. Curriculum Development
Develop, justify, and implement curricula that address perennial and evolving family, career, and community issues; reflect the integrative nature of family and consumer sciences; and integrate core academic areas.

6. Instructional Strategies and Resources
Facilitate students’ critical thinking and problem solving in family and consumer sciences through varied instructional strategies and technologies and through responsible management of resources in schools, communities, and the workplace.

7. Learning Environment
Create and implement a safe, supportive learning environment that shows sensitivity to diverse needs, values, and characteristics of students, families, and communities.

8. Professionalism
Engage in ethical professional practice based on the history and philosophy of family and consumer sciences and career and technical education through civic engagement, advocacy, and ongoing professional development.

9. Student and Program Assessment
Assess, evaluate, and improve student learning and programs in family and consumer sciences using appropriate criteria, standards, and processes.

10. Student Organization Integration
Integrate the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America student organization into the program to foster students’ academic growth, application of family and consumer sciences content, leadership, service learning, and career development.

www.natefacs.org
**Expectation Statements for the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences.**

Expectation statements for the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences were developed in 2007. These statements serve as performance indicators and provide examples to assist in development of teacher preparation programs.

---

**2007 Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Education Conference**
Conference organized by the National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences (NATEFACS)
An affiliate of the Family and Consumer Sciences Division of the Association for Career and Technical Education
September 21-23, 2007, Indianapolis

**Expectation Statements for the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences (2nd ed.)**

This document provides “Expectation Statements” for each of the ten standards in the National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences. These statements describe knowledge, skills, attitudes, and/or behaviors of beginning family and consumer sciences teachers related to the Standards. The Statements were developed through a multi-phase national process (Fox & Klemme, 2009). The Statements are intended to serve as performance indicators and as examples that states and institutions can adapt or supplement based on local requirements and emerging issues.

The criteria used to write the Expectation Statements for each Standard were:
- The statements should use action, high cognitive-level verbs.
- The statements should clarify expectations for beginning family and consumer sciences teachers.
- The statements should have potential for assessment.
- The set of statements should encompass the complete Standard.

**Standard #1. Career, Community, and Family Connections**
Analyze family, community, and work interrelationships; investigate career paths; examine family and consumer sciences careers; and apply career decision making and transitioning processes.

- Explain career choice in an interrelated context of family, community, and work.
- Explain career pathways in relation to family and consumer sciences.
- Examine careers and career transition skills.
- Apply career, community, and family concepts in curriculum and instructional planning (pedagogical).

**Standard #2. Consumer Economics and Family Resources**
Use resources responsibly to address the diverse needs and goals of individuals, families, and communities in family and consumer sciences areas such as resource management, consumer economics, financial literacy, living environments, and textiles and apparel.

- Assess the influence of values held by individuals and families (dispositions).
- Evaluate the management of human, material, and fiscal resources to achieve goals (knowledge).
Standard #3. Family and Human Development
Apply principles of human development, interpersonal relationships, and family to strengthen individuals and families across the lifespan in contexts such as parenting, care giving, and the workplace.

- Relate theory and principles of human development, interpersonal relationships, and families to continuing concerns that families face across the lifespan.
- Analyze contexts in which individuals and families function.

Standard #4. Nutrition, Food, and Wellness
Promote nutrition, food, and wellness practices that enhance individual and family well being across the lifespan and address related concerns in a global society.

- Evaluate nutrition and wellness choices and practices to enhance individual and family well being across the lifespan, using reliable guidelines and sources of information.
- Synthesize principles of food acquisition, safety and sanitation, and preparation to meet long-term nutrition needs of individuals, families, and communities, including special dietary considerations.
- Evaluate impacts of science, technology, and technological advances on wellness, nutrition, foods, and related issues.
- Assess governmental, economic, geographic, and technological influences on nutrition and foods practices, food availability, and related issues in a global society.

Standard #5. Curriculum Development
Develop, justify, and implement curricula that address perennial and evolving family, career, and community issues; reflect the integrative nature of family and consumer sciences; and integrate core academic areas.

- Develop and justify curricular choices that meet the needs of all learners.
- Implement curricula that address recurring concerns and evolving family, consumer, career, and community issues.
- Design curricula that reflect the integrative nature of family and consumer sciences content.
- Integrate family and consumer sciences content and grade level core academic standards.

Standard #6. Instructional Strategies and Resources
Facilitate students’ critical thinking and problem solving in family and consumer sciences through varied instructional strategies and technologies and through responsible management of resources in schools, communities, and the workplace.

- Justify and implement a variety of best-practice strategies to help all students learn.
- Critique methods, materials, technologies, and activities as related to lesson goals and diverse learning needs of all students.
- Utilize community, business, and industry resources to enrich all student experiences.
- Integrate family and consumer sciences content knowledge and skills with pedagogically appropriate strategies and resources.

Standard #7. Learning Environment
Create and implement a safe, supportive learning environment that shows sensitivity to diverse needs, values, and characteristics of students, families, and communities.

- Implement classroom management strategies that support a physically safe and accessible environment.
Display and promote tolerance, appreciation, and respect for diversity from a perspective that includes exceptionality, race, age, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic status, gender, and sexual orientation.

Consider basic human needs, human development, relationships, and family dynamics to support students’ high academic achievement.

Promote a pluralistic environment, engaging students in ethical problem solving, and action.

**Standard #8. Professionalism**
Engage in ethical professional practice based on the history and philosophy of family and consumer sciences and career and technical education through civic engagement, advocacy, and ongoing professional development.

- Relate historical and philosophical perspectives of family and consumer sciences and career and technical education to current and future professional practice.
- Engage in civic activities to generate reciprocal support between communities and programs.
- Advocate for public policies that support individuals and families (knowledge and skills).
- Justify professional practices based on knowledge of ethics and the enduring values and beliefs of the profession (dispositions).
- Implement a plan to enhance professional growth.

**Standard #9. Student and Program Assessment**
Assess, evaluate, and improve student learning and programs in family and consumer sciences using appropriate criteria, standards, and processes.

- Interpret criteria, standards, and processes used to evaluate student learning and programs in family and consumer sciences.
- Integrate a variety of evaluation techniques (e.g., authentic and performance assessments) to gather evidence regarding student learning and program performance.
- Justify decisions about teaching practices and program design based on data-driven evidence.
- Demonstrate the principles of reflective practice to improve teaching.

**Standard #10. Student Organization Integration**
Integrate the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America student organization into the program to foster students’ academic growth, application of family and consumer sciences content, leadership, service learning, and career development.

- Justify the use of FCCLA programs to foster youth development. (Indicators of youth development: leadership, communication, and the 40 developmental assets)
- Integrate FCCLA programs to enhance student learning of family and consumer sciences and other subject areas.

**Reference**

**Citation**
Focus Group Findings:
National Association of State Administrators for Family and Consumer Sciences (May 2011)
National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences (June 2011)

Since adoption of the Standards seven years ago, they have served as a basis for development, delivery and assessment of FCS teacher preparation programs. Trends, content and best practices in education change over time. It is timely to examine the Standards to determine if they address current trends, content and best practice in FCS teacher education. To begin this process, two focus groups, representing FCS teacher educators, FCS content specialists, FCS administrators, and other stakeholders, were surveyed to determine if the Standards address current trends, content and best practice in FCS teacher education and address the current usefulness of the standard in designing or redesigning teacher education programs and in assessing FCS teacher candidates related to the standard. Participants completed the survey and were given the opportunity to make written comments. The survey was followed with group discussion. The group discussion was compiled by two recorders in each focus group. There were a total of 32 participants. The results of these focus groups follow and frame this work.

Standard #1- Career, Community, and Family Connections
Analyze family, community, and work interrelationships; investigate career paths; examine family and consumer sciences careers; and apply career decision making and transitioning processes.

The “Career Community, and Family Connections” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard #1- Career, Community, and Family Connections</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written comments and group dialogue:
- Question terminology- Clarify who is this standard meant for? Would students be developing career plans? What does transitioning mean? Transitioning of what?
- It is critical to keep careers in FCS at the forefront; they are a specific outcome of our programs.
- Include the impact of personal career decisions upon family life.
- Connect to career clusters and pathways in all.
“... and apply career decision making and transitioning processes”... is this for the beginning teacher? It does not really seem to apply to beginning teacher. Maybe the statement needs rewriting.

- Possible correlation to the consideration of STEM<GREEN

**Standard #2- Consumer Economics and Family Resources**

Use resources responsibly to address the diverse needs and goals of individuals, families, and communities in family and consumer sciences areas such as resource management, consumer economics, financial literacy, living environments, and textiles and apparel.

The “Consumer Economics and Family Resources” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard #2- Consumer Economics and Family Resources</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written comments and group dialogue**

- Include all FCS areas of study in the “such as...” section. Nutrition is not included.
- Textiles & apparel, as well as, living environments need to be identified more explicitly.
- Certification requirements maintain these two areas more clearly and separately
- Standard #2 is so comprehensive because it ties in financial resources, housing, interiors and apparel and textiles. Nutrition has a stand-alone standard so might consider expanding to break these areas up rather than “lump” into #2.
- Why should beginning teacher not have knowledge/abilities in other FCS areas such as housing, textiles, etc?
- Relationships, within the community, need to be addressed.
- Isn’t consumer economics included in financial literacy?
- Include how textiles and apparel ties to clusters and occupations.
- Lacking sustainability and global society

**Standard #3- Family and Human Development**

Apply principles of human development, interpersonal relationships, and family to strengthen individuals and families across the lifespan in contexts such as parenting, care giving, and the workplace.

The “Family and Human Development” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.
### Standard #3- Family and Human Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written comments and group dialogue**

- Edits to statement are needed. Important FACS programs are not included in the statement.
- The community piece is missing. Include working with community, community contributions and relationship building in communities.
- Seems like its missing terminology that may be necessary to keep the standards current i.e. early childhood.
- Include global society here?
- Preparation for careers in the care giving and the workplace more focus on ECE not parenting in career clusters.
- Looking for actual child care or preparing the child care work force. Include how it ties to clusters pathways and occupations.
- Need to include diversity.
- Could “…applying principles to family” read “…applying principles to family development”?

### Standard #4- Nutrition, Food, and Wellness

Promote nutrition, food, and wellness practices that enhance individual and family well-being across the lifespan and address related concerns in a global society.

The “Nutrition, Food, and Wellness” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program in and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written comments and group dialogue**

- There is a lot missing. How is the standard connected to clusters/pathways and occupations? Expand to include hospitality and culinary.
- Include food, food practices and socialization.
- Add sustainability here.
- Comments related to global society include
  - “and address related concerns in a global society” is vague; not really needed.
Include global society?

**Standard #5 - Curriculum Development**

Develop, justify, and implement curricula that address perennial and evolving family, career, and community issues; reflect the integrative nature of family and consumer sciences; and integrate core academic areas.

The “Curriculum Development” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard #5 - Curriculum Development</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written comments and group dialogue**

- Add technology here.
- What does perennial mean?
- Justify with data driven decision making which informs curriculum and instruction.
- Curriculum development looking at teaming with other CTE programs
- The idea of data collection and PLC’s (professional learning communities). Are they learning and where do they get this.
- We need to talk the same as the other side of the house.
- In 5 or 6 include how FCS connects to OVTE/ CTE areas.
- Global and futuristic. Teaming with other CTE areas
- Not sure what it is saying- or what it wants.
- OVEA elements? @ 1st Century skills Need for visibility of process skills/21st century skills
- Career preparation
- Add global society, advisory committees, critical sciences
- Teaming with other professionals.
- Partnering with business and industry.
- Quality instruction- how is this accomplished?
- Curricula that addresses issues- vs. skills and career preparation.
- Curriculum that addresses issues doesn’t give us career preparation. “ … Justify” may have meant this but it needs to be clearer.
- In business entrepreneurship it is not about business but about the process.
- Need to include all the skills both 21st century and technical.

**Standard #6 - Instructional Strategies and Resources**

Facilitate students’ critical thinking and problem solving in family and consumer sciences through varied instructional strategies and technologies and through responsible management of resources in schools, communities, and the workplace.
The “Instructional Strategies and Resources” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard #6- Instructional Strategies and Resources</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written comments and dialogue:**
Need more instructional strategies. There is just critical thinking and problem solving.
Include 21st century skills, process skills and technical skills
Needs revision- reasoning, process skills, higher ordered thinking skills are very important.
How about strategies to teach skills and other processes?
Include creative thinking
Add “and effective” to varied …. instructional strategies
Challenging the status quo?

**Standard #7- Learning Environment**
Create and implement a safe, supportive learning environment that shows sensitivity to diverse needs, values, and characteristics of students, families, and communities.

Standard #7 – The “Learning Environment” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard #7- Learning Environment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written comments and group dialogue**
- “…a safe, supportive learning environment” --- add and atmosphere.
- Needs to truly address environment- the physical setting
- Address what a lab should look like- lab management and safe lab setups
- Teacher attitude has an impact on learning environment.
- Class size?
- Whose values?
- Too often there is no diversity here- we are not a nuclear family environment anymore
• Remove “…shows sensitivity to” and replace it accommodates. Instead of the word Show, use facilitates and inclusive or supportive learning environment; integrated with whole school
• Revision needed- consider classroom climate, classroom design, lab set up and equipment.

**Standard #8- Professionalism**

Engage in ethical professional practice based on the history and philosophy of family and consumer sciences and career and technical education through civic engagement, advocacy, and ongoing professional development.

The “Professionalism” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard #8- Professionalism</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written comments and group dialogue**

• Should service learning be included here?
• Standard needs a better focus on ethical, professional practice.
• Not sure that we need to specify- rather than FCS just say professional.
• How do you measure ongoing professional development? What kind of assessments would you develop? Wordy- needs some work.
• Promote professional membership at the pre-professional levels. Include data statistical and research.
• Identify and promote why what FCS does is important.
• Add knowledge of professional organizations and networking
• Ethics are a huge part of teacher education. We hear too much about unethical, unprofessional behavior of teachers- new and seasoned. Have we made a strong statement?

**Standard #9- Student and Program Assessment**

Assess, evaluate, and improve student learning and programs in family and consumer sciences using appropriate criteria, standards, and processes.

Standard #9 – The “Student and Program Assessment” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.
Standard #9 - Student and Program Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1  3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0  0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0  0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written comments and group dialogue**

- Needs more attention - assessment is so important; could the word development be added to read: Student and program development and assessment
- More suggestions for wording
  - …and make necessary adjustments to instruction for remediation and enrichment
  - …“continually” improve student learning
- This standard is vague - whose appropriate criteria?
- Every state is different in terms of assessing students and in class data collection.
- Include the “why” we have assessments.
- Data driven decision making.
- Grading practices.
- Teacher evaluation related to student achievement (strategies for living in the world).
- Program administration

Standard #10 - Student Organization Integration

Integrate the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America student organization into the program to foster students’ academic growth, application of family and consumer sciences content, leadership, service learning, and career development.

10. The “Student Organization Integration” standard as stated above provides a useful framework for designing or refining a beginning FCS teacher education program and is stated in a way that allows states and institutions to develop assessments of beginning FCS teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes related to this standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9  28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1  3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0  0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0  0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0  0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written comments and dialogue:**

- The word direct or enhance instead of foster could strengthen the standard.
- Add embedded approach within the classroom.
- Could this include the word leadership and use the word curriculum rather than program?
- Just like to see every teacher prep include student leadership.
- One of the biggest weaknesses is not good prep for FCCLA
The focus groups were asked if there were additional topics that should be included in the Standards. The responses are listed below. These topics have been identified by the focus groups in the written comments and dialogue for the individual standards.

- Connections to career clusters, pathways and articulations are lacking or not clearly delineated. i.e. hospitality, textiles and apparel, interior design.
- Career preparation, possibly merge with #8 Development
- Entrepreneurship
- Collaboration with business and industry.
- Credentialing and industry certification.
- Technical skills, 21st century skills, Perkins funding.
- Technology including tools and social media
- Advisory committee, parent communications, community and business partnerships and networking,
- Data: collection, analysis and use--data driven decisions and data informing instruction
- Global society, sustainability
- Inclusiveness
- Grading practices
- Teacher evaluation related to student achievement (strategies for living in the world)
- Program administration
- Safety
- Possible correlation to the consideration of STEM< GREEN.

Additional comments from the Focus Groups related to the Standards:

- I have utilized these standards to guide development and improvement of teacher education program. Expectations are crucial, publications helpful for justification and development of programs.
- Ten standards were well described and targeted. Important themes/strands relative for beginning FCS teacher Ed program. Content should include all FCS sections and pathways.
- The PRAXIS is being revised. We need to align these to that test.
- If teacher Ed programs do not stay current- like looking at career clusters/pathways and incorporate that- teachers will not be prepared.
- Add understanding of Perkins and use of advisory committees, articulation agreements working with post secondary.
- Content areas of FCS national standards are too condensed in this version- not sure people would understand the depth of our content along with the educational standards.
- Teachers need to know they are part of a big- nationwide- community.
- Technology needs to be visible.
- Do the standards crosswalk to the 16 content standards?
- While we’ve integrated standards content into courses, we’ve not used standards to organize program- we need to.
- How do these relate to the 16 standards?
- What do we do with post-baccalaureate people? What do we do to prep industry people and those who pick up 5th year teaching?
- How do we connect these to teacher licensure?
- Look at all areas of FCS
- Are the 16 areas of study reflected in these 4 standards
- Each area should be part of Praxis
- NCATE looks at SPA’s to align teacher Ed.

Think collectively about how to use the standards
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