

# Our Responsibility, Our Promise

Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession

## THE COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nonpartisan, nationwide, of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council seeks member consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public.

### CCSSO Task Force on Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession Members

#### CCSSO

Tom Luna, Chair, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Idaho

Terry Holliday, Vice-Chair, Commissioner of Education, Kentucky

Virginia Barry, Commissioner of Education, New Hampshire

Mitchell Chester, Commissioner of Education, Massachusetts

Judy Jeffrey, Former Director of Education, Iowa

Christopher Koch, Superintendent of Education, Illinois

Rick Melmer, Former Secretary of Education, South Dakota

Jim Rex, Former State Superintendent of Education, South Carolina

Melody Schopp, Secretary of Education, South Dakota

#### NGA

David Archer, Senior Policy Advisor to Governor John Hickenlooper, Colorado

Jeanne Burns, Board of Regents, Louisiana

#### NASBE

Brenda Gullett, NASBE Board of Directors, Arkansas Board of Education

Steven Pound, NASBE Board of Directors, Maine Board of Education

Patrick A. Guida, Esquire, NASBE Board of Directors, Rhode Island Board of Education

One Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20001-1431

Phone (202) 336-7000 Fax (202) 408-8072 [www.ccsso.org](http://www.ccsso.org)

Copyright © 2012 by the Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, DC All rights reserved.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iii
PURPOSE .....	1
Our Responsibility, Our Promise.....	1
Learner-Ready Teachers.....	2
A New Vision for Teaching and Leading Schools.....	2
School-Ready Principals .....	3
Continuum of Development for Teachers and Principals .....	3
Instructional Leadership.....	3
State Levers for Change.....	4
EDUCATOR PREPARATION .....	7
Variation in Policy and Practice.....	7
International Lessons Learned about Educator Preparation .....	8
High Quality Preparation Systems.....	10
Highly Selective Criteria for Program Entry and Exit .....	10
Supply and Demand.....	11
Assessment Literacy .....	11
Clinically-Based Preparation Approaches .....	11
STATE POLICY LEVERS .....	13
Recommendations for Licensure.....	13
Recommendations for Approving Educator Preparation Programs.....	18
Recommendations for Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting.....	22
Elements for Consideration with Data Systems.....	23
Governance Structure .....	23
Unique Educator Identifier.....	24
Data Passport.....	24

Links to Non-Traditional Preparation Providers .....	24
Sharing Candidate Data .....	25
Continuous Improvement .....	25
Accountability.....	26
CONCLUSION .....	27
NEXT STEPS .....	29
REFERENCES.....	30
NOTES .....	32
APPENDIX A.....	34
APPENDIX B .....	36

# Our Responsibility, Our Promise

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To ensure students in the United States receive an education that is the best in the world, and one where they graduate from high school college- and career-ready, chief state school officers and their agencies have raised the bar. States across the country have increased expectations for what our educational system can achieve and what our students can learn by adopting and implementing college- and career-ready standards. One way in which a majority of states have raised expectations is through the adoption of the state-led and developed common core state standards in English language arts and mathematics. Our students are now expected to master rigorous content, think critically and solve problems, and work collaboratively. These standards set higher expectations for our students and articulate the skills they need to thrive personally and professionally.

With the adoption of these more rigorous learning standards, it is the responsibility of chief state school officers to keep the promise to our students of a better education. To accomplish this, we must examine and transform how we prepare teachers and principals so that they can provide instruction and organize learning environments to help students reach these heightened expectations. To fulfill this promise, teachers and principals have asked for assistance in implementing a new vision of teaching students and leading schools that will require them to obtain and master new knowledge and skills to improve student achievement and growth.

This report, *Our Responsibility, Our Promise*, was written by the Task Force on Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession. The task force is made up of current and former chiefs who are members of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) with input from our partners at the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) and the National Governors Association (NGA). This report is a call to action for chiefs and an invitation to our colleagues, especially members of NASBE and NGA who contributed to this report. We ask those in educator preparation and others interested in transforming entry into the education profession for teachers and principals to join us in supporting the implementation of the recommendations contained in this report. While the report attempts to focus on the state policy levers chiefs can activate, it is clear that the work required by these recommendations is not easy and will require the leadership and collaboration of all stakeholders involved in P-20 education.

The focus of the task force is on teacher and principal preparation and entry into professional roles. While an educator's development will span his or her career, the entry point into the profession is the foundation for cultivating the knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching and leading. Given this belief, the task force has defined learner-ready teachers and school-ready principals and focused on key actions that must be taken by CCSSO's membership in partnership with members of NASBE and NGA to implement the changes now needed.

A learner-ready teacher is one who is ready on day one of his or her career to **model and develop** in students the knowledge and skills they need to succeed today including the ability to think critically and creatively, to apply content to solving real world problems, to be literate across the curriculum, to collaborate and work in teams, and to take ownership of their own continuous learning. More specifically, learner-ready teachers have **deep knowledge of their content and how to teach it**; they **understand the differing needs** of their students, **hold them**

**to high expectations**, and personalize **learning** to ensure each learner is challenged; they **care about, motivate, and actively engage students in learning**; they **collect, interpret, and use student assessment data** to monitor progress and adjust instruction; they systematically **reflect, continuously improve, and collaboratively problem solve**; and they **demonstrate leadership and shared responsibility** for the learning of all students.

A school-ready principal is ready on day one to blend their energy, knowledge, and professional skills to collaborate and motivate others to **transform school learning environments in ways that ensure all students will graduate college and career ready**. With other stakeholders, they craft **the school's vision, mission, and strategic goals** to focus on and support high levels of learning for all students and high expectations for all members of the school community. To help transform schools, they lead others in using **performance outcomes and other data to strategically align people, time, funding, and school processes to continually improve student achievement and growth**, and to **nurture and sustain a positive climate and safe school environment for all stakeholders**. They work with others to **develop, implement, and refine processes to select, induct, support, evaluate, and retain quality personnel** to serve in instructional and support roles. They **nurture and support professional growth in others and appropriately share leadership responsibilities**. Recognizing that schools are an integral part of the community, they **lead and support outreach to students' families and the wider community to respond to community needs** and interests and to integrate community resources into the school.

The recommendations contained in this report focus on the levers for change that are the responsibility of state education agencies (SEAs) and, where applicable, their partner professional standards boards: licensure; program approval; and data collection, analysis, and reporting.

CCSSO pledges to support chief state school officers as they move to implement the state actions recommended in this report. In doing so, we will ensure that teachers and principals entering the system are truly ready to teach and lead. Utilizing the three state levers, chiefs should consider taking the following actions to ensure that teachers and principals entering the profession are prepared for what their profession requires on day one. The members of the task force are calling on the full CCSSO membership to commit to implementing the recommendations and state actions that follow in order to ensure that the education workforce is prepared to have a positive impact on all students' achievement upon entry into the learning environment regardless of where they teach or lead.

## Licensure

1. States will revise and enforce their licensure standards for teachers and principals to support the teaching of more demanding content aligned to college- and career-readiness and critical thinking skills to a diverse range of students.
2. States will work together to influence the development of innovative licensure performance assessments that are aligned to the revised licensure standards and include multiple measures of educators' ability to perform, including the potential to impact student achievement and growth.
3. States will create multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a coherent developmental continuum that reflects new performance expectations for educators and their implementation in the learning environment and to assessments that are linked to evidence of student achievement and growth.
4. States will reform current state licensure systems so they are more efficient, have true reciprocity across states, and so that their credentialing structures support effective teaching and leading toward student college- and career-readiness.

## Program Approval

5. States will hold preparation programs accountable by exercising the state's authority to determine which programs should operate and recommend candidates for licensure in the state, including establishing a clear and fair performance rating system to guide continuous improvement. States will act to close programs that continually receive the lowest rating and will provide incentives for programs whose ratings indicate exemplary performance.
6. States will adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards to assure that educator preparation programs recruit candidates based on supply and demand data, have highly selective admissions and exit criteria including mastery of content, provide high quality clinical practice throughout a candidate's preparation that includes experiences with the responsibilities of a school year from beginning to end, and that produce quality candidates capable of positively impacting student achievement.
7. States will require alignment of preparation content standards to PK-12 college- and career-ready standards for all licensure areas.
8. States will provide feedback, data, support, and resources to preparation programs to assist them with continuous improvement and to act on any program approval or national accreditation recommendations.

## Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting

9. States will develop and support state-level governance structures to guide confidential and secure data collection, analysis, and reporting of PK-20 data and how it informs educator preparation programs, hiring practices, and professional learning. Using stakeholder input, states will address and take appropriate action, individually and collectively, on the need for unique educator identifiers, links to non-traditional preparation providers, and the sharing of candidate data among organizations and across states.
10. States will use data collection, analysis, and reporting of multiple measures for continuous improvement and accountability of preparation programs.





# OUR RESPONSIBILITY, OUR PROMISE:

## Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Education Profession

### PURPOSE

The Task Force on Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Education Profession, formed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), is pleased to release the following recommendations and state actions for transforming educator (teacher and principal) preparation and entry into the education profession. Current and former chief state school officers along with representatives from the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) and the National Governors Association (NGA) came together to address the need for a coherent and comprehensive system of entry into the education profession that ensures learner-ready teachers and school-ready principals who can prepare students to be college- and career-ready. This report, written by chiefs for chiefs, identifies areas of critical action chiefs and state education agencies (SEAs) and, where applicable, their partner professional standards boards and NASBE and NGA, can take with respect to licensure; program approval; and data collection, analysis, and reporting.

The spotlight has shifted to the education workforce now that states are in the process of implementing college- and career-ready standards for students. As teachers and principals become increasingly aware of these new standards that states have recently adopted, they have expressed concern that they and educators entering the profession are not yet prepared to lead students in attaining these higher standards. To address their concern, this task force is issuing this report to all chief state school officers to sound a clarion that current policies and practices for entry into the education profession are not sufficient to respond to this new challenge and will not lead to our desired outcomes for students. While the focus of this report is on new teachers and principals, future reports will address the need for additional preparation of veteran teachers and principals.

Through this report we are asking our fellow chiefs to collectively take action to address these issues. We believe chiefs will rise to the occasion because as state education leaders, they are committed to making the policy changes needed to ensure we have the teachers and principals who can implement our desired reforms in education. Recommendations that SEAs may consider implementing are outlined in the State Policy Levers section of this report.

---

### Our Responsibility, Our Promise

---

Since student achievement and growth are the states' responsibility, the chiefs have already identified the knowledge and skills in mathematics and English language arts that all high school graduates need to be successful

### Assumptions

1. Preparation programs include nonprofit organizations, programs offered by local education agencies (LEAs) and institutions of higher education, programs that are online and/or face-to-face, and any other entity or means that prepare teachers and leaders for employment in the education profession.
2. We expect that all newly prepared and licensed teachers are "learner-ready" and principals are "school-ready" regardless of where and how they are prepared.
3. All programs should meet the same standards for outcomes based on demonstrated performance of the teachers and leaders they prepare.

## Learner-Ready Teachers

On day one of their careers, teachers should be able to model and develop in students the knowledge and skills they need to succeed today including the ability to think critically and creatively, to apply content to solving real world problems, to be literate across the curriculum, to collaborate and work in teams, and to take ownership of their own continuous learning. More specifically, learner-ready teachers have deep knowledge of their content and how to teach it; they understand the differing needs of their students, hold them to high expectations, and personalize learning to ensure each learner is challenged; they care about, motivate, and actively engage students in learning; they collect, interpret, and use student assessment data to monitor progress and adjust instruction; they systematically reflect, continuously improve, and collaboratively problem solve; and they demonstrate leadership and shared responsibility for the learning of all students.

–2011 InTASC Standards

in college, careers, and in the communities where they live. Setting high expectations for students requires change in the delivery of instruction by an education workforce who must make learning relevant and engaging. The key to our success is having teachers and principals equipped with the content and pedagogical knowledge and skills to improve student achievement, growth, and outcomes in the timeframe that is needed. Tying knowledge and skills that students acquire to their future endeavors requires mastering content, learning to think critically and solve problems, and learning to collaborate and work in teams. The mandate we have to prepare our students for life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond requires an education workforce who can deliver on the promise of graduating all students ready for college and careers.

---

### A New Vision for Teaching and Leading Schools

---

Many Americans are facing situations in which their children and grandchildren will be less prosperous than they are unless we find a way to engage students in their own learning and assist them in attaining high levels of knowledge and skills. Many parents are perplexed about what advice to give their children about preparing for the future because what worked for them in pursuit of a career is often no longer sufficient. The job market is rapidly changing. Jobs that exist today may not exist tomorrow. Many of the jobs of tomorrow can't yet be imagined.

While it is hard to predict what the world will be like when young people now entering kindergarten begin their careers, we know we must prepare students for a lifetime of learning. While family and poverty deeply affect student performance, an effective teacher has even greater impact on student achievement and growth. The challenges described above require new skills for teachers and principals and a deep understanding of content so they can provide guidance to students as they inquire about new concepts, processes, and material. The challenges also require a dramatically different type of preparation for teachers who are expected to enter the classroom on day one ready to assume the responsibility for their students' learning. These challenges also require a dramatically different type of preparation for school leaders who must make the transition from management to leadership with their primary responsibility being to motivate students and teachers and create a supportive environment where active learning takes place.

Teachers must be prepared to provide students with the tools that will be useful over time and durable no matter what changes occur. Knowing how to prepare students for a lifetime of learning and the ability to diagnose why students are not learning are essential skills that teachers must have. In fact, the knowledge and skills required of today's teachers are so extensive that it makes the creation of teams of teachers more necessary. It also reinforces the need for shared leadership and restructuring of the school day to ensure that all students are engaged in learning.

---

## Continuum of Development for Teachers and Principals

---

While professionals become more proficient in their work as they move through their careers, there are fundamental elements of knowledge and critical skills that need to be in place when both teachers and principals begin their careers. Preparation and entry into the profession compose the first phase of a continuum of development for teachers and principals and are the foundation on which a teacher or principal builds his or her career. The quality of preparation often determines the success a teacher has in the classroom or a principal has leading a school, especially in the first few years in their respective roles. Clearly, educators need an appropriate induction into the profession and mentoring by experienced effective educators who have demonstrated success in achieving student outcomes and in leading teachers and students. They also need ongoing professional learning, collaboration with colleagues, and feedback on their performance. Those topics will be the focus of future reports issued by CCSSO. The focus of this report is on preparation and entry of teachers and principals into the education profession and leadership positions.

---

## Instructional Leadership

---

Managing schools using low-risk strategies that perpetuate the educational status quo is no longer acceptable if all students are to attain higher levels of learning and graduate from high school ready to enter college and/or begin their careers. We need school principals who serve as leaders with the integrity, talent, knowledge, and skill to lead along new pathways that transform and increase the capacities of schools to provide high quality instruction and caring support to all students. While all school personnel can, and should, engage in leadership activities, principals are the essential catalyst for engaging others in designing, implementing, supporting, and refining school processes that lead to improved outcomes for students and transformational instructional practice for teachers.

The leadership responsibilities of a school principal are daunting and must be taken on in collaboration with others. These school leaders are expected to lead with a vision of high expectations for students and staff alike. They are expected to be collaborators; acquire resources; efficiently manage school facilities and resources; positively engage parents and other community members; lead the analysis of data; shape curriculum; and evaluate school personnel and provide them with actionable feedback. Additionally, they are expected to work with students, staff, and families to establish a strong, safe, tolerant, school culture and climate. Principals must serve as transformational change agents able to apply their leadership knowledge to their specific schools and communities while building the leadership capacities of others. Effective school leaders combine these roles in synergistic ways that motivate and inspire others to continually improve outcomes for students.

With the importance and wide-ranging nature of these many responsibilities, it is easy to understand why school leadership ranks second only behind

## School-Ready Principals

On day one, principals should be able to blend their energy, knowledge, and professional skills to collaborate with, and motivate others to **transform school learning environments in ways that ensure all students will graduate college and career ready**. With other stakeholders, they craft **the school's vision, mission, and strategic goals** to focus on and support high levels of learning for all students and high expectations for all members of the school community. To help transform schools, they lead others in using **performance outcomes and other data to strategically align people, time, funding, and school processes to continually improve student achievement and growth** and to **nurture and sustain a positive climate and safe school environment for all stakeholders**. They work with others to **develop, implement and refine processes to select, induct, support, evaluate, and retain quality personnel** to serve in instructional and support roles. They **nurture and support professional growth in others and appropriately share leadership responsibilities**. Recognizing that schools are an integral part of the community, they **lead and support outreach to students' families and the wider community to respond to community needs** and interests and to integrate community resources into the school.

instruction as a critical factor in student achievement and growth. It is also easy to understand why recruiting, preparing, supporting, and retaining talented individuals to effectively lead as school principals is imperative if our country is to attain the high levels of student achievement and growth to which we aspire.

---

## State Levers for Change

---

After a review of the current policy environment and best practice, three levers for change have been identified that are the responsibility of the states. This report attempts to avoid being prescriptive about how changes in preparation programs should be made. Instead, definitions that articulate the expectations of learner-ready teachers and school-ready principals have been created and recommendations made that identify state actions that can help shape policies on licensure, program approval, and the use of student outcomes and other beginning teacher and leader performance data in the continuous improvement and evaluation of preparation programs. This report and its recommendations for state actions are meant for all entities that prepare teachers and principals — nonprofit organizations, programs offered by local education agencies (LEAs) and institutions of higher education, programs that are online and/or face-to-face, and any other entity or means that prepare teachers and leaders for employment in the education profession. These preparation providers are in the best position to develop their own capacity for meeting the needs schools, districts, and states have for improving student achievement and growth. They are also most qualified to develop the innovative practices that prepare principals to be school-ready and teachers to enter the learning environment ready for the students they serve no matter their zip code or impediments that may exist.

### *Background*

In 2011, many states were still in the early stages of implementing college- and career-ready student standards. These standards reflect a growing consensus about what students should know and be able to do in a dynamic world where our students are persistently compared to and compete against students across the United States, and from other countries that have their own common standards and high levels of student achievement. As states progressed with their implementation, a growing concern arose among principals that they were not prepared to support teachers in achieving higher levels of effective practice. And there was also concern by teachers that they were not prepared for teaching to the rigor of higher standards and did not possess the strategies and approaches necessary for successful implementation of college- and career-ready standards.

We applaud the willingness of educators to seek assistance in implementing college- and career-ready standards and to signal their concern for those teachers and principals entering the profession. Individually, teachers and leaders are not responsible for inadequate preparation or the lack of understanding of the changes that are required to improve student achievement and growth. Components of the education system such as standards have changed without proper attention to and adjustment of other aspects of the system — namely the support to help teachers and leaders in continuous improvement. In the current education workforce, when teachers and principals are provided with the opportunity to learn the standards, realize the implications they have on their practice, discuss and learn from others in improvement communities or communities of practice, and receive feedback on actual classroom practice, the chances are much greater that they will be able to meet the rigor of the higher standards and

achieve the results that are part of the mandate for more in-depth student achievement and growth. While teachers and leaders must develop additional knowledge and skills, it is essential that the system change to provide for knowledge acquisition in content and skills, to support teachers as they change their teaching practice, and to provide feedback on what is effective and what is not.

With the new college- and career-ready standards for students in hand, CCSSO established a committee to revise practice standards for teachers to reflect the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they need to successfully implement college- and career- ready standards. Instructional leadership is key to the success of student attainment of increased knowledge and skills. The revised Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) *Model Core Teaching Standards* were released in April 2011 and laid the foundation for a new vision of teaching. These standards are currently being used by SEAs and where applicable, their partner professional standards boards to create systems for effective teachers, with preparation programs as major components of their curriculum; additionally, the edTPA, a performance assessment process being piloted in teacher preparation programs in 24 states, is aligned with the InTASC standards. The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) *Educational Leadership Policy Standards* were revised in 2008 and plans are underway by the National Policy Board on Educational Administration (NPBEA) to revise the standards in light of recent reforms.

Soon after being elected as president of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in November 2011, Tom Luna, State Superintendent of Public Instruction in the State of Idaho, convened a task force to ensure that school districts across the country have access to teachers prepared to assist all students in graduating from high school college- and career-ready. Our Task Force on Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession is composed of seven current chief state school officers and three former chiefs, several of whom have had experience as leaders in both PK-12 and educator preparation. Members of NASBE and NGA also contributed to the task force discussions and recommendations. (A full list of the task force members can be found in Appendix A.)

The task force had four formal meetings and a range of other interactions in the course of our study. We were advised by an Expert Advisory Group with a range of expertise and perspectives on what knowledge, skills, and dispositions teachers and leaders should have in order to be licensed to teach and lead; on the components for which educator preparation programs should be held accountable; and on what and how data should be used by educator preparation programs for continuous improvement and evaluation. A full list of the advisory group can be found in Appendix A. We also held a working meeting on educator preparation for members of CCSSO's [State Consortium on Education Effectiveness](#) (SCEE) who provided feedback on this report. The state teams were composed of SEA teacher and leader staff, educator preparation faculty, and state teachers of the year.

Many reports on educator preparation reform have preceded this report (e.g., *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* [Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986]; *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* [Holmes Group, Inc., 1995]; the 19 postulates of *Teachers for our Nation's Schools* [Goodlad, 1990]) and made recommendations on some measures that have led to change in the way teachers and leaders are prepared. But despite the huge number of changes that have occurred in society, we continue to prepare teachers much the same way veteran educators were prepared. And, we continue to teach much

the same way we were taught. Despite research and promising practices, we have failed to implement changes in preparation that are systemic and universal, and produce the desired results in student achievement necessary for success in college and careers.

We realize that recommendations that have been made in previous reports have had a marginal impact on transforming the preparation of teachers and principals or failed to accomplish their intent for a number of reasons. It is our belief that the outcome will be different due to a number of related considerations:

1. The Task Force focused on areas where chiefs have responsibility. While involving key stakeholders in implementing these recommendations will be critical, the recommendations focus on what chiefs and their agencies and partners have authority to exercise.
2. The Task Force sought and received feedback and buy-in from the CCSSO membership. CCSSO also intends to seek and receive commitments from chiefs to proceed with advancing the recommendations and then fully support our members in acting on such recommendations.
3. The Task Force gathered input from our partners at NASBE and NGA and other external stakeholder groups. CCSSO also used an expert panel to help craft and enhance the recommendations.
4. The number of states adopting the common core state standards and other college- and career-ready standards requires a fundamental shift in how educators are prepared to meet new student expectations. The stakes have never been higher with the increased expectations for student achievement and growth and the competition we have from around the globe.
5. There are a multitude of deadlines and reforms that are to be implemented in states which will impact and influence the conversation about what we should expect of educators throughout their careers, including those entering the profession.
6. Other organizations are also focusing on reforming educator preparation and entry into the profession. While this report might differ in approaches for transforming preparation and entry, it seems like there is common agreement on state policy levers that will garner the necessary transformation—licensure, program approval, and data collection, analysis, and reporting.

While this report is written with chiefs in mind, it is also an open invitation to our partners and colleagues in educator preparation and others who have a stake in transforming entry into the education profession for teachers and principals by supporting the implementation of the recommendations contained in this report. This work is difficult and will require additional or reallocated resources to take the actions recommended in this report and the leadership and collaboration of all stakeholders involved in P-20 education. If we put aside our turf protection, find ways to collaborate effectively, and focus on what we must do for students to make good on our promise, this time we can be successful.



## EDUCATOR PREPARATION

As candidates enter educator preparation programs to prepare for a career in teaching or leading schools, they should begin a journey of continuous improvement during which the sophistication of their skills and strategies, application of their knowledge of content and student cognitive development, use of data to drive instruction, and knowledge of their communities grow over time. As self-contained classrooms are replaced with teams of teachers and anywhere, anytime learning, teachers will have even greater need for collaboration, communication, and problem-solving skills to keep pace with rapidly changing learning environments and new technologies. There is also a need for shared leadership where teachers take on more leadership roles and assist with the tasks of leading and operating a school. A teacher or principal's professional growth increases with feedback, mentoring, collegial sharing, and other forms of support and development.

---

### Variation in Policy and Practice

---

One of the lessons we have learned from studies of educator preparation programs is that there is tremendous variability among programs. The readiness of candidates to enter classrooms and schools varies from program to program across states, within states, and even within preparation providers. In other words, within the same institution or organization, candidates from some licensure areas are much better prepared than candidates in other licensure areas. For a variety of reasons, the range of program quality is wide. The varieties of routes and programs through which teachers enter classrooms and principals enter schools have different requirements for coursework and clinical practice and set different standards for quality. For example, while candidates in some programs receive extensive preparation in methods for teaching their subject areas and for reaching diverse students effectively, others receive only an overview of different types of student disabilities and a session or two of general ideas for teaching English language learners and students with disabilities.

The licensure requirements for teaching and leading vary from state to state. One of the most striking disparities in initial licensure requirements is in the passing score on licensure tests such as Praxis II exams. States with the highest score requirements tend to have a cut score 20-30 points (on a 100-point scale) above the states with the least-demanding scores. This spread is significant. For example, for the mathematics Praxis II exam, it separates the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of takers nationwide from the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile — meaning that some states require teachers to know their subject matter better than one out of four candidates, while others require knowledge superior to three out of four (ETS, 2012).

All but two states currently use some type of standardized assessment as a requirement for licensure. With their widespread use, these assessments have the potential to serve as an effective means of driving change in educator preparation programs. The assessments, including performance measures, that we put in place to measure a candidate's readiness for the classroom or leadership position are essential to changes needed in the preparation of teachers and principals and should be aligned to a state's college- and career-ready standards. In addition to ensuring that cut scores for licensure tests are set at an appropriate level, a review of the scope and depth of the topics that are addressed on licensing tests and other measures may lead to a work group composed of state education leaders who will promote licensing test enhancements including performance assessments that will determine the readiness of candidates to be learner- or school-ready.

## National Institute of Education, Singapore's report, *Teacher Education Model for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TE21)*, recommends five improvements for preparation programs

1. Curriculum—The curriculum should be composed of a coherent collection of courses across the program with clear linkages between courses. It should include a concept mind map for the preparation program so that candidates understand how they will acquire the competencies and what is included in their learning journey that will ensure they are effective in the classroom. Singaporeans believe in using introductory courses to develop values, including candidate's social responsibility, responsibility for cultural literacy development, and how to be an active contributor in the community.
2. Pedagogy—Candidates should be taught how to be good designers of learning environments, engage students in their own learning, transfer ownership of learning from teacher to student, become a facilitator and coach, harness enabling powers of technology, promote learning outside of the classroom, and use the "flipped classroom" model where students do "homework" in class.
3. Assessment—Candidates need to know how to use formative and summative assessment to assess 21<sup>st</sup> century competencies.
4. Theory-practice linkage—Preparation programs should strengthen their relationships with schools and follow graduates to the schools where they teach.
5. Facilities—Preparation programs should create 21<sup>st</sup> century facilities that are interactive and provide space for group work.

Many principals come to their leadership roles through a personal decision to enroll in preparation programs that were designed to lead them to licensure as school leaders. Few preparation programs make concerted efforts to recruit educators and other personnel who exhibit the potential to become effective school leaders. But not everyone who enrolls in these programs expects to serve as administrators. Some educators enroll in leadership programs because they want to assume school leadership roles in their schools other than administrative roles, and principal preparation programs are usually the only available programs for developing leadership knowledge and skills. Other leadership candidates pursue a degree because compensation structures provide incentives for attaining a higher level of education even if the candidate does not assume a school leadership role. States should consider revising these salary incentives to ensure that we are using our resources to prepare the best principals possible to create learning environments for students to achieve and grow and teachers to implement effective instructional practices.

The recruitment of principals should be considered and purposeful. Principals should be recruited who have demonstrated interest and performance that would predict that they would likely be able to successfully complete the requirements of rigorous preparation and successfully lead schools. School districts need to actively partner with preparation programs in creating a more "selective and probing" process of determining who they will prepare to be the school leaders of the future.

---

### International Lessons Learned about Educator Preparation

---

In the past few years, CCSSO has assisted chiefs in learning more about education systems in other countries that have taken significant steps to increase student achievement levels. From studies of other countries, chiefs have learned lessons that apply to the education system in the United States. Two of the most notable countries we have learned about — Singapore and Finland — are spotlighted in this report for their efforts to transform educator preparation.

#### *Singapore*

Singapore began its transformation of educator preparation by having a comprehensive review at the system level conducted by the National Institute for Education (NIE). As a result of this review, NIE published a report, *Teacher Education Model for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TE21)*, which includes a framework that articulates



the 21<sup>st</sup> century competencies that educators must have to be effective. They arrived at these competencies by determining that Singapore needed confident, self-directed, active, and concerned citizens and then identifying the preparation that teachers needed to educate students to acquire these attributes.

Two inspiring components of Singapore’s educator preparation system are their desire to do research in order to continue to improve and to associate themselves with other countries who are also studying ways to improve the preparation of teachers. They understand their role as change agents in preparing students for the future.

### Finland

Finland has a nationwide education system that is radically different from our own and is ranked first by the United Nations. The [Programme for International Student Assessment \(PISA\)](#) ranks Finland as one of the top education systems in the world, while the U.S. is ranked as average overall.

One of the keys to Finland’s high levels of student achievement is strong and competitive teacher preparation. Admissions to Finnish teacher preparation programs are highly competitive; prospective candidates must earn high marks on their matriculation exams, pass a rigorous entrance exam, and undergo an interview. Only 10 percent of applicants are accepted into educator preparation programs. As part of the teacher preparation program paid for by the Finnish government, prospective teachers earn a BA and MA in their subject and/or pedagogy, completing five years of college-level classes and training. In addition, the students observe master teachers and then prepare lessons and teach in front of a panel of other prospective teachers, professors, and master teachers. Finland’s preparation programs haven’t always been examples of best practice. The change occurred after the country underwent a complete overhaul of their preparation programs due to a major effort to raise student performance. Programs were closed and reopened as part of research universities where the selectivity we now associate with Finland was implemented.

One of the keys to Finland’s success is strong and competitive teacher preparation. Admissions to Finnish teacher preparation programs are highly competitive; prospective candidates must earn high marks on their matriculation exams, pass a rigorous entrance exam, and undergo an interview.

Singapore’s framework includes values, skills, and knowledge that guide teachers in the three key roles they have in a classroom:

1. nurture the child and quality of learning of the child—hence, believe that every child can learn;
2. facilitate learning of content/subject in a deep way; and
3. work with colleagues to build the profession and have respect for diversity.

Most analysts observe that excellent teachers have played a critical role in Finland’s success in improving student achievement. Among Finland’s successful practices for preparing teachers that we can emulate is the development of rigorous, research-based teacher education programs that prepare teachers in content, pedagogy, and educational theory, as well as the capacity to do their own research, and that includes fieldwork mentored by expert veterans.

Finnish teachers' capacity to teach in classrooms and work collaboratively in professional communities has been systematically built through academic teacher education. Teachers' strong competence and preparedness create the prerequisite for the professional autonomy that makes teaching a valued career. Because teaching is a desirable career in Finland, teacher preparation programs can afford to be both selective and demanding.

Teachers in Finland spend at least 10 hours each week working collaboratively to plan and develop curriculum as a team, working together on research and professional development planning, and working on teams with administrators to discuss curriculum, textbooks, assessments, professional growth, and budgeting. Finnish teachers spend over 100 hours more per year teaching than the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development average. This allows more time for supporting students with learning difficulties and for collaboration.

---

## High Quality Preparation Systems

In addition to the examples of best practice in other countries, there are also examples of best practice in preparation programs throughout this country. High quality preparation programs

Alverno College set up promotional gates within its teacher preparation programs that enable students to advance in the program from theory and subject-matter preparation to clinical training only after they meet rigorous criteria, enabling the program to be open to a broader range of students and to advance students who demonstrate high performance.

–NCATE, 2010

have several characteristics that make a difference in the candidates that they produce for the teaching profession. They are designed such that school districts have a significant role in the design and implementation of the program, the selection of candidates for clinical placements in their schools, and the assessment of candidate performance and progress. These partnerships are critical to the success of preparation programs, and preparation programs should be held accountable for how well they address the needs of schools and help improve PK-12 student achievement and growth.

For many years, educational administration and teacher preparation programs have been criticized for their lack of selectivity, irrelevance of coursework to the demands of the job, and inadequate connections between universities and school sites. More recently, states have been taking significant action to change the standards and requirements for approval of preparation programs, based on research that has identified the key factors in strong teacher and leadership preparation

and models for supporting teachers and school leaders during their initial years on the job and throughout their careers.

### *Highly Selective Criteria for Program Entry and Exit*

Not only do high quality preparation systems have selective criteria in choosing candidates for entry into their preparation programs, these preparers of teachers also have transparent and rigorous criteria for program completion. These programs understand that it is no longer sufficient for candidates to complete a series of courses without knowing what skills and knowledge a candidate has acquired and if they can apply them in classroom settings and other learning environments. High quality preparation systems have begun using performance assessments and other authentic assessments to determine the readiness of their candidates for licensure and employment in a learning environment. These assessments,

as well as other well thought out criteria, are the basis for recommendations from preparation programs of their candidates for state licensure.

### *Supply and Demand*

In addition to having highly selective criteria for program entry, admission to preparation programs should be based on the needs that districts and states have for teachers. Science and math teachers, as well as teachers of students with disabilities, have been in short supply for as long as we have been tracking shortages. On the other hand, we consistently have an oversupply of elementary teachers who have a difficult time finding a teaching job. Teachers who have technological skills to teach in online learning environments are in short supply. As more and more instruction will be provided in online and blended (face-to-face and online) environments, teachers must be equipped with the skills to be successful in these environments.

Candidates should be made aware of the supply and demand findings in their state and the country before they enroll in preparation programs. Preparation programs should also be provided with incentives for preparing teachers in shortage areas and in underrepresented populations in the education workforce. States may want to consider capping the enrollment of candidates in licensure area programs where there is an oversupply of teachers (e.g., elementary). We recommend that scholarships and loan forgiveness be based on shortage areas and focused on those who agree to teach in and serve as a principal in hard-to-staff schools.

### *Assessment Literacy*

Just as educator preparation programs must use data to do a better job of preparing candidates and to make changes to their curriculum, assessments, and clinical practice, teachers must also know how to use data to drive instruction. In this era of increased school accountability, high quality educator preparation programs must prepare candidates to “use data from a variety of assessments as well as information on student attendance, student engagement, demographics, and school climate in order to develop or adjust instruction” (NCTQ, 2012). In fact, teacher candidates should not only learn the types of assessments that demonstrate student growth and achievement, but also how to create formative and summative assessments that align to content standards. Preparation faculty and mentor teachers should routinely model appropriate uses of assessment and how to analyze student learning to plan instruction to increase student achievement and growth.

### *Clinically-Based Preparation Approaches*

Prospective teachers must be prepared to become practitioners who know how to use the knowledge of their profession to advance student achievement and growth and build their professional knowledge through practice. Practice must be placed at the center of teaching preparation.

#### **Assessment Literacy**

Three domains of knowledge needed by teacher candidates in the area of assessment preparation:

1. **Assessment Literacy:** How to measure student performance using assessments
2. **Analytical Skills:** How to analyze student performance data from such assessment
3. **Instructional Decision Making:** How to use student performance data from assessments to plan instruction

–NCTQ, 2012

High quality preparation systems use clinically-based approaches and have relevant and well-planned clinical experiences throughout the preparation of candidates.

Currently, most state policies require a specific number of days or weeks that candidates must participate in clinical practice prior to program completion. Clinical practice includes what has traditionally been called student teaching as well as practica usually associated with methods classes. However, the amount of time spent in clinical experiences is not the key to ensuring that a candidate receives the hands-on experience they need to prepare for their own classroom. What is important is the nature and quality of the candidate's experiences during their clinical practice. If the candidates are observing teaching, they should have specific things to look for and a framework for making sense of the complexity of what they see. As much as possible, clinical experiences should simulate the actual practice of teaching that candidates will encounter in their first job. In fact, candidates should be prepared to be able to open a classroom at the beginning of the school year and close a classroom at the end of a year as well as the events and learning progression that takes place during the school year.

Maryland and the state of Washington have taken steps to describe what high quality clinical practice should look like and how programs should be held accountable.

Laboratory experiences are also important in the preparation of teaching candidates. Prospective teachers can learn through online and video demonstrations, analyzing case studies representing both exemplary practice and common dilemmas, and participating in peer and micro-teaching (NCATE, 2010).

### Urban Teacher Residency United (UTRU)

Urban Teacher Residency United is an example of a nonprofit organization that supports the development of residency programs that select a diverse group of talented college graduates, career changers, and community members for preparation through a residency program. During the residency year, teacher candidates participate in a unique synthesis of theory and practice, combining a yearlong classroom apprenticeship with a carefully aligned sequence of master's-level coursework. The UTRU completers often outperform and are rated more effective than their peers. For more information, please visit [www.utrunited.org](http://www.utrunited.org).

Diverse clinical settings are also important to help candidates prepare to teach no matter where they accept a teaching job. Working with students with disabilities and in schools facing high-needs and low-performance are challenging, but teachers should not face these challenges for the first time in their first teaching job. Programs for preparing educators to serve English language learners and students with disabilities need particular attention. Educators need to develop strong cultural competency and be prepared to teach every student to higher standards.

A number of preparation programs are moving to residency programs where candidates have an extended opportunity to practice their craft with students under the close guidance of an experienced and effective PK-12 teacher who is licensed in the area that the candidate is preparing to teach. These extended residencies also include supervision and mentoring by a representative of the preparation program who, along with the PK-12 teacher, ensures the candidate is ready for program completion and recommendation for licensure. Research on professional development schools and urban teacher residencies indicates new teachers prepared in these intensive clinically-based programs have greater teacher efficacy and higher retention rates. There are also models for clinical practice where the candidate has a more traditional student teaching experience for the first part of the clinical practice and then becomes the teacher of record for the

remainder of the experience. For the most part, these types of more in-depth clinical experiences have produced better-prepared candidates and have also resulted in changes to the preparation programs after observing firsthand the gaps in their candidates' performance.

No matter what model is used for preparing teacher candidates for the classroom, preparation programs should develop a screening process for identifying PK-12 clinical teachers who positively impact student growth and achievement and demonstrate effective instructional practices. Preparation programs should train all PK-12 teachers who will serve as mentors in clinical practice, whether or not states require this type of training. States should consider requiring the training of mentors as part of the program approval process. Additionally, the funding structure for clinical preparation needs to be changed and the roles of clinical faculty (preparation program faculty and PK-12 teachers) should be clearly defined between the roles of clinical faculty hired by the preparation program and those hired by the PK-12 learning environment. First, clinical faculty who are employed by the preparation program should have their role legitimized and should be rewarded accordingly. As long as clinical practice is relegated to faculty who are not part of the decision-making process within the preparation program, the program cannot adequately address needed changes in program requirements. At the same time, funding for clinical practice is heavily skewed toward the preparation program with little or no funding going to the school in which the candidate is placed, nor any compensation to the teacher who is expected to mentor and coach the candidate on a daily basis. Just as clinical faculty members are paid for their roles as supervisors and mentors, PK-12 teachers should be compensated for their role as model, coach, and evaluator. If schools and PK-12 teachers receive the financial support needed to carry out the important role of assisting with the preparation of candidates for teaching positions, schools are more likely to accept placements and mentor teachers will have more accountability for carrying out required tasks. If there is going to be a true partnership between educator preparation programs and PK-12 schools, the PK-12 teachers who assume the responsibility of helping candidates apply what they have learned in ways that help real students learn must be treated as an equal partner. This partnership may also lead to a cadre of teacher candidates available for employment in the school that helped prepare them.

Tennessee and Florida have implemented policies that require that candidates are placed in clinical practice only with effective teachers.

## STATE POLICY LEVERS

States have three key policy levers — licensure; program approval; and data collection, analysis, and reporting — they can use to drive development of these new entry systems into the education profession. States must oversee construction of a data feedback infrastructure that will be essential to implementation of the new entry systems. Listed below are specific actions we will ask states to commit to take in each of the three leverage areas.

---

### Recommendations for Licensure

---

Initial licensure requirements can be a key driver of what an entry system will look like for teachers and leaders. Before states can address reforming teacher and leader licensure systems in this country, however, they must first ask themselves, "What do we want licensure

to do?” Historically, state licensure followed a “Do No Harm” policy and set minimum qualifications for educators before they were allowed to practice in a classroom or school. That is what the current system is designed to do and why we have basic skills tests, and tests of content and pedagogical knowledge. Today, however, we are asking licensure assessments to do more, to ensure a certain standard of educator quality and to be based on indicators correlated with readiness to enter a classroom or a school so we can make better-informed decisions of who gets into the profession. Current reform efforts are focused on these new expectations of performance — Can the candidate actually do the job? — and higher standards of rigor — Are educators effective?

Specific actions that states should take include

- 1. States will revise and enforce their licensure standards for teachers and principals to support the teaching of more demanding content aligned to college- and career-readiness and critical thinking skills to a diverse range of students.**

Licensure requirements should embed and leverage the new vision of teaching and leading necessary to move all students to college- and career-readiness. This new vision includes not only the new content included in the common core state standards (CCSS), but also changes in pedagogy (such as cross- or inter-disciplinary perspectives; teaming and collaborative problem solving; assessment literacy to define, collect, and interpret data; and understanding individual learners in ways that education can be personalized), as well as changes in leadership strategies to support this new pedagogy. This means the new student achievement and growth expectations (e.g., CCSS) must be fused with the state’s performance expectations of both teachers (e.g., *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards*) and leaders (e.g., *ISLLC School Leader Standards*) into one conceptual framework for how we must deliver education differently.

Adopting new common definitions for learner-ready teachers and school-ready principals is a first step in building coherent entry systems both within and across states. The next step is to translate those definitions into specific expectations and embed them into standards that will drive development of licensure assessments and preparation program curriculum.

- 2. States will work together to influence the development of innovative licensure performance assessments that are aligned to the revised licensure standards and include multiple measures of educators’ ability to perform, including the potential to impact student achievement and growth.**

The *edTPA* (formerly the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium or TPAC) is a new pre-service performance assessment that was field tested in 24 states plus the District of Columbia and 160 preparation programs.

Consensus has been growing that we need to move away from a focus on input measures that serve as a proxy for candidates’ knowledge and skill (e.g., courses taken and GPA) to authentic evidence of their ability to perform. Performance assessments vary, but include real-time observation models and/or evidence from authentic artifacts of teaching, which might include teacher and student work samples, unit or lesson planning and implementation, case studies of students, video of actual teaching, analysis of student assessment results, and reflection on the teaching.

The focus on demonstrating performance for the initial license is beginning to show promise through the *edTPA* (formerly the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium or TPAC) in which



24 states plus the District of Columbia and 160 preparation programs participated in a field study of a new assessment to measure a candidate's ability to perform to standards before completing the program and/or receiving a recommendation for licensure. The assessment is completed during the candidate's student teaching experience and generates data that can be fed back to the candidate and the program for improvement purposes. The assessment also serves state policy in that it builds capacity of preparation program faculty members by providing them with opportunities for professional growth as they reflect on the impact of their curriculum on their candidates' performances. (See Note 3 at the end of this report.) Challenges for states in implementing new performance assessment systems and in evaluating preparation programs generally are staff and resource capacity to conduct the reviews and how much of those costs should be shared by preparation providers, states, and candidates.

As part of the evidence of a candidate's ability to perform, states will need evidence of a candidate's content knowledge, content-specific pedagogical knowledge, and general pedagogical strategies. This is the foundational content for the new vision of teaching and leading that must be incorporated into a reformed licensure system. To model this new vision, states should leverage development of innovative assessments that might include interactive video scenarios or simulations to which candidates react in real time (to a student achievement and growth challenge, to a collaborative problem solving task, to a professional learning opportunity) and which capture the critical thinking skills that the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study and other studies show are insufficiently addressed in today's learning environments. These kinds of assessments could be part of the preparation program curriculum or stand-alone licensure tests. They would be one element in a set of multiple measures that could be administered at appropriate times during preparation or a residency period before receiving a license. States should specify the performance data and criteria upon which recommendations for licensure are made or require that preparation providers be transparent about and outline the performance data and criteria upon which they are relying to make recommendations for licensure of individual candidates.

An emerging trend in states is making evidence of student achievement and growth one key aspect of license renewal. If licensure systems are to measure what we value, then evidence of student achievement and growth must be included in the licensure process. This is a challenge for initial licensure because educators who are new to the classroom have a limited track record with students from which to pull evidence. We need to identify indicators beyond student test scores, including high leverage educator qualities (e.g., verbal skills, content knowledge) that are predictive of improved student achievement and growth, and focus on those to inform licensure in the early part of the candidate's career.

One key action that CCSSO can take as a first step is to convene states to identify and share lessons learned across states from implementation of existing pre-service performance assessments including edTPA, Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT), California TPA, and other valid and reliable assessments regarding their potential use in making licensure decisions.

- 3. States will create multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a coherent developmental continuum that reflects new performance expectations for educators and their implementation in the learning environment and to assessments that are linked to evidence of student growth.**

As states design requirements for initial licensure, they should be looking to build a continuum of licensure expectations and assessments that are coherent and linked to improved student achievement and growth. A number of states are moving toward tiered licensure as they recognize that licensure can be a lever to promote educator development, advancement, and retention, and work hand-in-hand with policies on compensation, career ladders, and ongoing professional learning. It is also a way for states to ensure that candidates implement what they have learned through courses and other activities for licensure renewal. According to the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC KnowledgeBase, 2012), roughly 10 states use a single certificate, about 21 use a two-tier system consisting of an initial and a professional license, and about 17 states use three or more tiers. An advantage of multiple tiers is it creates a structure of incentives for educators to develop and improve their performance along with increased professional opportunities and compensation. It also provides an accountability system for determining which teachers or principals advance in the system.

States should also leverage the relationships between preparation providers and the districts in which their candidates are placed (either for clinical practice, residencies, or employment)

Ohio House Bill 1 created a new 4-tier licensure structure that took effect in January 2011. The first tier is a 4-year nonrenewable Resident Educator License followed by a Professional Educator, a Senior Professional Educator, and a Lead Professional Educator License, all being 5 year renewable licenses. The structure is aligned to the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession and the Ohio Continuum of Teacher Development. See <http://www.ode.state.oh.us>.

so there is follow through into the early induction years and a culture of collegial coaching carries over from preparation into early practice. The state's interest is in seeing initial licensure candidates supported and further developed so they reach the professional licensure stage with limited attrition. This opportunity to learn and scaffold the development of early educators should be transparent and resourced, and should be a shared responsibility among preparation providers, districts, and states.

The *InTASC Draft Learning Progressions for Teachers*, currently being developed by CCSSO and aligned to the *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards*, will be a useful tool to help states in crafting a tiered system of licensure, supports, assessments, and advancement opportunities for teachers. They will help states see how teaching practice develops over time and what more sophisticated practice looks like at different developmental levels. Specifically, the progressions can inform preparation program curriculum development and scaffolding of preparation experiences during clinical practice; a bridging plan for continued growth

from pre-service into induction; ongoing professional growth plans linked to evaluation systems at the district level; and requirements for initial and tiered licensure levels.

**4. States will reform current state licensure systems so they are more efficient, have true reciprocity across states, and so that their credentialing structures support effective teaching and leading toward student college- and career-readiness.**

Our current licensure systems are antiquated and have lost credibility with the public. They should be revised to ensure they align with new performance expectations and realities. Any new licensure system must take into account the fact that new generations of workers anticipate having multiple careers across their lifetime. Education policy needs to



accommodate career changers and create flexibility that allows them to become an education professional without undue burdens. This does not mean sacrificing high standards, but only allowing multiple pathways for entry and multiple ways to demonstrate competence without automatically having to satisfy onerous input requirements. The demonstration of competence again calls for the development of a new generation of performance assessments.

In addition, our system of portability of licenses across states is inefficient and often burdened by too many hurdles and processes. Certainly, states have a vested interest in ensuring the quality of educators coming in from other states and many requirements are in place for good reason. However, if we are to achieve true reciprocity, states need to streamline, simplify, and reach consensus on licensure requirements. As a first step, states need to

- Adopt comparable definitions of learner-ready teachers and school-ready principals so we have some consensus on what it takes to enter the profession
- Develop agreement on the kinds of evidence that will demonstrate performance against the definitions
- Develop common definitions for key preparation components that implicate licensure requirements such as clinical practice, including
  - defining the nature and quality of clinical practice experiences (e.g., co-teaching v. observing; quality and role of school-based clinical faculty; urban or rural experience; experience with students with disabilities or second language learners)
- Develop common guidelines for reciprocity for multiple pathways, including online programs that cross state lines
- Address the issue of widely varying licensure requirements across states, which means teachers and leaders meet very different standards for entry into the profession, for example
  - passing scores on common licensure assessments like the Praxis exams differ 20-30 points (on a 100-point scale) between the least and most-demanding states (ETS, 2012)
  - requirements for content knowledge vary with some states requiring a bachelor's degree in content and others requiring varying levels of coursework (NASDTEC, 2012)
- Examine the implications of the new vision of teaching and leading for changing licensure requirements such as

Recently, a Maryland teacher who is the wife of a serviceman described how difficult it is for her to get a license in a new state when her husband gets new orders and the family moves. Even with a degree and successful teaching experience, teachers have to obtain a new license in each new state. As a result, some spouses of service men and women have given up on teaching because of the labor-intensive application process and confusing requirements.

- o eliminating broad licenses that cover wide grade spans or multiple content areas to ensure a teacher has deep content knowledge and skills appropriate to a smaller range of student developmental levels. (The tradeoff is that districts will lose flexibility in making staff assignments, which will be a challenge for rural areas especially where one teacher often teaches a range of subjects and students. Blended programs that include virtual and face-to-face instruction may address some of these challenges at the high school level.)
- o adding a requirement that all teachers be able to develop student literacy across the curriculum (a requirement of the CCSS)
- o requiring that all general education teachers have greater knowledge and skill in teaching students with disabilities and English language learners

In addition, states need to shift away from duality of licensure as either traditional or alternative and set one standard for all pathways into the profession. (See Assumptions on page 1.) High quality and consistently applied licensure assessments and requirements can provide an objective and equitable measure of accountability for *all* preparation providers by focusing on the quality of the candidates they produce.

---

### Recommendations for Approving Educator Preparation Programs

---

Program approval is an evaluation process that determines if a preparation program seeking educator preparation authorization meets state standards defined in statute, state board of education requirements, and SEA policy and guidance. A preparation program may include preparation in one or more licensure areas. Typically, the determination of program approval is carried out in a collaborative effort by the SEA and, where applicable, their partner licensing board, and the state agency that oversees higher education and includes initial approval and reauthorization usually not more than once every five years. Initial approval and reauthorization are required for any entity offering educator preparation programs leading to licensure, including public, private, and out-of-state institutions, LEAs, and nonprofit and for-profit organizations. (See Note 1 at the end of this report.) Currently, in many states, accreditation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), the two entities approved by the U.S. Department of Education as accreditors for educator preparation programs, is substituted for state program approval. NCATE and TEAC have merged and will soon begin accrediting educator preparation programs as the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

To ensure that an educator preparation program continues to meet the requirements set by the state, two stages of program approval are required — initial and reauthorization. Initial program approval in essence is the process that determines whether an entity is eligible to offer an educator preparation program and recommend candidates for licensure in a state. Initial program approval is granted by a state only after a preparation program has demonstrated that it meets the appropriate preconditions and standards. Reauthorization of program approval is accomplished by reviewing evidence submitted by the preparation program that describes how it meets the appropriate program standards and provides the necessary evidence (e.g., performance assessments, description of field experiences, course

syllabi, handbooks, data on program graduates, evaluation forms) to support the narrative description. The SEAs and where applicable, their partner professional standards boards should be able to determine at any point if program intervention or assistance is needed. Success of the program approval system is measured by the continuing viability of programs that produce effective educators for a state's students.

Specific actions that states should take include

- 5. States will hold preparation programs accountable by exercising the state's authority to determine which programs should operate and recommend candidates for licensure in the state, including establishing a clear and fair performance rating system to guide continuous improvement. States will act to close programs that continually receive the lowest rating and will provide incentives for programs whose ratings indicate exemplary performance.**

A primary purpose of the program approval system is to ensure accountability to the public, PK-12 students, and the education profession that educator preparation programs are producing candidates with the potential to be effective and are responsive to the educational needs of current and future candidates. Only an approved educator preparation program should recommend a candidate for a license to teach or lead in a state. The general public has a compelling interest in program approval decisions, especially consumers of those programs such as potential candidates for teacher and principal positions and parents.

States should address the following issues in their policies for program approval:

- a. States must provide a transparent process for selecting and training reviewers who have the expertise and experience to examine submitted evidence and provide feedback for program approvers to use to make decisions.
- b. No licensure area program should be allowed to underperform for a prolonged period before it is prohibited from admitting or graduating candidates.
- c. All licensure area programs should be held accountable for the performance of their graduates (e.g., during the period teachers hold a probationary license using a sliding scale of responsibility that decreases over time).
- d. All licensure area programs should provide knowledge of student and educator standards along with the instructional framework adopted by the state or district, strong content preparation through appropriate coursework, and pedagogical preparation that supports higher order thinking and performance skills for students.
- e. Clinical practice in all licensure area programs should begin early and include
  - i. Clear and rigorous clinical training expectations that build the link between theory and practice. (See Note 2 at the end of this report.)

- ii. More school-based models of preparation, such as residency models; school-university professional development school partnerships for teachers, especially in high-need communities; and residency components for principals.
  - iii. Collaboration with school-based partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. These partnerships create stronger programs and learner- and school-ready candidates.
  - iv. Selection of trained school-based clinical faculty who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students. School-based clinical faculty should be trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, and evaluated and recognized as effective teachers.
- f. All preparation programs should make transparent how they will use the results of program approval or national accreditation for continuous program improvement.
  - g. Accountability results from all licensure area programs should be made available to states that import teachers.

**6. States will adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards to assure that educator preparation programs recruit candidates based on supply and demand data, have highly selective admissions and exit criteria including mastery of content, provide high quality clinical practice throughout a candidate's preparation that includes experiences with the responsibilities of a school year from beginning to end, and that produce quality candidates capable of positively impacting student achievement.**

In addition to accountability, a second purpose of program approval is to ensure that educator preparation programs are high quality, effective, and provide education and experiences consistent with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of an educator serving the needs of the diverse population in today's public schools. In most states, SEAs have statutory responsibility for adopting program approval standards that describe levels of quality it deems acceptable for quality assurance. Standards should require trained reviewers with professional expertise to review program outcomes as well as some inputs to ascertain whether an educator preparation program is characterized by acceptable levels of quality as defined in the standards that will be used to make a recommendation to the board or agency that grants program approval. Program approval decisions should hinge on findings that are evidence-based, educationally significant, and clearly related to quality-oriented standards.

Program approval standards should be written so program providers can meet them in a variety of acceptable ways. There are effective and ineffective forms of educator preparation; program approval should differentiate between them. There are also multiple ways of effectively educating prospective educators; program approval should not favor any of

these over the others. Standards should describe levels of quality and effectiveness without stipulating how program providers are to comply.

Explanations of the standards should clarify their meaning without making the standards overly restrictive or prescriptive. The training of program approval reviewers should, moreover, emphasize the importance of understanding diversity and creativity among the variety of program providers while still meeting standards.

States should address the following essential components (this is not an inclusive list) in drafting their program approval standards:

- a. admission requirements for entry into an educator preparation program (e.g., admitted candidates should have appropriate experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to diverse populations, effective communication skills, and basic academic skills that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness);
- b. a plan for how performance will be measured, including a description of how data systems and assessments will be used to measure candidate and program performance;
- c. standards for clinical practice and a plan for enforcing the implementation of those standards;
- d. alignment with college- and career-ready standards and standards for teaching and leading (e.g., CCSS, InTASC, ISLLC); and
- e. exit requirements that candidates must demonstrate to be recommended for licensure.

### **7. States will require alignment of preparation content standards to PK-12 college- and career-ready standards for all licensure areas.**

A third purpose of the program approval system is to ensure candidates have demonstrated competence in the content standards for which they will teach and for which they are being licensed. The approving agency within a state, usually the SEA, should have a process for reviewing standards used by licensure area programs and determining if they are appropriate for the requirements of professional service in public schools. In many cases, states require all preparation programs to use the state's adopted standards for teachers and principals as well as content standards. If that is the case, states should invite stakeholders to participate in periodic reviews of the teacher and principal standards to ensure they are aligned with the state adopted academic content and performance standards for PK-12 students (e.g., college- and career-readiness).

A review of how each preparation program meets the state's standards should take place when a determination is being made for initial program approval. The program approval system should require educator preparation programs to provide evidence that their programs address specific licensure area content standards as well as teacher and principal standards and that their candidates can implement the standards effectively in learning environments. Sources of evidence that could be provided by preparation programs are performance data from pre-service clinical practice, including initial and eventual pass rates of candidates; surveys of program graduates upon

initial licensure, Tier II licensure, and license renewal regarding preparation; surveys of supervisors and human resources personnel regarding teacher and principal preparation; and, where available, results of performance assessments of practice in a public school classroom or school. See the Recommendations for Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting section below for more information on the types of data preparation programs that should be provided by states.

**8. States will provide feedback, data, support, and resources to preparation programs to assist them with continuous improvement and to act on any program approval or national accreditation recommendations.**

A fourth purpose of the program approval system is to support program improvement. The program approval process can drive improvements in the quality of a preparation program's policies, practices, and outcomes as its faculty, administrators, and candidates strive to meet program approval standards. In addition, specific program approval decisions can initiate needed improvements. States should have a plan for supporting programs that have identified weaknesses and areas for improvement, especially in cases where a preparation program has been identified as at-risk or low performing. To do this, though, the process must identify and describe with some specificity the weaknesses in the quality of a preparation program's offerings. In addition to identified weaknesses, preparation programs should also receive commendations for exemplary program offerings and practices that other programs might emulate.

See Appendix B for a description of the key attributes of program approval that function within the four purposes described above.

---

## Recommendations for Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting

---

The success and public perception of the educator effectiveness agenda depends in large part on states' abilities to collect and report data for different purposes in ways that are meaningful to multiple stakeholders over time. An ideal data reporting system provides relevant information to support continuous improvements in educator preparation programs and to inform licensure and program approval reform. A transparent system supports teacher and principal candidates in selecting the highest-quality programs for pursuing a career in education and principals in selecting the best-prepared graduates for teaching positions. Data systems also enable states that have preparation programs that are struggling with educator effectiveness to take evidence-based action such as reducing program sizes in cases where there is an oversupply of teachers in certain licensure areas or even closing programs based on data identifying how programs and their graduates perform.

With regard to student outcome data, there is still much debate within the education community over whether and how that data should be used in teacher and principal evaluation, and whether data should be linked back to the preparation programs where the candidates were prepared. While consensus is emerging in the PK-12 community and in some preparation programs that student-learning outcomes should be a central educational metric for assessing student and system progress, the capacity to do so remains substantially underdeveloped. Significant gaps exist in data collection, data connectivity, data quality, analytic capacity, and political will at all levels of the educational system. In addition, the absence of common data definitions and indicators has led to a lack of consistency in the data that is collected and shared.

Many efforts are already underway in states and preparation programs to collect and analyze data, including the development of state longitudinal data systems (which should be in place in every state by the end of 2013); annual reporting required by the Higher Education Act; and new educator

evaluation systems under the Race to the Top state grants, and, most recently, under the ESEA flexibility waivers granted to 34 states and Washington, DC, so far. These 34 states and DC and thousands of LEAs are currently in the process of creating or adopting, piloting, and implementing new or revised evaluation systems for teachers and leaders; however, less than one-fourth of the waiver applications include plans to provide these data to preparation programs. While much state energy has gone to the PK-12 system of evaluating practicing educators, increased emphasis needs to be placed on connecting data on educator effectiveness back to the programs that prepare educators. The same student growth data that are utilized in teacher and principal evaluation systems can serve as an indicator of how well preparation programs prepare learner-ready teachers and school-ready principals. States will also find those data useful to inform the state policy levers of licensure and program approval.

### *Elements for Consideration with Data Systems*

Elements states should consider when establishing or transforming data sets on educator preparation include but are not limited to educator observation data, student achievement and growth data, surveys of alumni and principals/employers, program retention rates, program non-completers, field retention rates disaggregated by licensure area, candidate diversity, and placement in hard-to-staff positions. States have varying capacities to report on student growth data depending on the growth model they use. Although many preparation programs conduct surveys of their graduates, creating a state-specific survey will allow for comparability. To increase the return rate of the survey, some states have tied the task to licensure requirements.

Specific actions that states should take include

- 9. States will develop and support state-level governance structures to guide confidential and secure data collection, analysis, and reporting of PK-20 data and how it informs educator preparation programs, hiring practices, and professional learning. Using stakeholder input, states will address and take appropriate action, individually and collectively, on the need for unique educator identifiers, links to non-traditional preparation providers, and the sharing of candidate data among organizations and across states.**

### *Governance Structure*

SEAs and preparation programs will need policies to guide data collection, synthesis, evaluation, and use, including how long states will report data on new teachers and leaders (e.g., during the period teachers hold a probationary license using a sliding scale of responsibility that decreases over time) to preparation programs and hold them accountable for their graduates' performance in a teaching or principal position. With increasing reliance on data, these policies will need to be reviewed periodically, and, if needed, updated. As an important first step in developing a data reporting system, states should convene stakeholders to identify purposes and needs and build on existing data reporting techniques to inform practices based on the elements, issues, and key attributes described below. States should involve stakeholders at all levels in the verification of data before such information is used for decision-making or disseminated to the public. States should also consider issues of privacy and control in terms of who owns those data, who has access to the data (and at what grain size), and how to prevent data from being used for unintended and undesired purposes. A recent paper, *Presenting Findings from Measures of Teacher Effectiveness*, written by Carole Gallagher (2012) for CCSSO's Accountability Systems and Reporting State Collaborative on



Assessment and Student Standards (ASR SCASS), provides helpful information to states on sharing and reporting data on educator effectiveness, including examples of reports being used by states.

### *Unique Educator Identifier*

Once the governance system is in place, one of the first tasks of states, individually or collectively, is to establish or enhance the ability to identify and link information about individual educators across data systems. This will require creating a unique identifier for each educator so the system can identify the students they teach, at which preparation provider and in which licensure area program they received their preparation to be a teacher and/or a principal, and their effectiveness in their roles. These links will be especially critical for students who have multiple teachers (e.g., students with disabilities). Having teams of teachers work with a group of students for one or more years is a growing practice, and the data system should be created to identify the impact of a team on student achievement.

States should also consider working together to create a unique educator identifier that identifies where a candidate received his or her preparation for teaching or leading. The identifier can be assigned to candidates when they enroll in programs to achieve consistency across states. This unique identifier would allow states to provide feedback to out-of-state preparation providers and would be especially beneficial to states that are importers of teachers and principals. Making these changes to the unique educator identifier will fulfill multiple data collection and reporting purposes.

### *Data Passport*

Mobility has become much more prevalent among teachers and principals as they relocate to take a job, to return where they grew up, or to accommodate family needs. It becomes difficult for preparation programs or states to keep track of teacher and principal candidates when they leave the state where they were prepared. Modern state data systems have elevated the potential for cross-state data sharing regardless of teacher and principal mobility. Over the next three years, CCSSO will work with states to identify the necessary standard data elements, determine the appropriate policies, and understand the technology needs in order to implement candidate record exchange allowing all candidates and practicing teachers and principals access to their own “Education Data Passport.” A data passport is one method that the task force recommends be employed to help track teacher and principal program completers across state lines and to provide data back to the preparation programs where they were prepared. Another use of this passport would be to help ensure that states have sufficient data to rate a preparation program’s effectiveness, including the individual licensure areas within a program. In some programs, the majority of the program completers leave the state and statistically significant data is not available to determine a program’s effectiveness. The data passport could be piloted by states in one or more regions of the country where any issues with the system could be resolved before being used by all states.

### *Links to Non-Traditional Preparation Providers*

Even if states are establishing links from state PK-12 data systems to postsecondary education, few, if any, of these systems are being linked to LEAs, nonprofit organizations, or others that prepare teachers and leaders. One of the assumptions (see page 1) used in writing this report is that there should be multiple ways to enter the profession and that all preparation programs should be held to the same requirements. Making these links will be challenging because there is no established system for assigning identifiers to the programs that are not housed at institutions



of higher education. A consortium of states working together could devise a system or identify an organization with the responsibility for assigning identifiers to preparation programs that are not housed at institutions of higher education.

### *Sharing Candidate Data*

Preparation programs should also share data about their program completers with employers in the PK-12 sector for the purpose of fulfilling future employment needs, specifically recruiting and hiring. This type of partnership will strengthen the quality of clinical experiences and other types of support that the program provider can provide to the LEA. Further, the PK-12 educator development system (professional learning) would benefit from data shared from educator preparation to determine how teachers and principals should be inducted, mentored, and supported. Finally, it would also be useful to preparation programs to have employment information on their graduates, including their retention rates and their continued employment.

#### **10. States will use data collection, analysis, and reporting of multiple measures for continuous improvement and accountability of preparation programs.**

While achieving transparency remains an important part of the data reporting agenda, accountability and continuous improvement have emerged as major drivers for data collection and reporting of multiple measures. Collecting PK-12 student outcome data in multiple ways and using these data to make instructional decisions and hold teachers and leaders accountable for *all* students and preparation programs for *all* candidates is critical. In an effort to ensure that all students achieve high standards, state policymakers are looking to data—especially data on performance and outcomes—to determine how well our system of education is serving all students and to identify areas for improvement. In particular, if analysis of data results in consequences for programs, mechanisms for decision-making must be valid and reliable. A robust data set with multiple measures supports high-stakes decisions with increased data quality and confidence in the results.

### *Continuous Improvement*

The primary purpose of sharing these data is to stimulate continuous improvement that leads to the preparation of more effective future teachers and leaders. Many different kinds of data are being collected by states on teachers and students. Much of this data can be useful to preparation programs to help them determine if there are gaps in their curriculum or if their clinical experiences are providing the practice that candidates need to successfully perform in their own classroom or school. States should share educator performance data, including student achievement and growth outcomes, with preparation programs responsible for preparing educators to teach and lead. In addition to student achievement and growth outcomes, other data may include observation data, student surveys, self-reflections, teacher work samples, employer satisfaction survey results, candidate satisfaction survey results, and employment data. These data should be used to stimulate continuous improvement in preparation programs in all licensure areas.

Because of variation in the quality of preparation across licensure areas within a program, outcome data by licensure area should be provided to educator preparation programs to ensure that candidates in all licensure areas receive the preparation they need to be effective. For instance, a program may successfully prepare secondary science teachers but inadequately prepare middle school social studies teachers. Disaggregating data to the appropriate level of information, such as by standard, within a licensure area will contribute to the use of data for continuous improvement.

Likewise, states have been working to diversify the workforce and ensure that shortage areas are filled. Data on their success in producing diverse teachers and leaders as well as data on teachers and leaders who are prepared to work in hard-to-staff subjects and schools should be collected and reported. States must be able to disaggregate data by both student and educator demographics in order to determine their progress toward these types of specific goals.

## Accountability

States should use data not only to monitor and drive continuous improvement in educator preparation programs but also for accountability. Data should be provided to state policymakers, the general public, accrediting bodies, and other education stakeholders to guide decisions related to the status of preparation programs and whether or not they are allowed to operate in a state. States are responsible for ensuring that programs have the capacity to offer a quality program to candidates and for monitoring the performance of preparation programs and their graduates. These data can be useful to states in making these evaluation decisions. States and preparation programs should be able to disaggregate data by licensure area so that strengths and weaknesses can be identified by licensure areas as opposed to identifying an entire program as effective or ineffective based on the results of one area. By providing programs with outcome data at the level of student standards and educator standards (*InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards*, *ISLLC School Leader Standards*, and/or adapted versions), states will enable programs to identify and remediate their weaknesses.

States should be able to monitor actual program quality by examining the effectiveness of preparation program completers and the extent to which a program is improving or not. Determining which data to collect that provides the necessary evidence for decisions that must be made and that are cost effective can be challenging. Survey results collected by preparation programs and states often have very low return rates and rarely provide helpful information about the quality of the candidates produced by a specific preparation program. States will also need to make a determination of whether the usefulness of retention data outweighs the time and cost of collecting it, especially with all the outside factors that can impact retention (e.g., marriage, parenting, graduate school) and it is currently almost impossible to track data across states.

States should also use data to identify best practices across programs. Once identified, states can disseminate information about these practices to all programs. States may also use this data to inform policy changes to encourage the adoption of these practices in all preparation programs.

States will further need data to determine if a program should be put on probation, closed, or be subject to other consequences. Other consequences might include, for example, withholding federal scholarship monies from low performing programs. Many states also use state resources to award scholarships or loan forgiveness for candidates who enter educator preparation and should consider whether those funds should be awarded to students who attend low-performing preparation programs. Other state and federal funds could be withheld if programs do not measure up to the quality necessary to achieve the ambitious PK-12 goals. A determination will need to be made regarding the degree to which programs are responsible for the effectiveness of educators depending on educators' years of service. Multiple factors begin to influence effectiveness over time. A sliding scale of accountability for preparation programs should be considered (e.g., the program's responsibility for the effectiveness of a first year teacher is greater than its responsibility for a fourth year teacher whose effectiveness is influenced to a greater extent by other factors).

## CONCLUSION

The clarion has been sounded. As chief state school officers, we are responsible for student achievement and growth. We have raised our expectations for students and have made a promise that we will provide them with the education they need to be college- and career-ready and productive in their communities. To fulfill this promise, we must have great teachers and leaders for *all* students.

Teaching matters. Teachers are key to making reforms happen in classrooms and learning environments where they have firsthand responsibility for student achievement and growth. Higher expectations for students have led to higher expectations for teaching and leading. A new vision of teaching that includes teams of teachers working and leading collaboratively must be implemented in all learning environments throughout the country.

Leadership matters. Effective principals are second only to effective teaching in importance to ensuring student achievement and growth. A school principal who can facilitate shared leadership among teams will have a greater impact on student achievement and growth than one who leads individually. School principals exert key influence on the quality of instruction provided to students in the classroom and other learning environments. They observe and monitor instruction and work with others to provide actionable feedback about how instruction can be improved. And school principals provide each teacher ongoing professional learning opportunities to improve his/her practice.

As leaders of state education systems, we owe teachers and principals the preparation and ongoing support they need to carry out their responsibilities for student achievement and growth. We also owe students, their parents, and the taxpayers who support the system to hold teachers and leaders accountable for getting the results that will demonstrate we are making progress.

Through this report, we are asking all chief state school officers and leaders of the education systems in their respective states to commit to taking the following actions to ensure we have an education workforce prepared to enter the profession ready to teach and ready to lead. We believe the entry point on the continuum of development for teachers and leaders is the foundation for the remainder of their career, and we must set a level of expectation that will ensure they are ready on day one. We feel strongly that, individually and collectively, chiefs should commit to the following state actions:

### **Licensure**

1. States will revise and enforce their licensure standards for teachers and principals to support the teaching of more demanding content aligned to college- and career-readiness and critical thinking skills to a diverse range of students.
2. States will work together to influence the development of innovative licensure performance assessments that are aligned to the revised licensure standards and include multiple measures of educators' ability to perform, including the potential to impact student achievement and growth.

3. States will create multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a coherent developmental continuum that reflects new performance expectations for educators and their implementation in the learning environment and to assessments that are linked to evidence of student achievement and growth.
4. States will reform current state licensure systems so they are more efficient, have true reciprocity across states, and so that their credentialing structures support effective teaching and leading toward student college- and career-readiness.

### **Program Approval**

5. States will hold preparation programs accountable by exercising the state's authority to determine which programs should operate and recommend candidates for licensure in the state, including establishing a clear and fair performance rating system to guide continuous improvement. States will act to close programs that continually receive the lowest rating and will provide incentives for programs whose ratings indicate exemplary performance.
6. States will adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards to assure that educator preparation programs recruit candidates based on supply and demand data, have highly selective admissions and exit criteria including mastery of content, provide high quality clinical practice throughout a candidate's preparation that includes experiences with the responsibilities of a school year from beginning to end, and that produce quality candidates capable of positively impacting student achievement.
7. States will require alignment of preparation content standards to PK-12 student standards for all licensure areas.
8. States will provide feedback, data, support, and resources to preparation programs to assist them with continuous improvement and to act on any program approval or national accreditation recommendations.

### **Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting**

9. States will develop and support state-level governance structures to guide confidential and secure data collection, analysis, and reporting of PK-20 data and how it informs educator preparation programs, hiring practices, and professional learning. Using stakeholder input, states will address and take appropriate action, individually and collectively, on the need for unique educator identifiers, links to non-traditional preparation providers, and the sharing of candidate data among organizations and across states.
10. States will use data collection, analysis, and reporting of multiple measures for continuous improvement and accountability of preparation programs.

## NEXT STEPS

Implementing these 10 recommended actions will take the leadership and political will of the chief state school officer and the involvement of many key stakeholders in each state including their partners from NASBE and NGA. Implementation will also require resources and support from many different levels of the system. Collectively, the commitment from a number of state chiefs to move forward with implementation of transformed policies in licensure; program approval; and data collection, analysis, and reporting will increase the knowledge and skills of the educator workforce. Hiring teachers who are learner-ready and principals who are school-ready along with these focused actions will help chiefs meet their responsibility and promise of helping students reach our heightened expectations of college- and career-readiness.

With commitment from chief state school officers, CCSSO will activate a number of supports and services to ensure success in this work. CCSSO's [State Consortium on Educator Effectiveness](#) (SCEE), a network of 29 states, will provide a backbone of support to chiefs and their teams ready and willing to take on the recommendations contained in this report. States will also receive a guided self-assessment tool that they and their stakeholders can use to examine current policies and determine the steps needed to implement the recommendations. Through a work group within SCEE, self-assessment results will be analyzed and turned into action plans customized for each state. States will learn from each other as they make progress in implementing the recommendations contained in this report.

Lessons learned from proposed activities such as the ones listed below will be shared across states:

- Examining results from implementing existing pre-service performance assessments including edTPA, Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT), California Teacher Performance Assessment, and others regarding their potential use in making licensure decisions;
- Reviewing the scope and depth of topics that are addressed in current licensing tests and determine if steps need to be taken to promote licensing test enhancements;
- Identifying necessary standard data elements, determining appropriate policies for use of data (especially with respect to privacy and security), and addressing the technology needed to implement a candidate record exchange that would allow all candidates and practicing teachers and principals access to their own education data passport;
- Periodic reviews of teacher and principal standards to ensure they are aligned with the state-adopted academic content and performance standards for PK-12 students (e.g., college- and career-readiness); and
- Examining the feasibility of creating a system and/or identifying an organization with the responsibility for assigning identifiers to preparation programs that are not housed at institutions of higher education.

The work CCSSO will pursue with states will influence and inform our advocacy agenda and hopefully influence the national dialogue about our expectations for entering teachers and principals. CCSSO will also work with other associations and organizations that have an interest in transforming educator preparation and entry into the profession to capitalize on the synergy of work being done.

## REFERENCES

- California Task Force on Educator Excellence. (2012). *Greatness by design: Supporting outstanding teaching to sustain a golden state*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education. Retrieved October 26, 2012, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/documents/greatnessfinal.pdf>.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Hyattsville, MD: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Center for Educational Leadership and Technology. (2012). *Teacher-student data link project*. Retrieved September 9, 2012, from <http://www.tsdl.org>.
- Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). (2007). *Accreditation framework: Educator preparation in California*. Adopted December 2007; updated with revised common standards December 2008. Retrieved November 1, 2012, from [http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation\\_framework.pdf](http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_framework.pdf).
- Compton, R. (Producer), & Faust, S. (Director). (2011). *The Finland phenomenon: Inside the world's most surprising school system* [Motion picture]. United States: 2minutes.com.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved November 1, 2012, from [http://www.ccsso.org/documents/2008/educational\\_leadership\\_policy\\_standards\\_2008.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/documents/2008/educational_leadership_policy_standards_2008.pdf).
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011). *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved November 1, 2012, from [http://www.ccsso.org/documents/2011/intasc\\_model\\_core\\_teaching\\_standards\\_2011.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/documents/2011/intasc_model_core_teaching_standards_2011.pdf).
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education (SCOPE). Retrieved October 26, 2012, from <http://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/creating-comprehensive-system-evaluating-and-supporting-effective-teaching.pdf>.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Recognizing and Developing Effective Teaching: What Policy Makers Should Know and Do*. NEA Policy Brief: Washington, DC. Retrieved October 26, 2012, from [http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/Effective Teaching - Linda Darling-Hammond.pdf](http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/Effective_Teaching_-_Linda_Darling-Hammond.pdf).
- Data Quality Campaign (DQC). (2012). *10 state actions to ensure effective data use*. Washington, DC: DQC. Retrieved October 26, 2012, from <http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/build/actions/>.
- Educational Testing Service. (2012). *The Praxis Series™ passing scores by test and state*. Retrieved October 6, 2012, from [http://www.ets.org/s/praxis/pdf/passing\\_scores.pdf](http://www.ets.org/s/praxis/pdf/passing_scores.pdf).
- Gallagher, C. (2012). *Presenting findings from measures of teacher effectiveness: Key reporting considerations for states and districts*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Goldring, E., Porter, A.C., Murphy, J., Stephen N. Elliott, S.N., & Cravens, X. (2009). Assessing learning-centered leadership: Connections to research, professional standards, and current practices. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8(1), 1-36.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Hill, D., Stumbo, C., Paliokas, K., Hansen, D., & McWalters, P. (2010). *State policy implications of the model core teaching standards* (InTASC draft discussion document). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved September 9, 2012, from [http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2010/State\\_Policy\\_Implications\\_Model\\_Core\\_Teaching\\_DRAFT\\_DISCUSSION\\_DOCUMENT\\_2010.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2010/State_Policy_Implications_Model_Core_Teaching_DRAFT_DISCUSSION_DOCUMENT_2010.pdf).

Holmes Group, Inc. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

National Association of State Directors for Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). (2012). *NASDTEC KnowledgeBase*. Retrieved October 6, 2012, from <http://www.nasdtec.info/>.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ). (2012). *What teacher preparation programs teach about K-12 assessment*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 26, 2012, from [http://www.nctq.org/p/edschools/docs/assessment\\_publication.pdf](http://www.nctq.org/p/edschools/docs/assessment_publication.pdf).

National Institute of Education (NIE). (2009). *TE21: A Teacher Education Model for the 21st century*. Nanyang Walk, Singapore: Author. Retrieved December 9, 2012, from [http://www.nie.edu.sg/files/spcs/TE21\\_Executive%20Summary\\_101109.pdf](http://www.nie.edu.sg/files/spcs/TE21_Executive%20Summary_101109.pdf).

National Institute of Education (NIE). (2012). *NIE's journey from concept to realisation: An implementation report*. Singapore: Author. Retrieved October 26, 2012, from [http://www.nie.edu.sg/files/booklet\\_web.pdf](http://www.nie.edu.sg/files/booklet_web.pdf).

Wahlstrom, K.L., Louis, K.S., Leithwood, K., & Anderson, S.E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student achievement and growth: Executive summary of research findings*. New York: University of Minnesota, The University of Toronto, and The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved October 26, 2012, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning-Executive-Summary.pdf>.

The Wallace Foundation. (2012). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning*. New York: Author. Retrieved October 26, 2012, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/effective-principal-leadership/Documents/The-School-Principal-as-Leader-Guiding-Schools-to-Better-Teaching-and-Learning.pdf>.

Wergin, J.F. (2012). Five essential tensions in accreditation. In M. Lacle-Peterson and D. Rigden (Eds.), *Inquiry, evidence, and excellence: The promise and practice of quality assurance* (pp. 27-38). Washington, DC: Teacher Education Accreditation Council.



## NOTES

**Note 1:** The program approval state actions, purposes, and key attributes presented in this working paper are derived from the introduction of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing's *Accreditation Framework: Educator Preparation in California*. This framework was adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in December 2007. For more information, please visit [http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation\\_framework.pdf](http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_framework.pdf).

**Note 2:** National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education's (NCATE's) 2010 report, *Transforming Teacher Education through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers*.

A clinically based approach to teacher education will give aspiring teachers the opportunity to integrate theory with practice, to develop and test classroom management and pedagogical skills, to hone their use of evidence in making professional decisions about practice, and to understand and integrate the standards of their professional community. Working with clinical faculty from the university and the PK-12 sector and with trained mentor teachers from their districts and other experts, the programs will help aspiring candidates respond to the challenge of teaching and leading with integrity in the face of increasingly high standards.

That portion of preparation that is practiced and demonstrated in real schools with real students helps ensure that candidates will be ready for the students with whom they will work and the schools in which they will teach. This is critically important in preparing teachers to be successful in hard-to-staff, low-performing schools and is useful in all teaching environments.

Transforming teacher education by placing clinical preparation at its center can help usher in additional changes in schools, for clinically based teacher preparation does not end with initial preparation. New teachers require intensive induction programs. This continuum of teacher development requires a parallel continuum of experienced, trained professionals (university- and school-based) who teach, supervise, and mentor candidates and novice teachers.

**Note 3:** License Teachers Based on Performance by Linda Darling-Hammond (in Hammond's NEA policy brief, *Recognizing and Developing Effective Teaching: What Policy Makes should Know and Do*, available at [http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/Effective\\_Teaching\\_-\\_Linda\\_Darling-Hammond.pdf](http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/Effective_Teaching_-_Linda_Darling-Hammond.pdf))

To leverage stronger preparation and teacher quality, states should make initial licensing decisions based on greater evidence of teacher competence than merely completing a set of courses or surviving a certain length of time in the classroom. Since the 1980s, the desire for greater confidence in licensing decisions has led to the introduction of teacher licensing tests in nearly all states. However, these tests—generally multiple-choice tests of basic skills and subject matter—are not strongly predictive of teachers' abilities to effectively teach children. Furthermore, in many cases these tests evaluate teacher knowledge *before* they enter or complete teacher education, and hence are an inadequate tool for teacher-education accountability.

Moving the field forward, several states have incorporated performance assessments in the licensing process. These measures of performance—which can provide data to inform the program approval process—have been found to be strong levers for improving preparation and mentoring, as well as determining teachers' competence. For example, the Performance



Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) requires teachers to document their plans for a unit of instruction linked to the state standards, adapt them for special education students and English language learners, videotape and critique lessons, and collect and evaluate evidence of student achievement and growth. School-based and university-based teacher educators, who are trained to produce reliable scores that are calibrated and audited, score it. The Connecticut Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) assessment used a similar portfolio for granting the professional license for beginning teachers (year 2 or 3 in the profession).

Like the National Board assessments, beginning teachers' ratings on the PACT and the BEST assessments have been found to predict their students' achievement gains on state tests. This form of *predictive validity* has not been established for traditional teacher tests, but is essential to making the claim that an assessment measures the right things on which to focus teachers' attention and learning.

Currently, more than 25 states have joined together in the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium to create a common version of an initial licensing assessment, based on the work done in these states, which could be used nationwide to make preparation and licensing performance based and grounded in teachers' abilities to support student achievement and growth. This assessment, currently being piloted, is based on teaching standards that are linked to the common core state standards (CCSS) and will ultimately be embedded in states' curriculum frameworks. The assessment ensures that teachers-in-training can plan, teach, and evaluate student achievement and growth effectively.

A more advanced version of the assessment could also be used at the point of the professional license (at the end of the probationary period), and to guide the mentoring process during the induction period. More than 40 states currently require some form of induction for beginning teachers, but these programs are rarely guided by a clear vision of what teachers should be able to do by the end of that period. Since the professional license is generally granted just before local districts make tenure decisions, this assessment could inform those decisions as well. States and districts that have adopted performance assessments to guide induction and decisions about licensing and tenure have supported much more purposeful and focused mentoring, with greater attention to a shared vision of good practice.

University and school faculty score these portfolios using standardized rubrics in moderated sessions following training, with an audit procedure to calibrate standards and ensure reliability. Faculties then use the PACT results to revise their curriculum. The scoring participants describe how this process creates a shared understanding of good teaching, focuses them on how to improve preparation, and creates a foundation for planning teacher induction and professional development.

Teacher education programs receive detailed, aggregated data on all of their candidates by program area and dimensions of teaching, and use the data to improve their curriculum, instruction, and program designs. Using these aggregated data for program approval will ultimately provide a solid basis for deciding which program models should be approved and expanded, and which should be closed if they cannot improve enough to enable most of their candidates to demonstrate that they can teach. With the addition of the incentives for National Board Certification, these assessments would provide a continuum of measures that both identify and help stimulate increasing effectiveness across the career.

## APPENDIX A

A special expression of thanks goes to all of the members of the Task Force on Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession who gave their time and expertise to lead the production of the recommendations and state actions described in this report.

### *Task Force Members*

#### **CCSSO**

Tom Luna, Chair, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Idaho

Terry Holliday, Vice-Chair, Commissioner of Education, Kentucky

Virginia Barry, Commissioner of Education, New Hampshire

Mitchell Chester, Commissioner of Education, Massachusetts

Judy Jeffrey, Former Director of Education, Iowa

Christopher Koch, Superintendent of Education, Illinois

Rick Melmer, Former Secretary of Education, South Dakota

Jim Rex, Former State Superintendent of Education, South Carolina

Melody Schopp, Secretary of Education, South Dakota

#### **NGA**

David Archer, Senior Policy Advisor to Governor John Hickenlooper, Colorado

Jeanne Burns, Board of Regents, Louisiana

#### **NASBE**

Brenda Gullett, NASBE Board of Directors, Arkansas Board of Education

Steven Pound, NASBE Board of Directors, Maine Board of Education

Patrick A. Guida, Esquire, NASBE Board of Directors, Rhode Island Board of Education

We are also most appreciative to the members of the Expert Advisory Group who gave their time and expertise to advise us on the work of the task force.

### **Expert Advisory Group Members**

Deborah Ball, Dean of Education, University of Michigan

Jim Cibulka, President, National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)  
and the Council of Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)

Ann Nutter Coffman, Senior Policy Analyst, National Education Association (NEA)

Hardin Daniel, Vice President, Discovery Education Assessment

Mary Diez, Dean of Education, Alverno College

Tabitha Grossman, Program Director, National Governors Association (NGA)

Diann Huber, President, iteachU.S.

Sandi Jacobs, Vice President, National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ)

Jim Kohlmoos, Executive Director, National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)

Jill Pitner, Innovation Director, Urban Teacher Residency United (UTRU)

Mary Vixie Sandy, Executive Director, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Michelle Young, Director, University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and  
Professor, Curry School of Education University of Virginia

## APPENDIX B

### Key Attributes of Program Approval of Educator Preparation Programs

#### **Key Attributes of Program Approval of Educator Preparation Programs**

The key attributes described below function within the four purposes of program approval. These attributes pertain to the development of program standards, the initial program approval process, and the subsequent reviews and program approval of educator preparation programs.

#### ***The Professional Character of Program Approval***

Professional educators, as well as states, should hold themselves and their peers accountable for the quality of education they give to their students. Professionals should be involved intensively in the entire program approval process. They should be involved in creating program approval standards, conducting program approval reviews, and making program approval recommendations. In each step of program approval, recommendations should emerge from adherence to the standards and consultative procedures that result in the consensus of the professional participants.

#### ***Breadth and Flexibility***

For institutions/program providers to be effective in states, they must be creative and responsive to the changing needs of the students and communities they serve as well as prospective educators. In a society as diverse as ours, states, universities, colleges, and other program providers vary substantially in their missions and philosophies. Program approval standards and practices should have a firm basis in principles of educational quality, effectiveness, and equity. The program approval system should accommodate breadth and flexibility in the processes used within and among institutions/program providers to support improvement as long as their candidates are prepared to be effective teachers and leaders.

Program approval standards should be written so different institutions/program providers can meet them in a variety of acceptable ways. There are effective and ineffective forms of educator preparation; program approval should differentiate between them. There are also multiple ways of effectively educating prospective educators acceptably; program approval should not favor any of these over the others. Standards should describe levels of quality and effectiveness without stipulating how institutions/program providers are to comply.

Explanations of the standards should clarify their meaning without making the standards overly restrictive. The training of program approval reviewers should, moreover, emphasize the importance of understanding diversity and creativity among the variety of institutions/program providers.

#### ***Intensity in Program Approval***

Program approval should focus with intensity on key aspects of educational quality and effectiveness. While allowing and encouraging divergence, the process should also be exacting in assembling key information about critical aspects of educational quality and effectiveness.

In order to recommend a program provider for program approval, experienced professional reviewers should be satisfied that the program provider provides a comprehensive array of

excellent learning opportunities and assurances that future educators have demonstrated that they have attained the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be effective professionals. Program approval decisions should be based on information that is sufficient in breadth and depth for the results to be credible and dependable. Program approval reviewers should understand the components of the program under review and the types of standards-based evidence that substantiate its overall quality and effectiveness. To find out if broad, quality-oriented standards are met, and to make reliable judgments and sound recommendations, reviewers need to assemble a considerable body of data that is collectively significant.

### ***Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness***

A program approval system should fulfill its purposes efficiently and cost-effectively. Review procedures, decision processes, and reporting relationships should be streamlined and economical. Participants' roles should be clearly defined, and communications should be efficient.

There are costs associated with establishing standards, training reviewers, assembling information, preparing reports, conducting meetings, and checking the accuracy of data and the fairness of decisions. Containing these costs is an essential attribute of program approval, but efficiency must not undermine the capacity of reviewers and decision makers to fulfill their responsibilities to the public and the profession. Program approval costs, which are borne by institutions/program providers and the program approver (state), should be reviewed periodically by the states in relation to the key purposes of program approval.





Council of Chief State School Officers  
One Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700 | Washington, DC 20001-1431 | voice: 202.336.7000 | fax: 202.408.8072