

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	SUPERINTENDENT’S UPDATE	Information Item
2	PENDING RULE – DOCKET NO. 08-0201-1301 – RULES GOVERNING ADMINISTRATION - NEGOTIATIONS	Motion to Approve
3	TEMPORARY AND PROPOSED RULE IDAPA – 08.02.02.020, .021 TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATIONS	Motion to Approve
4	TEACHER PREP – CCSO RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE COMPARISON TO WHAT THE STATE DEPARTMENT IS CURRENTLY DOING	Motion to Approve

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013

SUBJECT

Superintendent of Public Instruction Update to the State Board of Education

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Luna, will provide an update on the State Department of Education.

BOARD ACTION

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013

SUBJECT

Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0201-1301, Rules Governing Administration, Negotiations

REFERENCE

December 13, 2012 Board approved temporary and proposed rule changes to IDAPA 08.02.01.051, Negotiations.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-1272, 33-1273A, and 67-2343 through 67-2347, Idaho Code
Idaho Administrative Code, IDAPA 08.02.01.151, Negotiations

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In 2011, the State Board of Education approved and the Idaho Legislature subsequently passed, a rule (Docket 08-0201-1101) clarifying aspects of collective bargaining and negotiations found in the Students Come First laws. On November 6, 2012, Idaho voters repealed the Students Come First laws.

This rule change would return this section of Idaho Administrative Code to the language that appeared prior to Docket 08-0201-1101's passage and prior to the Students Come First laws.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – IDAPA 08.02.01.151, Rules Governing Administration Page 3

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the pending rule Docket No. 08-0201-1301, Rules Governing Administration, Negotiations, as submitted.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

**IDAPA 08
TITLE 02
CHAPTER 01**

08.02.01 - RULES GOVERNING ADMINISTRATION

151. ~~NEGOTIATIONS.~~

01. ~~Open Meeting.~~ For the purposes of Section 33-1273A, Idaho Code, all open meeting negotiations shall adhere to Sections 67-2340 through 67-2344 and 67-2346 through 67-2347, Idaho Code, including posting notices and agendas. In addition, notices and agendas shall be posted on the main page of the school district's website. ~~(3-29-12)~~

02. ~~Collective Bargaining Limited to Compensation and Benefits.~~ Items that may be included in master contracts or negotiated agreements shall be limited to the specific items defined under the terms "Compensation" and "Benefits" under Section 33-1272, Idaho Code. For the purposes of the definition of "Compensation" as stated in Section 33-1272, Idaho Code, the term "salary" means: ~~(3-29-12)~~

a. ~~Any monies provided through public funding that are paid to an employee pursuant to an employment contract, the form of which is approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction pursuant to Section 33-513, Idaho Code; and~~ ~~(3-29-12)~~

b. ~~The process by which the school district board of trustees will determine local student achievement share awards pursuant to Section 33-1004I, Idaho Code.~~ ~~(3-29-12)~~

c. ~~The inclusion of any other items in a master contract or negotiated agreement is hereby prohibited. Any items included in violation of this provision are hereby declared null, void and of no force or effect.~~ ~~(3-29-12)~~

1521. -- 199. (RESERVED)

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013

SUBJECT

Temporary and Proposed Rule - Educator Evaluations

REFERENCE

February 16, 2012	State Board Approval of ESEA Waiver
August 16, 2012	State Board Initial Approval of Rule Revisions and Additions.
October 18, 2012	State Board Approval of Final Draft of ESEA Waiver
November 19, 2012	Rule was vacated due to the Students Come First Laws being overturned

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho Administrative code, IDAPA 08.02.02 .020, .121

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

On February 21, 2012 the State Department of Education (SDE) submitted an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver to gain relief from the mandates of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). There were two application periods for waivers: November 2011 and February 2012. Idaho chose to apply in the second round so that the SDE was able to offer additional time for feedback and evaluation.

Principle 3 of the ESEA waiver clearly outlined required elements of teacher and principal evaluation models. As a result, Idaho needed to make adjustments to our teacher evaluation model and adopt a principal evaluation model for the state. The excerpt below is from the cover page that accompanied the waiver which was presented and approved at the State Board Meeting on February 16, 2012 and again on October 18, 2012:

Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership:

Idaho developed a statewide framework for teacher evaluation. Schools also receive financial rewards for effective instruction as measured by student achievement. The State Department is currently creating a statewide framework for principal evaluation which should be completed by May 2012. The state will use their frameworks to then make necessary changes with teacher and administrator preparation programs.

As a result of the work of both the Administrator Evaluation Focus Group and the Evaluation Capacity Task Force, both of which are referenced throughout the ESEA Waiver, that State Department of Education brought forth recommended rule changes for increased rigor and utility of teacher evaluations as well as a new section specific to administrator evaluation at the August 16, 2012 State Board meeting.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013

The State Board of Education approved these revisions during that meeting. On November 6, 2012, Idaho voters repealed the Students Come First laws that formed the foundation of Idaho's teacher and principal evaluation systems. Because of this, Idaho was no longer in compliance with the ESEA Waiver requirements which required student achievement and multiple measures to be a part of both teacher and principal evaluations. As a result, Idaho needed to work with stakeholders to extensively redraft the rules to bring Idaho's teacher and principal evaluation standards back in to compliance with the ESEA Waiver requirements. Because of this, the Idaho State Department of Education vacated the rule making process to allow an Educator Evaluation Task Force to be convened to analyze the gaps between Idaho's current evaluation systems and what was needed to bring Idaho's evaluation system back in to compliance with the ESEA Waiver requirements.

In December 2012, the Idaho State Department of Education submitted the following timeline and plan to the US Department of Education outlining how we would ensure that Idaho was in compliance with the ESEA Waiver requirements.

January – March:

- Convene Educator Evaluation Task Force with the specific goal of making recommendations on the following items to the State Board of Education:
 - The percentage of the evaluation that will be based on Student Achievement?
 - What multiple measures will be used in the evaluation, i.e. Parental Input, Student Input, Work Place Survey, etc.?
 - The inclusion of an Individualized Professional Learning Plan that will be created for each teacher based upon evaluation findings, and shall be used in subsequent years as the baseline measurement for professional development and growth?
 - How many observations are required annually and who must perform the observations?
 - Will administrators be required to complete a proficiency assessment prior to performing any evaluation or as part of their ongoing professional development for recertification?
 - Will we require a proficiency assessment for initial administrator licensure?

April – May:

- Take evaluation rule revisions for IDAPA 08.02.02.120 (Teacher Evaluation) and the addition of IDAPA 08.02.02.121 (Principal Evaluation) to the State Board of Education as Temporary and Proposed Rule.
- Receive State Board of Education approval of revisions to rule.
- Put rule revisions out for public comment.
- Receive final approval from the State Board of Education on Temporary and Proposed Rule.

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

2013 – 2014 School Year:

- Districts pilot revised evaluation models.

2014 – 2015 School Year:

- Full implementation of revised evaluation models in accordance with ESEA Waiver requirements.

The attached documents include the revisions to IDAPA 08.02.02.120 and the addition of IDAPA 08.02.02.121 which are based off of the recommendations and work of the Educator Evaluation Task Force. This rule is being brought forth as temporary and proposed to ensure that Idaho is able to meet the demands of the timeline outlined above.

IMPACT

If the State Board of Education does not approve the changes, Idaho will be out of compliance with the requirements of the US Department of Education's ESEA Waiver application. If the waiver is repealed as a result, Idaho schools will continue to be held accountable under the NCLB mandates rather than the new system of accountability approved by the State Board on February 16, 2012.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Revisions to IDAPA 08.02.02.120

Page 5

Attachment 2 – Addition of IDAPA 08.02.02.121

Page 9

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by the State Department of Education to revise IDAPA 08.02.02.120 and to add IDAPA 08.02.02.121.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

**IDAPA 08
TITLE 02
CHAPTER 02**

08.02.02 - RULES GOVERNING UNIFORMITY

120. LOCAL DISTRICT EVALUATION POLICY – TEACHER AND PUPIL PERSONNEL CERTIFICATE HOLDERS.

Each school district board of trustees will develop and adopt policies for teacher performance evaluation using multiple measures in which criteria and procedures for the evaluation of certificated personnel are research based and aligned to the Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching Second Edition domains and components of instruction. The process of developing criteria and procedures for certificated personnel evaluation will allow opportunities for input from those affected by the evaluation; i.e., trustees, administrators and teachers. The evaluation policy will be a matter of public record and communicated to the certificated personnel for whom it is written. (3-29-10)()

01. Standards. Each district evaluation model shall be aligned to state minimum standards that are based on the Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching Second Edition domains and components of instruction. Those domains and components include: (3-29-10)

- a.** Domain 1 - Planning and Preparation: (3-29-10)
 - i. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy; (3-29-10)
 - ii. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students; (3-29-10)
 - iii. Setting Instructional ~~Goals~~Outcomes; (3-29-12)()
 - iv. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources; (3-29-10)
 - v. Designing Coherent Instruction; and (3-29-10)
 - vi. Designing Student Assessments. (3-29-12)
- b.** Domain 2 - The Classroom Environment: (3-29-12)
 - i. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport; (3-29-10)
 - ii. Establishing a Culture for Learning; (3-29-10)
 - iii. Managing Classroom Procedures; (3-29-10)
 - iv. Managing Student Behavior; and (3-29-10)
 - v. Organizing Physical Space. (3-29-10)
- c.** Domain 3 - Instruction and Use of Assessment: (3-29-10)
 - i. Communicating with Students; (3-29-12)
 - ii. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques; (3-29-10)
 - iii. Engaging Students in Learning; (3-29-10)

- iv. Using Assessment in Instruction; and (3-29-12)
- v. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness. (3-29-12)
- d. Domain 4 - Professional Responsibilities: (3-29-10)
- i. Reflecting on Teaching; (3-29-10)
- ii. Maintaining Accurate Records; (3-29-10)
- iii. Communicating with Families; (3-29-10)
- iv. Participating in a Professional Community; (3-29-12)
- v. Growing and Developing Professionally; and (3-29-10)
- vi. Showing Professionalism. (3-29-10)

02. ~~Parent Input.~~ ~~Input from the parents and guardians of students shall be considered as a factor in the evaluation of any school based certificated employees. For such certificated employees on a Category A, B or grandfathered renewable contract, this input shall be part of the first portion of the evaluation (as stipulated in 33-514(4), Idaho Code,) that must be completed before February 1 of each year (Section 33-513 and 33-514, Idaho Code).~~ **Professional Practice.** For evaluations conducted on or after July 1, 2013, all certificated instructional employees must receive an evaluation in which at least sixty-seven percent (67%) of the evaluation results are based on Professional Practice. All measures included within the Professional Practice portion of the evaluation must be aligned to the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching Second Edition. The measures included within the Professional Practice portion of the evaluation shall include a minimum of two documented observations annually, with at least one (1) observation being completed by January 1 of each year. District evaluation models shall also include at least one (1) of the following as a measure to inform the Professional Practice portion of all certificated instructional employee evaluations: Parent/guardian input, student input and/or portfolios. (3-29-12)()

03. Student Achievement. ~~For evaluations conducted on or after July 1, 2012~~2013, all certificated instructional employees, principals and superintendents must receive an evaluation in which at least ~~fifty percent (50%)~~thirty-three percent (33%) of the evaluation results are based on multiple objective measures of growth in student achievement as determined by the board of trustees and based upon research. Growth in student achievement as measured by the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) must be included. This portion of the evaluation may be calculated using current and/or past year's data and may use one (1) or multiple years of data~~student achievement portion of the evaluation shall be completed by the end of the school year in which the evaluation takes place (Section 33-513 and 33-514, Idaho Code).~~ Growth in student achievement may be considered as an optional measure for all other school based and district based staff, as determined by the local board of trustees. (3-29-12)()

04. Participants. Each district evaluation policy will include provisions for evaluating all certificated employees identified in Section 33-1001, Idaho Code, Subsection 16, ~~and each school nurse and librarian.~~ Evaluations shall be differentiated for certificated non-instructional employees and pupil personnel certificate holders in a way that aligns with the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching Second Edition to the extent possible. Policies for evaluating certificated employees should identify the differences, if any, in the conduct of evaluations for nonrenewable contract personnel and renewable contract personnel. (3-29-12)()

05. Evaluation Policy - Content. Local school district policies will include, at a minimum, the following information: (4-1-97)

- a. Purpose -- statements that identify the purpose or purposes for which the evaluation is being conducted; e.g., individual instructional improvement, personnel decisions. (4-1-97)

b. Evaluation criteria -- statements of the general criteria upon which certificated personnel will be evaluated. (4-1-97)

c. Evaluator -- identification of the individuals responsible for appraising or evaluating certificated instructional staff and pupil personnel performance. The individuals assigned this responsibility ~~should~~shall have received training in evaluation and prior to September 1, 2018, shall demonstrate proof of proficiency in conducting observations and evaluating effective teacher performance by passing a proficiency assessment approved by the State Department of Education as a onetime recertification requirement. (4-1-97)()

d. Sources of data -- description of the sources of data used in conducting certificated personnel evaluations. For ~~certificated instructional staff/~~classroom teaching personnel, a minimum of two (2) documented classroom observations should~~shall~~ be included as one (1) source of data. At least one of those observations must be completed prior to January 1 of each year. Parent/guardian input, student input and/or portfolios shall be considered. (4-1-97)()

e. Procedure -- description of the procedure used in the conduct of certificated personnel evaluations. (4-1-97)

f. Communication of results -- the method by which certificated personnel are informed of the results of evaluation. (4-1-97)

g. Personnel actions -- the action, if any, available to the school district as a result of the evaluation and the procedures for implementing these actions; e.g., job status change. Note: in the event the action taken as a result of evaluation is to not renew an individual's contract or to renew an individual's contract at a reduced rate, school districts should take proper steps to follow the procedures outlined in Sections 33-513 through 33-515, Idaho Code in order to assure the due process rights of all personnel. (4-1-97)

h. Appeal -- the procedure available to the individual for appeal or rebuttal when disagreement exists regarding the results of certificated personnel evaluations. (4-1-97)

i. Remediation -- the procedure available to provide remediation in those instances where remediation is determined to be an appropriate course of action. (4-1-97)

j. Monitoring and evaluation. -- ~~A~~a description of the method used to monitor and evaluate the district's personnel evaluation system. (4-1-97)

k. Professional development and training -- a plan for ongoing training for evaluators/administrators and teachers on the districts evaluation standards, tool and process. (3-29-10)

l. Funding -- a plan for funding ongoing training and professional development for administrators in evaluation. (3-29-10)

m. Collecting and using data -- a plan for collecting and using data gathered from the evaluation tool that will be used to inform professional development. Aggregate data shall be considered as part of the district and individual schools Needs Assessment in determining professional development offerings. (3-29-10)()

n. Individualizing teacher evaluation rating system -- a~~A~~ plan for how evaluations will be used to identify proficiency and record growth over time. No later than July 1, 2013, districts shall have established an individualized teacher evaluation rating system with a minimum of three rankings used to differentiate performance of teachers and pupil personnel certificate holders including unsatisfactory being equal to "1", basic being equal to "2" and proficient being equal to "3"~~define a process that identifies and assists teachers in need of improvement.~~ (3-29-10)()

o. A plan for including ~~all~~ stakeholders including, but not limited to, teachers, board members, and administrators in the development and ongoing review of their teacher evaluation plan. (3-29-10)

06. Evaluation Policy - Frequency of Evaluation. The evaluation policy shall include a provision for evaluating all teacher and pupil personnel certificated ~~personnel~~employees on a fair and consistent basis. All contract personnel shall be evaluated at least once annually. (3-29-12)()

07. Evaluation Policy - Personnel Records. Permanent records of each certificated personnel evaluation will be maintained in the employee's personnel file. All evaluation records will be kept confidential within the parameters identified in federal and state regulations regarding the right to privacy (Section 33-518, Idaho Code). Local school districts shall report the rankings of individual certificated personnel evaluations to the State Department of Education annually for State and Federal reporting purposes. The State Department of Education shall ensure that the privacy of all certificated personnel is protected by not releasing statistical data of evaluation rankings in local school districts with fewer than five (5) teachers and by only reporting that information in the aggregate by local school district. (4-1-97)()

08. Evaluation System Approval. Each school district board of trustees will develop and adopt policies for teacher and pupil personnel certificated performance evaluation in which criteria and procedures for the evaluation are research based and aligned with the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching Second Edition. By July 1, 2014 an evaluation plan which incorporates all of the above elements shall be submitted to the State Department of Education for approval. Once approved, subsequent changes made in the evaluation system shall be resubmitted for approval. ()

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

**IDAPA 08
TITLE 02
CHAPTER 02**

08.02.02 - RULES GOVERNING UNIFORMITY

121. LOCAL DISTRICT EVALUATION POLICY - SCHOOL PRINCIPAL.

Each school district board of trustees will develop and adopt policies for principal performance evaluation using multiple measures in which criteria and procedures for the evaluation of administratively certificated personnel serving as school principal are research based. The process of developing criteria and procedures for principal evaluation will allow opportunities for input from those affected by the evaluation; i.e., trustees, administrators and teachers. The evaluation policy will be a matter of public record and communicated to the principal for whom it is written. ()

01. Standards. Each district principal evaluation model shall be aligned to state minimum standards based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and include proof of proficiency in conducting teacher evaluations using the state's adopted model, the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching Second Edition. Proof of proficiency in evaluating teacher performance shall be required of all individuals assigned the responsibility for appraising, observing or evaluating certificated personnel performance. Proof of proficiency in evaluating performance shall be demonstrated by passing a proficiency assessment approved by the State Department of Education as a onetime recertification requirement prior to September 1, 2018. Principal evaluation standards shall additionally address the following domains and components: ()

a. Domain 1: School Climate - An educational leader promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional development. An educational leader articulates and promotes high expectations for teaching and learning while responding to diverse community interest and needs. ()

i. School Culture - Principal establishes a safe, collaborative, and supportive culture ensuring all students are successfully prepared to meet the requirements for tomorrow's careers and life endeavors ()

ii. Communication - Principal is proactive in communicating the vision and goals of the school or district, the plans for the future, and the successes and challenges to all stakeholders. ()

iii. Advocacy - Principal advocates for education, the district and school, teachers, parents, and students that engenders school support and involvement. ()

b. Domain 2: Collaborative Leadership - An educational leader promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations and resources for a safe, efficient and effective learning environment. In collaboration with others, uses appropriate data to establish rigorous, concrete goals in the context of student achievement and instructional programs. He/She uses research and/or best practices in improving the education program. ()

i. Shared Leadership - Principal fosters shared leadership that takes advantage of individual expertise, strengths, and talents, and cultivates professional growth. ()

ii. Priority Management - Principal organizes time and delegates responsibilities to balance administrative/managerial, educational, and community leadership priorities. ()

iii. Transparency - Principal seeks input from stakeholders and takes all perspectives into consideration when making decisions. ()

iv. Leadership Renewal - Principal strives to continuously improve leadership skills through, professional development, self-reflection, and utilization of input from others. ()

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013

v. Accountability - Principal establishes high standards for professional, legal, ethical, and fiscal accountability for self and others. ()

c. Domain 3: Instructional Leadership - An educational leader promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community. He/She provides leadership for major initiatives and change efforts and uses research and/or best practices in improving the education program. ()

i. Innovation - Principal seeks and implements innovative and effective solutions that comply with general and special education law. ()

ii. Instructional Vision - Principal insures that instruction is guided by a shared, research-based instructional vision that articulates what students do to effectively learn. ()

iii. High Expectations - Principal sets high expectation for all students academically, behaviorally, and in all aspects of student well-being. ()

iv. Continuous Improvement of Instruction - Principal has proof of proficiency in assessing teacher performance based upon the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching Second Edition. Aligns resources, policies, and procedures toward continuous improvement of instructional practice guided by the instructional vision. ()

v. Evaluation- Principal uses teacher/principal evaluation and other formative feedback mechanisms to continuously improve teacher/principal effectiveness. ()

vi. Recruitment and Retention -Principal recruits and maintains a high quality staff. ()

02. Professional Practice. For evaluations conducted on or after July 1, 2013, all principals must receive an evaluation in which sixty-seven percent (67%) of the evaluation results are based on Professional Practice. All measures included within the Professional Practice portion of the evaluation must be aligned to the Domains and Components listed in Subsection 121.01.a through 121.01.c. District evaluation models shall also include at least one (1) of the following as a measure to inform the Professional Practice portion of all principal evaluations: Parent/guardian input, student input and/or portfolios. ()

03. Student Achievement. For evaluations conducted on or after July 1, 2013, all certificated instructional employees, principals and superintendents must receive an evaluation in which at least thirty-three percent (33%) of the evaluation results are based on multiple objective measures of growth in student achievement as determined by the board of trustees and based upon research. Growth in student achievement as measured by the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) must be included. This portion of the evaluation may be calculated using current and/or past year's data and may use one (1) or multiple years of data. Growth in student achievement may be considered as an optional measure for all other school based and district based staff, as determined by the local board of trustees. ()

04. Evaluation Policy - Content. Local school district policies will include, at a minimum, the following information: ()

a. Purpose -- statements that identify the purpose or purposes for which the evaluation is being conducted; e.g., individual instructional leadership, personnel decisions. ()

b. Evaluation criteria -- statements of the general criteria upon which principals be evaluated. ()

c. Evaluator -- identification of the individuals responsible for appraising or evaluating principal performance. The individuals assigned this responsibility shall have received training in evaluation. ()

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

d. Sources of data -- description of the sources of data used in conducting principal evaluations. Proficiency in conducting observations and evaluating effective teacher performance shall be included as one (1) source of data. ()

e. Procedure -- description of the procedure used in the conduct of principal evaluations. ()

f. Communication of results -- the method by which principals are informed of the results of evaluation. ()

g. Personnel actions -- the action, if any, available to the school district as a result of the evaluation and the procedures for implementing these actions; e.g., job status change. ()

h. Appeal -- the procedure available to the individual for appeal or rebuttal when disagreement exists regarding the results of an evaluations. ()

i. Remediation -- the procedure available to provide remediation in those instances where remediation is determined to be an appropriate course of action. ()

j. Monitoring and evaluation. -- A description of the method used to monitor and evaluate the district's principal evaluation system. ()

k. Professional development and training -- a plan for ongoing training and professional learning based upon the district's evaluation standards and process. ()

l. Funding -- a plan for funding ongoing training and professional development for evaluators of principals. ()

m. Collecting and using data -- a plan for collecting and using data gathered from the evaluation tool that will be used to inform professional development for principals. ()

n. Individualizing principal evaluation rating system -- a plan for how evaluations will be used to identify proficiency and record growth over time. No later than July 01, 2013, districts shall have established an individualized principal evaluation rating system with a minimum of three rankings used to differentiate performance of principals including unsatisfactory being equal to "1", basic being equal to "2" and proficient being equal to "3". ()

o. A plan for including stakeholders including, but not limited to, teachers, board members, and administrators in the development and ongoing review of their principal evaluation plan. ()

05. Evaluation Policy - Frequency of Evaluation. The evaluation policy should include a provision for evaluating all principals on a fair and consistent basis. ()

06. Evaluation Policy - Personnel Records. Permanent records of each principal evaluation will be maintained in the employee's personnel file. All evaluation records will be kept confidential within the parameters identified in federal and state regulations regarding the right to privacy (Section 33-518, Idaho Code). Local school districts shall report the rankings of individual certificated personnel evaluations to the State Department of Education annually for State and Federal reporting purposes. The State Department of Education shall ensure that the privacy of all certificated personnel is protected by not releasing statistical data of evaluation rankings in local school districts with fewer than five (5) teachers and by only reporting that information in the aggregate by local school district. ()

07. Evaluation System Approval. Each school district board of trustees will develop and adopt policies for principal performance evaluation in which criteria and procedures for the evaluation are research based and aligned with state standards. By July 1, 2014 an evaluation plan which incorporates all of the above elements shall be submitted to the State Department of Education for approval. Once approved, subsequent changes made in the evaluation system shall be resubmitted for approval. ()

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013

SUBJECT

Council of Chief State School Officers – Recommendations and Multi-State Consortium

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-1254, 33-1258, and 33-114, Idaho Code
IDAPA 08.02.02.100

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

With the adoption of more rigorous Common Core standards, it is the responsibility of chief state school officers to keep the promise to our students of a better education. To accomplish this, states 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. The Council of Chief State School Officers' report, *Our Responsibility, Our Promise*, was written by the Task Force on Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession. Superintendent Luna was a member of the task force along with other current and former chiefs who are members of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) with input from the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) and the National Governors Association (NGA).

The recommendations contained in the CCSSO 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. The recommendations are also similar to recently released standards by the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation. The attached document shows the intersection of the two group's recommendations as well as the specific areas in which Idaho would like to move forward.

Idaho has already begun addressing many of the recommendations included in the report, and is proposing additional policy for consideration. As part of a multi-state consortium with the support of CCSSO, it is likely that Idaho will be able to meet and exceed many of the recommendations contained in this report. Any change that requires alterations in Administrative Code will be brought forward to the State Board of Education for final approval. The State Department of Education will also continue to provide the State Board of Education with regular updates. By committing to the consortium, Idaho commits to a process to further advance higher standards in teacher preparation.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013

IMPACT

With the adoption of these more rigorous standards, Idaho will be making a commitment to raise the bar and transform how we prepare teachers and principals so that they can provide instruction and organize learning environments to help students reach the higher expectations that come with the adoption and implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – CCSSO Report: *Our Responsibility, Our Promise: Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession* Page 3

Attachment 2 - DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CAEP BOARD Page 49

Attachment 3 – SBOE- CCSSO RECOMMENDATIONS AND POLICY PROPOSAL FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS Page 87

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the time of agenda production, staff at our public Colleges of Education had not had an opportunity to fully review or provide feedback on strategies proposed by the Department in Attachment 3. Any plan moving forward should be developed in collaboration with the Department staff at the institutions, Board staff, and the Professional Standards Commission.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by the State Department of Education to join the CCSSO's consortium on Educator Effectiveness.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

Our Responsibility, Our Promise

Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

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

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

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013

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 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.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013

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 21st 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 21st 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 25th percentile of takers nationwide from the 75th 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 21st 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 21st 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 21st 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 21st Century (TE21)*, which includes a framework that articulates

the 21st 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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

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.

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.

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.

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.

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. Lacelle-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.

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)

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

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

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.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CAEP Commission
on Standards
and Performance
Reporting

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CAEP BOARD

As part of its commitment to transparency and public accountability, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the nation's newest specialized accrediting body, is seeking public comment on the recommendations developed by the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting. Following a public comment period, the Commission will consider the feedback received in developing its final recommendations to the CAEP Board of Directors. These draft recommendations also may be viewed online at <http://caepnet.org/commission/standards/>, and public comments may be submitted at <http://standards.caepnet.org> February 22–March 29, 2013.



Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting

Camilla Benbow, co-chair
Patricia and Rodes Hart
Dean of Education and Human Development
Vanderbilt University, Peabody College

Terry Holliday, co-chair*
Commissioner of Education
Kentucky Department of Education

Andrés Alonso, Chief Executive
Officer, Baltimore City Public
Schools

JoAnn Bartoletti, Executive
Director, National Association
of Secondary School Principals

Erik Bitterbaum, President,
State University of New York
College at Cortland

Mary Brabeck, Dean,
Steinhardt School of Culture,
Education and Human
Development, New York
University

Peggy Brookins, NBCT,
Mathematics Instructor, Forest
High School, Florida

Gail Connelly, Executive
Director, National Association
of Elementary School Principals

Richard DeLisi, Dean, The
Graduate School of Education,
Rutgers University

Melissa Erickson, PTA Leader,
Hillsborough Public Schools,
Florida

Francis (Skip) Fennell, Professor of
Education, McDaniel College

Deborah L. Ford, Chancellor,
University of Wisconsin-
Parkside

Susan Fuhrman, President,
Teachers College, Columbia
University

Kurt F. Geisinger, Professor of
Educational Psychology, University
of Nebraska

Rick Ginsberg, Dean, School of
Education, University of Kansas

Marquita Grenot-Scheyer,
Dean, College of Education,
California State University,
Long Beach

William Isler, School Board
Representative, Pittsburgh
Public Schools

Christopher Koch, State
Superintendent, Illinois State
Board of Education

Jim Kohlmoos, Executive
Director, National Association
of State Boards of Education

Jillian Lederhouse, Professor of
Education, Wheaton College

Arthur Levine, President,
Woodrow Wilson National
Fellowship Foundation

Annie Lewis O'Donnell, Vice
President, Program Design and
Teacher Preparation, Teach for
America

Paul Lingenfelter, President,
State Higher Education
Executive Officers

Patricia Manzanera-Gonzales,
Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs, Western
State Colorado University

Tina Marshall-Bradley,
Associate Vice President,
Academic Affairs, Paine College

Susan B. Neuman, Professor
of Education, University of
Michigan

Tom Payzant, Professor of
Practice, Harvard Graduate
School of Education

Rebecca Pringle, Secretary/
Treasurer, National Education
Association

Sidney Ribeau, President,
Howard University

Benjamin Riley, Director of
Policy and Advocacy, New
Schools Venture Fund

David Ritchey, Executive
Director, Association of Teacher
Educators

Haydee Rodriguez, NBCT,
History and Theatre Teacher,
Central Union High School
District, California

Terry Ryan, Vice President
for Ohio Programs & Policy,
Thomas B. Fordham Institute

Philip Schmidt, Associate
Provost, Teachers College,
Western Governors University

David Steiner, Dean, School of
Education, Hunter College

Jennifer Stern, Executive
Director, Talent Management,
Janus Education Alliance and
Denver Public Schools

Julie Underwood, Dean, School
of Education, University of
Wisconsin-Madison

Randi Weingarten, President,
American Federation of
Teachers

Bob Wise, President, Alliance
for Excellent Education

Donna Wiseman, Dean, College
of Education, University of
Maryland

*Dr. Holliday became co-chair in
December 2012.

Gene Harris, Superintendent and
CEO for Columbus City Schools,
Ohio, was co-chair from May
2012 until she resigned from the
Commission in December 2012.

Designees at the December meeting

Jarrold Bolte for Andres Alonso
Andy Coons for Haydee Rodriguez
Shannon Hagerman for Jennifer Stern
Mariana Haynes for Bob Wise
Christine Mason for Gail Connelly
Dyan Smiley for Randi Weingarten
Linda Tomlinson for Christopher Koch

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
Message from the President.....	9
Message from the Co-chairs.....	10
Accreditation Standards and Recommendations.....	13
Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	16
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	19
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity	22
Standard 4: Program Impact.....	26
Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity	28
Additional Recommendations of the CAEP Commission	31
Endnotes.....	35

Executive Summary

The Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP) is poised to raise the bar. As the new accrediting body for educator preparation, CAEP will serve as a model accreditor with rigorous standards, demanding sound evidence and establishing a platform to drive continuous improvement and innovation. As its first initiative to achieve those goals, the CAEP Board of Directors created the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting and charged it to develop accreditation standards for preparation programs. The Commission is comprised of representatives from diverse professional positions who often reflect a range of divergent perspectives that challenge the status quo and push for urgent changes in educator preparation.

The Commission's Draft Report For Public Comment

The Commission has developed a draft of its recommendations for the CAEP Board of Directors and is circulating this report for public feedback. The Commission has given emphasis to a firm grounding of its standards and evidence on empirical research or, where there is little guiding research, has based its recommendations on best practices and professional consensus. The Commission calls for accountability of providers and CAEP, itself; public reporting must be forthright and transparent. And, the Commission recommends new standards and decision procedures that balance strong evidence with professional judgment.

CAEP's leaders have set challenging goals to enhance the value of accreditation. Commission members have responded to their charge by identifying four especially critical points of leverage to transform educator preparation in our nation:

- Build partnerships and strong clinical experiences—Educator preparation providers and collaborating schools and school districts bring complementary experiences that, joined together, promise far stronger preparation programs. (See standard 2.)
- Raise and assure candidate quality—From recruitment and admission, through preparation, and at exit, educator preparation providers must take responsibility to build an educator workforce that is more able, and also more representative of America's diverse population. (See standard 3, including minimum admissions criteria and a group average performance on nationally normed admissions assessments in the top third of national pools.)
- Include all providers—Accreditation must encourage innovations in preparation by welcoming all of the varied providers that seek accreditation and meet challenging levels of performance.
- And surmounting all others, insist that preparation be judged by outcomes and impact on P-12 student learning—Results matter; "effort" is not enough. (See standard 4, especially.)

These points of leverage are not accreditation "business as usual," nor do they represent marginal changes from current and former education accreditation practice. Exercising them can add value to what states are trying to accomplish with their reforms in preparation policy.

The Draft Standards And Recommendations

The Commission's work is organized in part around three areas of teacher preparation identified by the National Academy of Sciences 2010 report, *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy*. The Academy panel sifted through hundreds of research studies from recent decades and, not surprisingly, concluded that more research is needed in order to have sound evidence about the effects of particular aspects of preparation. But it found that existing research provides some guidance: content knowledge, field experience, and the quality of teacher candidates "are likely to have the strongest effects" on outcomes for students.¹

The Commission has drafted the following three standards:

Standard 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college and career-readiness standards.

Standard 2: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning.

Standard 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT AND SELECTIVITY

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and field and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification.

The Commission also explored important functions of an accrediting body that are fashioned around attributes of high-performing education organizations. These are supported by research on effective management, and, especially, the Baldrige education award criteria for performance excellence, and also by recent trends and new approaches among accreditors. Key concepts advanced in these resources are a relentless focus on results, and a systematic and purposeful use of evidence for continuous improvement. The fourth and fifth standards and two additional recommendations for the CAEP Board of Directors are built upon these sources.

Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning, classroom instruction and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Standard 5: PROVIDER QUALITY, CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT, AND CAPACITY

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained, evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning.

Recommendations on ANNUAL REPORTING AND CAEP MONITORING

The Commission recommends that CAEP gather the following data and monitor them annually from all providers:

On program impact:

1. Impact on P-12 learning
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness
3. Employer surveys, candidate retention and employment milestones
4. Results of completer surveys

On program outcomes:

5. Graduation rates
6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements
7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared
8. Student loan default rates

The Commission recommends that CAEP identify significant amounts of change in any of these indicators that would prompt investigation to initiate (1) adverse action that could include revocation of accreditation status or (2) recognition of eligibility for a higher level of accreditation. In addition, the Commission recommends that CAEP include these data as a recurring feature in the CAEP annual report.

Recommendations on LEVELS OF ACCREDITATION

The Commission proposes four levels of accreditation decisions:

1. denial of accreditation—for providers that fall below threshold in two or more standards
2. probationary accreditation—awarded to providers that meet or surpass the threshold in four standards, but fall below in one of the standards
3. full accreditation—awarded to providers that meet all five standards at the CAEP-established thresholds
4. exemplary or “gold” accreditation—awarded to a small number of providers that meet the threshold level set for all five standards and surpass the threshold in a combination of standards

The Commission also recommends that CAEP accreditation be based on a judgment that the provider’s accreditation evidence meets a designated “threshold” for each of the five standards recommended by the Commission. To achieve full accreditation, all components for standard 4 on Program Impact and components 5.4 and 5.5 on continuous improvement must reach an “operating” threshold for evidence.

The CAEP Board of Directors will need to craft implementation plans so that new standards and recommendations for action can be put into place. The evidence expectations must be phased in over a brief period of years, and as new assessments and more common measures come into place, the expectations can be raised. These new CAEP standards set the bar high so that attaining accreditation status will be a meaningful achievement. Setting high standards will change incentives and change the behavior of providers. High expectations for admissions and gaining proficiency during preparation will, themselves, attract more able candidates into teaching.

The charge to the Commission gave equal weight to “essential standards” and to “accompanying evidence” indicating that standards are met. Commissioners are optimistic that advances in the quality of evidence are at hand, and some of the pending opportunities are illustrated in the listed examples that follow each standard. The Commission has included examples of evidence that would be familiar to any accredited provider (e.g., observation measures of candidate performance), and ones that are familiar but with more rigorous performance levels expected (e.g., common cut scores on licensure tests). Some examples explicitly anticipate the emergence of additional measures or new assessments (e.g., a new generation of licensure tests), and the Commission recommends some evaluation data strategies that would be new to accreditation (e.g., recruitment plans, goals and monitoring of results). During the public comment period, the Commission is soliciting feedback on the appropriateness, rigor, comprehensiveness, and adequacy of these examples of evidence for accreditation decisions.

Message from
James G. Cibulka, President

The Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP) is poised to raise the bar for accreditation. We need educators for our schools and classrooms who can raise the levels of learning for American students, and CAEP can play a powerful role to make that happen. As the new accrediting body for educator preparation, CAEP will serve as a model accreditor with rigorous standards, demanding sound evidence and establishing a platform to drive continuous improvement and innovation.

In line with this new vision and as its first public action, CAEP invited representatives of diverse and often divergent views and perspectives that would challenge the status quo and push for the urgent change needed in the field of educator preparation. We invited critics of accreditation, innovative educator preparation providers, teachers, parents, district and state leaders, and reformers to craft recommendations for a foundation to support the vision of CAEP as a new kind of accrediting body that drives innovation and change. The Commission's makeup reflects a partnership between higher education and P-12 education, signaling the new demands for collaboration that CAEP expects.

Charge to the Commission

The CAEP Board of Directors charged the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting with transforming the preparation of teachers by creating a rigorous system of accreditation that demands excellence and produces educators who raise student achievement.


The Commission has taken its responsibility seriously and interpreted its mandate to encompass the full scope of the educational challenge facing our nation's teachers. America's teachers must not only raise student achievement for some learners, but they are challenged to do so for all learners in a nation with an increasingly diverse P-12 student population. Creating effective learning environments that challenge and engage all learners has been the frame of reference that guided the Commission's work and that readers of these draft standards and recommendations will find reflected at various points. I believe we all share a common goal that our teachers can help young people become successful, happy, productive contributors to American society.

Specifically, the Commission was established to develop accreditation standards for all preparation programs that are based on evidence, continuous improvement, innovation, and sound clinical practice. Wherever possible, the Commission has grounded its standards and evidence on empirical research or, where there is little guiding research, it has based its recommendations on best practices and professional consensus. CAEP is committed to building a stronger research base for preparation programs through its accreditation work. Better knowledge is needed on which input (e.g., candidate and program characteristics) and outcome measures predict high performance on the job. We can expect that new assessments will become available, measures of teacher impact on P-12 student learning will be refined, observation protocols will be applied to preservice, and so on.

As the knowledge base improves, CAEP standards and the evidence we can use to measure performance validly against those standards can be revised to reflect what truly matters in producing effective teachers who improve P-12 student learning. While this is a longer term goal, in the short run CAEP will employ a number of strategies to strengthen the use of evidence in accreditation decisions, informing both the Commission's deliberations and those of the CAEP Board. Along with rigorous standards and evidence, the Commission will recommend transparent CAEP public accountability reporting with multiple measures, including ones directly linked to student achievement.

Invitation for Public Comment

Now it is the public's turn to weigh in with feedback on the draft recommendations for the next generation of accreditation standards and performance measures for educator preparation. We invite all stakeholders and the general public to comment on this draft. The public feedback will be used to further strengthen the final Commission recommendations to the CAEP Board, to be completed in spring 2013. Information on how to respond to the draft is contained on the cover page.


James G. Cibulka
President

Message from Camilla Benbow and Terry Holliday, Co-chairs

The members of the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting have enthusiastically accepted President Cibulka's invitation and charge. CAEP is taking up its new responsibilities at a critical time. Its accreditation functions can provide powerful leverage for a new vitality in educator preparation that leads to more effective learning by America's P-12 students.

The Opportunity

The current policy context for education makes this moment as a pivotal one, offering an unprecedented opportunity. CAEP falls at the intersection of education policy with practice of the education profession. Its leaders have set challenging goals to make accreditation more effective by raising its rigor, and simultaneously, by fostering innovation.

What makes CAEP's beginnings even stronger is the sea change in the education policy landscape. This moment is characterized by the fortuitous juncture of governmental policies and practices: a now widely held perspective that well-prepared teachers and other education professionals are critical for increased learning in the classroom, and the advent of CAEP as the new and sole national educator preparation accreditor. If CAEP fails to take bold action now, states will move on, leaving accreditation on the sidelines.

The potential for CAEP to make a decisive impact on educator preparation has motivated the Commissioners. We eagerly are searching for appropriate ways to maximize the considerable leverage that the accreditation process can create. Commissioners have identified four especially critical points of leverage for CAEP accreditation:

- Build partnerships and strong clinical experiences—Educator preparation providers and collaborating schools and districts bring complementary experiences that, joined together, promise far stronger preparation programs.
- Raise and assure candidate quality—From recruitment and admission, through preparation, and at exit, educator preparation providers must take responsibility to prepare an education workforce that is more able and more representative of America's diverse population.
- Include all providers—CAEP must encourage innovations in preparation by welcoming all of the varied providers that seek accreditation and meet challenging levels of performance.
- And, surmounting all others, insist that preparation be judged by outcomes and impact on P-12 student learning—Results matter; "effort" is not enough.

These points of leverage are not accreditation "business as usual," nor do they represent marginal changes from education accreditation in the past. Exercising them can add value to what states are trying to accomplish with their reforms in preparation policy, reinforcing the efforts of leading states.

Consequences

After the Commission completes its final recommendations later this year, the CAEP Board will need to craft practical implementation plans. Realistically, the Commission's vision for higher quality, more consistent, and more rigorous evidence will need to be phased in over a brief period of years in collaboration with states. As new assessments and more common measures become available, the evidence expectations can be raised.

States and philanthropic foundations also must step up to their responsibilities for preparation. The Council of Chief State School Officers has recently published a report² on educator preparation and entry into the profession. One of its recommendations is that state purposes to "support program improvement." The report continues, "[s]tates 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."

We concur. Some providers simply lack appropriate faculty, sufficient resources, or capacity to monitor their own progress for continuous improvement. Effective preparation requires both sufficient, and effectively used, funds. The facts cannot be ignored.

These changes may not be for every provider. The bar is high so that attaining accreditation status would be a meaningful achievement. Setting high standards will change incentives and change the behavior of providers. High expectations for admissions and a wide array of opportunities to develop proficiencies during preparation will, themselves, attract more able candidates into teaching.

Status

Our work is not complete. At this mid-point, review and comments from the public and the education profession are the essential next step. At the close of the public comment period, the Commission will review the compiled feedback and make appropriate revisions before completing our final recommendations for the CAEP Board of Directors. Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter!



Camilla Benbow
Co-Chair



Terry Holliday
Co-Chair

Accreditation Standards and Recommendations

The Commission's draft includes five standards and two additional recommendations that address CAEP Board responsibilities for accreditation and accountability. Each of the five standards is followed by a rationale, and then by examples of evidence. Public comments are solicited on the standards, the examples of evidence, and the additional recommendations. The public comment website, <http://standards.caepnet.org> (available February 22), is arranged to guide reviewers through the recommendations serially.

Structure of the Standards

The Commission has adopted a structure for the standards that was proposed by President Cibulka during its first meeting. The first part of that structure is organized around the three areas of teacher preparation identified by the National Academy of Sciences 2010 report, *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy*. The Academy panel sifted through hundreds of research studies from recent decades and, not surprisingly, concluded that more research is needed in order to have sound evidence about the impact of particular aspects of preparation. But it found that existing research provides some guidance: content knowledge, field experience, and the quality of teacher candidates "are likely to have the strongest effects" on outcomes for students (p. 180).

Adapting that guidance to its task, the Commission's first three recommended standards are:

- Content and pedagogical knowledge
- Clinical partnerships and practice
- Candidate quality, recruitment and selectivity

The Commission also explored important functions of an accrediting body that are fashioned around attributes of high-performing education organizations. These are supported by research on effective management, and, especially, the Baldrige education award criteria, and also by recent trends and new approaches among accreditors. The fourth and fifth standards and additional recommendations for the CAEP Board are built on these sources:

- Standard 4: Program impact
- Standard 5: Provider quality, continuous improvement, and capacity
- Recommendation on Annual reporting and CAEP monitoring
- Recommendation on Levels of accreditation

These groupings serve to structure the draft recommendations that immediately follow the comments on evidence, below.

Evidence That Standards Are Met

President Cibulka's charge to the Commission gave equal weight to "essential standards" and to "accompanying evidence" indicating that standards are met. The additional rigor that CAEP has committed itself to apply is often found in the evidence rather than in the language of standards. In each of the Commission's draft standards there is a concluding section providing "examples of evidence." The Commissioners have identified these examples during their work over the past eight months and seek public comments on them as the next step toward final recommendations later this year.

In an ideal world, educator preparation accreditation would draw its evidentiary data from a wide array of sources that have different qualitative characteristics from many of those currently available. There would be elements of preparation that are quantified with common definitions or characteristics (e.g., different forms or patterns of clinical experiences) that everyone would understand and that providers would use in their own data systems. There would be comparable experiences in preparation that providers as well as employers, state agencies, and policymakers agree are essential. There would be similar requirements across states for courses, experiences and licensure. There would be a few universally administered examinations that serve as strong anchors for judgments about effective preparation and that are accepted as gateways to preparation programs, or employment, or promotion.

Educator preparation has few close approximations of such an ideal system. However, Commission members are optimistic that advances in the quality of evidence are at hand. From many arguments that might be made in defense of that optimism, three stand out. The current policy interest in well prepared teachers and leaders is probably higher than it has ever been, especially in states. In addition, the U. S. Department of Education's Institute for Education Sciences is supporting randomized controlled trials that are examining elements of preparation, including selection and clinical experiences. And the Gates foundation's "Measures of Effective Teaching" project has recently concluded a large research study of instruments used to evaluate teacher performances, some or all of which might be adapted to serve as preservice measures.

As the Commission's recommendations are put into place by CAEP, the years immediately ahead should be ones of substantial, even order of magnitude, advances in access to sound evidence. Indeed, the examples that the Commission has selected for this report on its draft recommendations amply illustrate this position.

- Among the examples are ones that would seem familiar to any accredited provider. See Standard 1, example a (noted as 1.a), state licensure exams; 1.b, grade point average (GPA) in coursework related to the area of teaching; 2.h video analysis of a candidates' teaching; 3.e, teacher work samples and Renaissance project portfolios; 4.d, employer surveys; 5.a, a quality assurance system with broad capacity to compile, store, access, manage and analyze data, and also 5.a, feedback from completers.
- There are examples of familiar forms of evidence applied more rigorously. Here illustrations found in the examples are 1.a, a licensure pass rate of 80 percent on a "common cut-score across states," within two administrations; and 3.i, general education and content course grades with at least a 3.0 average and 3.5 in practica courses. For admissions, minimum criteria are built into component 4 of standard 3, a GPA minimum of 3.0 and average cohort performance on standardized admissions tests in the top third of national test pools.
- Some examples explicitly anticipate the emergence of additional measures or new assessments. 1.a provides a note that CAEP should work with states to develop and employ new or revised licensure tests; 1.e lists P-12 student surveys of preservice candidates, and 1.f and 3.e list the Stanford/AACTE "edTPA" assessment, now being piloted; and 4.g includes edTPA "for in-service teachers (when an in-service version becomes available)." Also, component 3.4 contains, as an option for provider-established admissions criteria, "a model that predicts effective teaching" and measures the results in reliable and valid ways; and, similarly, an illustration of evidence for P-12 student learning in 4.c is "case studies of completers that demonstrate the impacts of preparation on P-12 student learning."
- And the Commission recommends some evaluation data strategies that would be new to accreditation. 2.a, 2.b, and 2.c on clinical partnerships call for evidence of understanding, data sharing, tracking and hiring patterns, and action indicating combined resource allocation and joint decision-making. Standard 3 on Candidate quality includes a strategic recruitment plan (3.a) with goals, evidence that progress is monitored, and use of the results for action. Standard 5 requires program outcome measures of graduation rates, candidate ability to meet licensing requirements, candidate hiring in the positions for which they prepared, and student loan default rates.

Another characteristic of the evidence examples is that they differ in level of specificity. Some are explicit performance measures (e.g., a state licensure test, a particular cut score on a test), while others describe inputs (e.g., coursework on assessment, embedding assessment topics in content and methods courses). Some recommendations are outlined in conceptual terms (e.g., evidence of tracking and sharing data with school district partners). Some measures give the appearance of precision (e.g., completion rates, placement rates), but anyone familiar with longstanding debates over the "Title II" preparation data reporting to the U. S. Department of Education is aware that every term must be defined and respondents trained if the results are to be consistent.

As new and better evidence becomes available, CAEP must be committed to use that evidence appropriately in making accreditation decisions. In addition, it should expect providers to take responsibility for examining the quality of evidence on which they rely—in part to make their case for accreditation but, routinely, for continuous improvement of their own programs. As the Commission moves into the final stages of its work, public comments on the examples of evidence contained in this report will be a critical source of counsel. Also, President Cibulka has made arrangements for additional technical advice to the Commission on appropriate conditions for use of various kinds of evidence, on accreditation decision rules and on threshold requirements that are developed for each standard and its components. The decision rules may require adaptation for providers operating in different states with differing approaches to constructing important performance indicators. The rules will need to be developmental and flexible enough to accommodate changes as the evidence measures change.

Providers, the public, and policymakers all need to perceive CAEP decisions as credible. The evidentiary base available to CAEP must improve, and it will. Stronger evidence, which CAEP will help generate, will provide a more solid foundation for the professional judgments reached in CAEP's accreditation decisions.

Standard 1:
CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college and career-readiness standards.

Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Knowledge

- 1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the critical concepts and principles in their discipline, including college and career-readiness expectations, and of the pedagogical content knowledge necessary to engage students' learning of concepts and principles in the discipline.

Instructional Practice

- 1.2 Candidates create and implement learning experiences that motivate P-12 students, establish a positive learning environment, and support P-12 students' understanding of the central concepts and principles in the content discipline. Candidates support learners' development of deep understanding within and across content areas, building skills to access and apply what students have learned.
- 1.3 Candidates design, adapt, and select a variety of valid and reliable assessments (e.g., formative and summative measures or indicators of growth and proficiency) and employ analytical skills necessary to inform ongoing planning and instruction, as well as to understand, and help students understand their own, progress and growth.
- 1.4 Candidates engage students in reasoning and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local, state, national, and global issues, incorporating new technologies and instructional tools appropriate to such tasks.
- 1.5 Candidates use research and evidence to continually evaluate and improve their practice, particularly the effects of their choices and actions on others, and they adapt their teaching to meet the needs of each learner.

The Learner and Learning

- 1.6 Candidates design and implement appropriate and challenging learning experiences, based on an understanding of how children learn and develop. They ensure inclusive learning environments that encourage and help all P-12 students reach their full potential across a range of learner goals.
- 1.7 Candidates work with P-12 students and families to create classroom cultures that support individual and collaborative learning and encourage positive social interaction, engagement in learning, and independence.
- 1.8 Candidates build strong relationships with students, families, colleagues, other professionals, and community members, so that all are communicating effectively and collaborating for student growth, development, and well-being.

Equity

- 1.9 Candidates reflect on their personal biases and access resources that deepen their own understanding of cultural, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, language, and learning differences to build stronger relationships and to adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner.

NOTE 1: In this report, the term “candidate” refers to individuals preparing for professional education positions. “Completer” is used as a term to embrace candidates exiting from degree programs, and also candidates exiting from other higher education programs or preparation programs conducted by alternative providers that may or may not offer a certificate or degree.

NOTE 2: In Standard 1, the subjects of components are “candidates.” The specific knowledge and skills described will develop over the course of the preparation program and may be assessed at any point, some near admission, others at key transitions such as entry to clinical experiences, and still others near candidate exit as preparation is completed.

Rationale

This standard asserts the importance of a strong content background and a foundation of pedagogical knowledge for all candidates. Teaching is complex and preparation must provide opportunities for candidates to acquire knowledge and skills that can move all P-12 students significantly forward—in their academic achievements, in articulating the purpose of education in their lives, and in building independent competence for life-long learning. Such a background includes experiences that develop deep understanding of major concepts and principles within the candidate’s field, including college and career-ready expectations.³ Moving forward, college and career ready standards can be expected to include additional disciplines, underscoring the need to help students master a range of learner goals conveyed within and across disciplines. Component 1.6 refers “a range of learner goals,” and these would explicitly include interdisciplinary emphases as a complement to the disciplinary focus in component 1.1. Examples, among others, would be civic literacy, health literacy and global awareness.

Content knowledge describes the depth of understanding of critical concepts, theories, skills, processes, principles, and structures that connect and organize ideas within a field.⁴ Research indicates that students learn more when their teachers have a strong foundation of content knowledge:⁵

Teachers need to understand subject matter deeply and flexibly, so that they can help students create useful cognitive maps, relate ideas to one another, and address misconceptions. They need to see how ideas connect across fields and to everyday life, and how ideas develop a foundation for pedagogical content knowledge⁶ that enables them to make ideas accessible to others.⁷

These essential links between instruction and content are especially clear in Linda Darling-Hammond’s description of what the Common Core State Standards mean by “deeper learning:”⁸

- An understanding of the meaning and relevance of ideas to concrete problems
- An ability to apply core concepts and modes of inquiry to complex real-world tasks
- A capacity to transfer knowledge and skills to new situations, to build on and use them
- Abilities to communicate ideas and to collaborate in problem solving
- An ongoing ability to learn to learn

Pedagogical content knowledge in teaching includes “core activities of teaching, such as figuring out what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting, and modifying textbooks; . . . deciding among alternative courses of action, and analyz(ing) the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities.”⁹ It is crucial to “good teaching and student understanding.”¹⁰

The development of pedagogical content knowledge involves a shift in a teacher’s understanding from comprehension of subject matter for themselves, to advancing their students’ learning through presentation of subject matter in a variety of ways that are appropriate to different situations—reorganizing and partitioning it, and developing activities, metaphors, exercises, examples and demonstrations—so that it can be grasped by students.¹¹

Understanding pedagogical content knowledge is complemented by knowledge of learners—where teaching begins. Teachers must understand that learning and developmental patterns vary among individuals, that learners bring unique individual differences to the learning process, and that learners need supportive and safe learning environments to thrive. Teachers’ professional knowledge includes how cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical development occurs.¹² Neuroscience is influencing education, and future educators should be well versed in findings from brain research, including how to facilitate learning for students with varying capacities, strengths, and approaches to learning.

The Commission’s development of this draft standard and its components has been influenced especially by the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, the Common Core State Standards Initiative¹³, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards’ Five Core Propositions.

Examples of Evidence

On content and pedagogical knowledge

- a. State licensure exams
 - o There should be a recommended specific and common cut-score across states, and a pass-rate of 80 percent within two administrations.
 - o CAEP should work with states to develop and employ new or revised licensure tests that account for college and career readiness standards, and establish a common passing score for all states. (Note: Recent reports from CCSSO, *Our Responsibility, Our Promise: Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession*, and from AFT, *Raising the Bar: Aligning and Elevating Teacher preparation and the Education Profession*, address preparation and entry requirements, indicating growing support for vastly improved licensure assessments).
- b. Grade point average (GPA) and/or grades in relevant coursework
 - o This could be an overall GPA, GPA in the major, or GPA in supporting/integral content coursework related to the area of teaching (e.g., science coursework for early childhood educators).
- c. Candidate performance on provider-based capstone measures related to content and pedagogical knowledge

On Instructional practice and the learner and learning

- d. Student performance on valid, reliable assessments aligned with instruction during clinical practice experiences
- e. P-12 student surveys of their preservice candidate teachers during clinical practice experiences
- f. Observational data of candidate performance during clinical practice experience, judged against rubrics and/or other performance metrics (e.g., edTPA, Danielson’s Framework for Teaching, etc.)
- g. Evidence that the provider promotes candidates’ assessment proficiencies (1) in course work focused on assessment, (2) by embedding assessment topics in content and methods courses, (3) by providing candidates with real-world opportunities to apply what they have learned, and (4) in the assessments it employs in all aspects of preparation

On equity

- h. Provider criteria that qualify candidates for completion, with program performance indicating that all completers have opportunities to reflect on their personal biases, access appropriate resources to deepen their understanding, can use this information and related experiences to build stronger relationships with P-12 learners, and can adapt their practices to meet the needs of each learner

(NOTE: The provider would also monitor data on:

- (1) Quality of candidates available in response to Standard 3 on Candidate quality, recruitment and selectivity, and
- (2) P-12 student learning, observations and surveys that are available in response to Standard 4, Program Impact).

Standard 2:
CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, including technology-based collaborations, and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

Clinical Educators

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support and retain high-quality clinical educators who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

Clinical experiences

2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning. Clinical experiences, including technology-based applications, are structured to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are associated with a positive impact on P-12 student learning.

NOTE: In this report, the term "all students" is defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools including students with disabilities or exceptionalities, who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and geographic origin.

Rationale

Education is a practice profession and preparation for careers in education must create nurturing opportunities for aspiring candidates to practice the application of their developing knowledge and skills. These opportunities take place particularly in real-life situations, but may be augmented by settings and situations enhanced by technology, such as simulations, video and online activities. The 2010 NCATE Panel report, *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice*,¹⁴ identified important dimensions of clinical practice and the Commission has drawn from the Panel's recommendations to structure the three components of this standard.

Educator preparation providers (EPPs) seeking accreditation should have strong collaborative partnerships with school district and individual school partners as well as other community stakeholders. The term "partnerships" for clinical practice signifies a collaboration among various entities in which all participating members pursue mutually agreed upon goals for preparation of education professionals. Characteristics of effective partnerships include: mutual trust and respect; sufficient time to develop and strengthen relationships at all levels; shared responsibility and accountability among partners and periodic formative evaluation of activities among partners.¹⁵ Linda Darling-Hammond and J. Baratz-Snowden¹⁶ call for strong relationships between universities and schools to share standards of good teaching that are consistent across courses and clinical work. The 2010 NCATE Panel proposed partnerships that are "strategic" in meeting partners' needs by defining common work, shared responsibility, authority and accountability.

Clinical educators are individuals from diverse settings who assess, support, and develop a candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions during clinical experience. The literature indicates that the quality of the clinical educators, both school-based and provider-based, can ensure the learning of educator candidates and P-12 students.¹⁷ Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice described high-quality clinical experiences as ones in which both providers and their partners require candidate supervision and mentoring by certified clinical educators—drawn from discipline-specific, pedagogical, and P-12 professionals—who are trained to work with and provide feedback to candidates. Clinical educators should be accountable for the performance of the candidates they supervise, as well as that of the students they teach.¹⁸

High-quality clinical experiences take place in a variety of settings including schools; community-based centers; and homeless shelters; as well as through simulations, video analyses, and other virtual opportunities (for example, online chats with students). Teacher candidates observe, critique, assist, tutor, instruct, and conduct research. They may be student teachers or interns.¹⁹ The experiences integrate applications of theory from pedagogical courses or modules in P-12 or community settings. They offer multiple opportunities for candidates to relate and reflect upon clinical and academic components of preparation.

The members of the 2010 Panel on clinical preparation and partnerships consulted both research resources and professional consensus reports in shaping their conclusions and recommendations, including proposed design principles for clinical experiences.²⁰ Among these are: (1) a student learning focus, (2) clinical practice that is integrated throughout every facet of preparation in a dynamic way, (3) continuous monitoring and judging of candidate progress on the basis of data, (4) a curriculum and experiences that permit candidates to integrate content and a broad range of effective teaching practices and to become innovators and problem solvers, and (5) an “interactive professional community” with opportunities for collaboration and peer feedback. Howey²¹ also suggests several principles, including tightly woven education theory and classroom practice as well as placement of teacher candidates in cohorts. An ETS report²² proposed clinical preparation experiences that offer opportunities for “Actual hands-on ability and skill to use . . . types of knowledge to engage students successfully in learning and mastery.” Linda Darling-Hammond and J. Baratz-Snowden²³ proposed an extended clinical experience of at least 30 weeks that is carefully mentored and interwoven with coursework.

Examples of Evidence

On partnerships

- a. Memoranda of understanding or data-sharing agreements with diverse P-12 and/or community partners
- b. Evidence of tracking and sharing data such as hiring patterns of the school district/school or job placement rates contextualized by partners' needs
- c. Evidence of actions that indicate combined resource allocation and joint decision-making, such as:
 - o program and course adjustments to meet partners' human capital and instructional needs
 - o stated characteristics and roles for on-site delivery of programmatic courses

On clinical faculty

- d. Plans, activities, and results related to selection of diverse clinical educators and their support and retention, such as training and support protocols, including implementation data, with and for clinical educators in EPP programs

On clinical experiences

- e. Performance data such as evidence of how candidates develop high-leverage instructional practices/strategies, throughout their programs in diverse clinical settings, with continuous opportunities for formative feedback and coaching from high-quality and diverse clinical educators
- f. Evidence that candidates integrate technology into their planning and teaching and use it to differentiate instruction
- g. Evidence of candidates' graduated responsibility for all aspects of classroom teaching and increasing ability to impact all students' learning
- h. Evidence of candidates' reflection upon instructional practices, observations, and their own practice with increasing breadth, depth, and intention with an eye toward improving teaching and student learning (e.g., video analysis of teaching, reflection logs)
- i. Studies of the effectiveness of diverse field experiences on candidates' instructional practices
- j. Other evidence, including reliable and valid measures or innovative models of high-quality partnerships, clinical educators, or clinical experiences

Standard 3:
CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification.

Plan for Recruitment

3.1 The provider presents plans and goals for strategic and recruitment outreach to recruit high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission.

Recruitment of Diverse Teacher Candidates

3.2 The provider documents goals, efforts and results for the admitted pool of candidates that demonstrate the diversity of America's P-12 students (including students with disabilities, exceptionalities, and diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and geographic origin).

Recruitment to Meet Employment Needs

3.3 The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, or regional or local needs for hard to staff schools and shortage fields, including STEM, English language learning, and students with disabilities.

Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement And Ability

3.4 The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average GPA of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum GPA of 3.0 and a group average performance in the top third of those who pass a nationally normed admissions assessment such as ACT, SAT or GRE.²⁴ The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence. If a program has a model that predicts effective teaching empirically as measured in reliable and valid ways, the cohort group floor must be above the mean of the predicted measure.

Additional Selectivity Factors

3.5 Provider preparation programs establish and monitor attributes beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors deemed important in the selection process and for development during preparation, predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

Selectivity During Preparation

3.6 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college and career ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical skills, including the effective use of technology.

Selection At Completion

3.7 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought, and can teach effectively with positive impacts P-12 student learning.

3.8 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.

Rationale

Educator preparation providers have a critical responsibility to ensure the quality of their candidates. This responsibility continues from purposeful recruitment that helps fulfill the provider's mission, to admissions selectivity that builds an able and diverse pool of candidates, through monitoring of candidate progress and providing necessary support, and to demonstrating that candidates are proficient at completion and that they are selected for employment opportunities that are available in areas served by the provider. The integration of recruitment and selectivity as EPP responsibilities to ensure quality is emphasized in a recent National Research Council report:²⁵

The quality of new teachers entering the field depends not only on the quality of the preparation they receive, but also on the capacity of preparation programs to attract and select academically able people who have the potential to be effective teachers. Attracting able, high-quality candidates to teaching is a critical goal.

The majority of American educators are White, middle class, and female.²⁶ A 2006 study reported 75 percent of teachers are female, 84 percent are White.²⁷ The makeup of the nation's teacher workforce has not kept up with the changing demographics. At the national level, students of color make up more than 40 percent of the public school population, while teachers of color are only 17 percent of the teaching force.²⁸ The mismatch has consequences. Goldhaber and Hansen²⁹ found that student achievement is positively impacted by a racial/ethnicity match between teachers and students.

While recruitment of talented minority candidates is a time- and labor-intensive process,³⁰ "teachers of color and culturally competent teachers must be actively recruited and supported."³¹ Recruitment can both increase the quality of selected candidates and offset potentially deleterious effects on diversity from more selective criteria—either at admissions or throughout a program.³² "Successful programs recruit minority teachers with a high likelihood of being effective in the classroom" and "concentrate on finding candidates with a core set of competencies that will translate to success in the classroom."³³ There is evidence that providers of alternative pathways to teaching have been more successful in attracting non-White candidates. Feistritz reports alternative provider cohorts that are 30 percent non-White, compared with 13 percent in traditional programs.³⁴

The 2010 NCATE Panel on Clinical Partnerships advocated attention to employment needs as a way to secure greater alignment between the teacher market and areas of teacher preparation.³⁵ The federal Department of Education regularly releases lists of teacher shortages by both content area specialization and state.³⁶ Some states also publish supply and demand trends and forecasts and other information on market needs. These lists could assist EPP programs in shaping their preparation program offerings and in setting recruitment goals.

There is a broad public consensus that providers should attract and select able candidates who will become effective teachers. The 2011 Gallup Phi Delta Kappan education poll³⁷ reported that 76 percent of the U. S. adult public agreed that "high-achieving" high school students should be recruited to become teachers. Another example is found in a recent AFT report on teacher preparation.³⁸ AFT seeks to "attract academically capable students with authentic commitment to work with children" and would set GPA requirements at 3.0, SATs at 1100 and ACT scores at 24.0.

Researchers conclude that academic quality, especially in verbal ability and math knowledge, impacts teacher effectiveness.³⁹ A study for McKinsey and Company⁴⁰ found that high-performing countries had a rigorous selection process similar to that of medical schools. Whitehurst⁴¹ suggests that educator preparation providers should be much more selective in terms of their candidates' cognitive abilities. When looking at the cost of teacher selection, Levin⁴² found "that recruiting and retaining teachers with higher verbal scores is five to ten times as effective per dollar of teacher expenditure in raising achievement scores of students as the strategy of obtaining teachers with more experience." Rockoff, Jacob, Kane, & Staiger⁴³ concluded that "teachers' cognitive and non-cognitive skills...have a moderately large and statistically significant relationship with student and teacher outcomes, particularly with student test scores."

In measuring teachers' cognitive and non-cognitive skills, researchers have found that both cognitive and non-cognitive factors "have a moderately large and statistically significant relationship with student and teacher outcomes, particularly with student test scores."⁴⁴ There is strong support from the professional community that qualities outside of academic ability are associated with teacher effectiveness. These include grit, the ability to work with parents, the ability to motivate, communication skills, focus, purpose, and leadership, among others. Duckworth et al⁴⁵ found "that the achievement of difficult goals entails not only talent but also the sustained and focused application of talent over time." A Teach for America study⁴⁶ concluded that a teacher's academic achievement, leadership experience, and perseverance are associated with student gains in math, while leadership experience and commitment to the TFA mission were associated with gains in English. Danielson asserts that "teacher learning becomes more active through experimentation and inquiry, as well as through writing, dialogue, and questioning."⁴⁷ In addition, teacher evaluations involve "observations of classroom teaching, which can engage teachers in those activities known to promote learning, namely, self-assessment, reflection on practice, and professional conversation." These "other" attributes and abilities lend themselves to provider innovation. Some providers might emphasize certain attributes because of the employment field or market for which they are preparing teachers.

Several researchers, including Deborah Ball in mathematics education, the MET study⁴⁸ on components of teaching, and skills approaches such as Lamov's Teach Like a Champion, assert there are important critical pedagogical strategies that develop over time. Henry,⁴⁹ Noell and Burns,⁵⁰ and Whitehurst⁵¹ all found that, in general, teachers became more effective as they gained experience. Both research, as synthesized by the National Research Council,⁵² and professional consensus, as represented by the Council of Chief State School Officers InTASC standards,⁵³ indicate that the development of effective teaching is a process.

There are various sets of criteria and standards for effective teaching and teacher education; many include performance tasks⁵⁴ and artifacts created by the teacher candidate.⁵⁵ These standards, like the ones the CAEP Commission has drafted, have a central focus on P-12 learning. Student learning should be a criterion for selecting candidates for advancement throughout preparation. The evidence indicators that appear below can be used to monitor and guide candidates' growth during a program. The Commission's draft standard 4 in this report is built around the ultimate impact that program completers have when they are actually employed in the classroom or other educator positions.

Many professional efforts to define standards for teaching (e.g., InTASC; CCSSO, NCTQ, and also rubrics for teaching in observational measures covered in the Gates foundation Measures of Effective Teaching study) recommend that candidates know and practice ethics and standards of professional practice as described in these national standards (such as those in InTASC standard 9 and 9(o)). The Commission recommends that CAEP strongly encourage additional research to define professional practices of P-12 educators, and how these practices, beliefs, and attitudes relate to student learning. (See also CAEP component 1.9 on equity responsibilities.)

However, many measures of both academic and non-academic factors associated with high-quality teaching and learning need to be studied for reliability, validity and fairness. CAEP should encourage development and research related to these measures. It would be shortsighted to specify particular metrics narrowly because of the now fast-evolving interest in, insistence on, and development of new and much stronger preparation assessments, observational measures, student surveys, and descriptive metrics. Instead, CAEP should ask that providers make a case that the data used in decision-making are valid, reliable and fair. States and localities are developing their own systems of monitoring and both providers and CAEP should obtain the data from these systems, where available, to use as valuable external indicators for continuous improvement.

Examples of Evidence

On recruitment:

- a. Strategic recruitment plans to achieve the EPP mission, taking account of employment opportunities for its completers, needs to serve increasingly diverse populations, and meeting needs for STEM, ELL, special education and other shortage areas
 - o Plans define outreach efforts to locate and target high-quality applicants from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations
 - o Plans contain specific numerical goals and base data
 - o Progress is monitored and analyzed annually
 - o Judgments are made about the adequacy of progress toward recruitment goals
 - o Data are used to make changes in recruitment efforts
 - o Movement of resources toward the identified areas and away from low need areas is monitored
 - o Evidence of marketing and recruitment to high schools and colleges that are racially and culturally diverse and reflecting opportunities and needs in areas of shortages
 - o Evidence of collaboration with other providers, states, and school districts could be an indicator of outreach and provide an awareness of employment needs and opportunities

On Admissions In Addition To The CAEP Floor Described In Component 3.4:

- b. Providers set other admissions requirements such as:
 - o High school course taking indicating rigorous courses (e.g., Advanced Placement, higher level math and languages)
 - o Academic awards achieved

On Nonacademic Factors At Admissions Or During The Preparation Experiences:⁵⁶

- c. Programs demonstrate how they assess non-academic qualities of candidates and how these qualities relate to teacher performance. Examples might include student self-assessments, letters of recommendation, Interviews, essays, leadership, surveys, Gallup measures, Strength finder 2/0, Meyers-Briggs, and personality tests
- d. Other examples illustrate candidate commitment and dispositions, such as (1) teaching, volunteerism, coaching, civic organizations, commitment to urban issues; (2) content related, goal oriented, data-driven, contributions/ value-add to current employer or organization; (3) mindsets/ dispositions/ characteristics such as coachability, empathy, teacher presence or “withitness,”⁵⁷ cultural competency, collaboration, beliefs that all children can learn; or (4) professionalism, perseverance, ethical practice, strategic thinking, abilities to build trusting, supportive relationships with students and families

During Preparation:

- e. The edTPA test,⁵⁸ Renaissance, Teacher Work Samples. Sample measures that often appear in these forms of assessment are:
 - o Differentiated instruction based on group and subgroup results on teacher created or standardized assessments (ELL, special education, gifted, high-needs students, etc.)
 - o Evidence of differentiated instruction in response to student test data
 - o Evidence of teacher reflection on practice.
- f. Analysis of video recorded lessons with review and evaluation using rubrics, rater rules and agreement levels
- g. Observation measures with trained review procedures, faculty peer observations with rubrics
- h. Appropriate performance measures, including those required by a state
- i. Content knowledge assessments, standardized test data and general education and content course grades throughout the program with at least a 3.0 average and 3.5 in practica courses
- j. Assessments of specialized abilities when appropriate, such as math content tests or ability to teach reading (as applicable to reading and other content teachers)
- k. Data provided by states on student achievement, teacher observations, student and employer surveys (NOTE: see also the Commission’s recommendations for Standard 4)
- l. Evidence of candidate ability to design and use a variety of formative assessments with PK-12 students

At Completion

- m. Provider criteria that qualify candidates for completion, with program performance documenting that all completers have reached a high standard for content knowledge
- n. Provider criteria that qualify candidates for completion, with program performance documenting that all completers can teach effectively with positive impact on P-12 student learning
- o. Provider criteria that qualify candidates for completion, with program performance information indicating that all completers understand expectations set out in codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policy

**Standard 4:
PROGRAM IMPACT**

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning, classroom instruction and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Impact on P-12 student learning

4.1 The provider documents, using value-added measures where available, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures constructed by the provider, that program completers contribute to an expected level of P-12 student growth.

Indicators of teaching effectiveness

4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Satisfaction of employers

4.3. The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

Satisfaction of completers

4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation was relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job and that the preparation was effective.

Rationale

CAEP Commission standards 1 through 3 address the preparation experiences of candidates, their developing knowledge and skills, and their abilities at the point of program completion. Candidate progress and faculty conclusions about the readiness of completers at exit are direct outcomes of the provider's efforts.

By contrast, Standard 4 addresses the results of preparation programs at the point where they matter—the classroom teaching and other educator responsibilities in schools. Knowing results, learning from that knowledge, and turning the information back to assess the preparation experiences are the expected responsibilities of every provider. The Baldrige education award criteria place 45 percent (450 of 1000) of their rating points on results. Student results and operational effectiveness are a significant component of those points. For a preparation provider, the student results have a dual meaning: first, candidate mastery of the knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching, and second teaching that has positive effects on P-12 student learning.

The paramount goal of providers is to prepare candidates who will have a positive impact on P-12 students. Impact can be measured in many ways, and one being adopted by several states and districts is known as "value-added modeling." A large Gates'-supported research effort, the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project, provides useful guidance about the circumstances under which this model can most validly be used. These new

findings are consistent with those noted in *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy* (NRC, 2010):⁵⁹ “Value-added models may provide valuable information about effective teacher preparation, but not definitive conclusions, and are best considered together with other evidence from a variety of perspectives.”

The MET study also provides empirical evidence not previously available about structured teacher observations that employ videotapes and specific evaluation protocols, and it found that “student perception surveys provide a reliable indicator of the learning environment and give voice to the intended beneficiaries of instruction.”⁶⁰ Beyond these sources of evidence, some providers will develop close collaborative relationships with districts in which their completers are employed and construct case studies that examine completers’ impacts on student learning. (NOTE: In addition, the Commission is still considering advice about appropriate conditions for use of evidence, as explained earlier in this report.)

Satisfaction measures such as employer surveys can provide useful feedback about completer performance. The Commission recommends that CAEP encourage more consistent use of employer surveys, and collaborate with states and other stakeholders to create more descriptive and more reliable instruments. In addition, the actual employment trajectories of completers—their retention, their promotion, their changing responsibilities—are useful indicators of employer satisfaction. Completer surveys are another source of program impact information. These can describe completer perceptions of the relevance and utility of aspects of their preparation as they view them in their day to day responsibilities.

An exemplary provider will be able to demonstrate superior impact on P-12 students and also the links between program characteristics and P-12 impact. The rationale for this exemplary distinction is that exemplary providers contribute to current P-12 achievement through the work of their own completers and to future P-12 achievement by serving as a model for other providers. (See CAEP Levels of Accreditation in the recommendations, below.)

Examples of Evidence

P-12 student learning

- a. Value-added measures of P-12 student learning that can be linked with teacher data
- b. State supported measures that address P-12 student learning that can be linked with teacher data
- c. Case studies of completers that demonstrate the impacts of preparation on P-12 student learning and can be linked with teacher data

Employer satisfaction

- d. Employer surveys and/or focus groups
- e. Completer retention
- f. Completer promotion and employment trajectory

Observations and surveys

- g. edTPA for in-service teachers (when an in-service version becomes available, or if/when other assessments that provide valid and reliable information about in-service teaching are available)
- h. Observations by credentialed evaluators of in-service teachers (e.g., Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) developed by Bob Pianta and Bridget Hamre; Framework for Teaching, developed by Charlotte Danielson)
- i. P-12 student surveys

Completer satisfaction

- j. Completer surveys and/or focus groups

Standard 5:
PROVIDER QUALITY, CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT, AND CAPACITY

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained, evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning.

Quality and Strategic Evaluation

5.1 The provider's quality assurance system demonstrates capacity to address all CAEP standards and investigates the relationship between program elements and candidate outcomes to improve graduates' impact on P-12 student learning.

5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. The system generates outcomes data that are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

5.3 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements and the provider's operational effectiveness. These include measures of program outcomes for:

- o Completer or graduation rates;
- o Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state accreditation requirements;
- o Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they are prepared; and
- o Student loan default rates.

Continuous Improvement

5.4 The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes. Available evidence on academic achievement of completers' P-12 students is reported, analyzed, and used to improve programs and candidate performance. Leadership at all levels is committed to evidence-based continuous improvement.

5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

Capacity

5.6 The provider assures continuing quality of curricula; educators (faculty); facilities, equipment, and supplies; fiscal and administrative capacity; student support services; recruiting and admissions practices; academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising; measures of program length and objectives; and student complaints.⁶¹

Rationale

Effective organizations rely on evidence-based quality assurance systems characterized by clearly articulated and effective processes for defining and assuring quality outcomes and for using data in a process of continuous improvement. A robust quality assurance system ensures continuous improvement by relying on a variety of measures, establishing performance benchmarks for its measures (with reference to external standards where

possible), seeking the views of all relevant stakeholders, sharing evidence widely with both internal and external audiences, and using results to improve policies and practices in consultation with partners and stakeholders.⁶²

Ultimately the quality of an educator preparation program is measured by the abilities of its completers to have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development.⁶³ Program quality and improvement are determined, in part, by characteristics of candidates that the provider recruits to the field; the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions that candidates bring to the program and acquire during the program; the relationships between the provider and the schools where its candidates receive clinical training; and subsequent evidence of completers' impact on P-12 student learning⁶⁴ in schools where they ultimately teach. To be accredited a preparation program must meet standards on each of these dimensions and demonstrate success in its own continuous improvement efforts.

Effective quality assurance systems rely on multiple measures and include a clearly articulated and effective process for defining and assuring quality outcomes. Reasons for the selection of each measure and the establishment of performance benchmarks for individual and program performance, including external points of comparison, are made clear. Providers show evidence of the credibility and dependability of the data that inform their quality control systems, as well as evidence of ongoing investigation into the quality of evidence and the validity of their interpretations of that evidence. Providers must present empirical evidence of each measure's psychometric and statistical soundness (reliability and validity).⁶⁵

Continuous improvement systems enable programs to quickly develop and test prospective improvements, deploy what is learned throughout the organization, and add to the profession's knowledge base and repertoire of practice.⁶⁶ CAEP should encourage providers to develop new models for evaluating and scaling up effective solutions to problems in educator preparation. Research and development in the accreditation framework can deepen the knowledge of existing best practices and provide models of emerging innovations to transform educator preparation.⁶⁷

A provider must have the capacity to support the desired program and candidate outcomes.⁶⁸ Core program elements include curriculum, faculty/educators, administrative and financial support, and candidate services that support candidates' ability to positively impact P-12 student learning. The adequacy and effectiveness of these elements in relation to candidate outcomes must be investigated as part of the quality assurance system.

Examples of Evidence

Quality Assurance System

- a. The quality assurance system demonstrates capabilities to compile, store, access, manage, and analyze data from diverse sources, including:
 - o multiple indicators from standards 1, 2, and 3 of candidate developing knowledge and skills from recruitment and admissions, during the preparation experience, and measures that inform provider decisions at candidate completion, including assessments of candidate performance such as licensure tests and evaluations of student teaching/internship;
 - o feedback from standard 4 on completers, employer satisfaction surveys, completer retention and employment milestones, state data on the academic achievement of completers' P-12 students, program completers own evaluation of their level of preparedness, and other sources that provide useful information on professional performance; and
 - o documentation of program outcomes from standard 5 such as the proportions of a candidate cohort who complete, who are licensed or certified, who are placed in education positions for which they have prepared, and the student loan default rate.

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

Use of Quality Assessment and Descriptive Measures

- b. Practices for investigating the quality of data sources and efforts to strengthen and improve the overall quality assurance system
- c. Processes for testing the reliability and validity of measures and instruments used to determine candidates' progress through the preparation program, at completion of the program, and during the first years of practice. The evidence should meet accepted research standards for validity and reliability of comparable measures and should, among other things, rule out alternative explanations or rival interpretations of reported results.
 - o Validity can be supported through evidence of:
 - Expert validation of the items in an assessment or rating form (content validation)
 - Agreement among findings of logically-related measures (convergent validity)
 - A measure's ability to predict performance on another measure (predictive validity)
 - Expert validation of performance or of artifacts (expert judgment)
 - Agreement among coders or reviewers of narrative evidence
 - o Reliability in its various forms can be supported through evidence of:
 - Agreement among multiple raters of the same event or artifact (or the same candidate at different points in time)
 - Stability or consistency of ratings over time
 - Evidence of internal consistency of measures
- d. Documentation that data are shared with both internal and external audiences and the use of data for program improvement.

Continuous Improvement Process

- e. Documentation of innovations that have been tested and improvements that have been made
- f. Examples of leadership commitment to continuous improvement such as planning and implementing change
- g. Documentation of stakeholder involvement in the provider's assessment of the effectiveness of programs and completers

Capacity

- h. Curriculum that reflects current needs in P-12 schools as well as national and P-12 state and/or college and career ready standards
- i. Quality of faculty members and/or other staff, including the range of relevant experiences such as academic qualifications; P-12 teaching experience and involvement in P-12 schools and districts; and course evaluations by candidates, teaching awards, or P-12 educator feedback to indicate their effectiveness as teachers
- j. Facilities that support teaching and learning.
- k. Fiscal and administrative resources that support programs and P-12 school partnerships; that develop expertise in new assessments (e.g., edTPA, teacher work samples); that support professional development for content area scholarship and expertise in new technologies, pedagogies, and curriculum (e.g., Common Core State Standards); and that support collaborative inquiry to make decisions regarding priorities and their implementation
- l. Candidate support services such as academic advising services, and counseling center services
- m. Provider's recruiting and admissions policies and practices, academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading, and advertising
- n. Information that describes the length and objectives of programs
- o. Policies for handling candidate complaints and examples of complaints and their disposal
- p. Review of any state actions on the institution or program, or any concerns that have come to the state's attention

Additional Recommendations of the CAEP Commission

The CAEP Commission was also charged with determining what information would be reported to the public, how often programs are reviewed and monitored, and what the levels of accreditation would be.

Commission members were guided in their work by analyses of recent trends and promising practices in accreditation.⁶⁹ In particular, the members put the most weight on student learning outcomes, referring to both candidate outcomes and P-12 student outcomes. In addition, however, Commissioners included consideration of program characteristics that would be expected to ensure and enhance quality, and that would support fair treatment of candidates.

CAEP Commission Recommendations On ANNUAL REPORTING AND CAEP MONITORING

The Commission recommends that CAEP gather the following data and monitor them annually from all providers:

Measures Of Program Impact:

1. Impact on P-12 learning (data provided for component 4.1 that include value-added measures in states where they are available, as well as other state-supported P-12 impact measures and/or provider measures)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness, including structured observations for evaluation and student surveys on teacher interactions (data provided for component 4.3)
3. Results of employer surveys, and including retention (annually and across five and ten year periods) and employment milestones (data provided for component 4.2, on a 2-year floating average)
4. Results of completer surveys (data provided for component 4.4, on a 2-year floating average)

Measures Of Program Outcomes:

5. Graduation rates (data provided for component 5.3 on program outcomes)
6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements (e.g., through acceptable pass rates on state licensure exams; data provided for component 5.3 on program outcomes)
7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (by certification area; data provided for component 5.3 on program outcomes)
8. Student loan default rates (on a 3-year floating average; data provided for component 5.3 on program outcomes)

The Commission recommends that CAEP identify significant amounts of change in any of these indicators that would prompt investigation to initiate (1) adverse action that could include revocation of accreditation status or (2) recognition of eligibility for a higher level of accreditation. In addition, the Commission recommends that CAEP include these data as a recurring feature in the CAEP annual report.

Indicators (1) through (4) are in-service measures of quality that are broadly consistent with recommendations from the National Research Council⁷⁰ regarding the incorporation of value-added measures, satisfaction and employment milestone measures from employers, and preparation satisfaction from program completers. Indicators (5) through (8) are intended to ensure the fair treatment of candidates and completers, so that candidates accepted to an educator preparation program would have specific information about chances for completion, licensure, finding a job in field for which they prepare, and student loan default rates.

As seen by the Commission, these data and their annual review serve a variety of purposes. They are incentives for providers to routinely gather, analyze and report critical data about their programs as one means for public accountability and transparency. Such data encourage more in-depth evaluation, self-interrogation, and reporting on the full breadth of standards and components. Employers and prospective applicants for admission need this kind of information in user-friendly, transparent, forms.

For CAEP, itself, there are many uses:

- The data will become the foundation of a national information base that increases in value over time.
- The data can send an alert to CAEP that trigger points have been exceeded so that closer inspection of a provider's preparation program should be scheduled. (See the explicit provision in the recommendation, above, for indicators of change that would prompt investigation to initiate (1) adverse action that could include revocation of accreditation status or (2) recognition of eligibility for a higher level of accreditation.)
- They will be a source of information for CAEP's annual report, will complement descriptive measures for all accredited providers, facilitate monitoring of trends over time, allow analysis of preparation patterns for different subgroups of institutions (e.g., state, regional, urban, rural), and be a resource for identifying benchmark performances.

The database will enable CAEP to report on the progress of continuous improvement not just for an individual provider but for educator preparation across all accredited providers.

**CAEP Commission Recommendations On
LEVELS OF ACCREDITATION**

The Commission proposes four levels of accreditation decisions:

1. denial of accreditation—for providers that fall below threshold in two or more standards
2. probationary accreditation—awarded to providers that meet or surpass the threshold in four standards, but fall below in one of the standards
3. full accreditation—awarded to providers that meet all five standards at the CAEP-established thresholds
4. exemplary or "gold" accreditation—awarded to a small number of providers that meet the threshold classification set for all five standards and surpass the threshold for a combination of standards

The Commission also recommends that CAEP accreditation be based on a judgment that the provider's accreditation evidence meets a designated "threshold" for each of the five standards recommended by the Commission. To achieve full accreditation, all components for standard 4 on Program Impact and components 5.4 and 5.5 on continuous improvement must reach an "operating" threshold for evidence.

The Commission proposes four levels of accreditation decisions. The first three would be "denial," "probationary," and "full accreditation." The fourth or highest level would be the Commission's vision for an exemplary or "gold" accreditation. Such a designation would break a new path in accreditation, giving visibility to attainment of a superior level of performance.

The Commission recommends that CAEP establish "threshold" classifications that define evidence from "beginning" to "leading" for each component. The threshold would be set on the basis of CAEP's experience in identifying and updating evidentiary measures that represent best current practice in provider performance. Threshold classifications would be defined by rubrics that describe both characteristics of the evidence and markers of performance. Each component of each standard would contribute to the composite evaluation for the standard.

The generic classification definitions are illustrated in the following example:

- beginning: a plan is in place for gathering data or identification of metrics and initial data collection has begun
- developing: actual data collection has been completed for at least a year and studies to examine and verify the data are underway
- operating: studies to examine and verify the data are completed, there is some reliability evidence, and data are available for more than one year. Data demonstrate performance markers meeting a threshold requirement, and data have been used for at least one cycle of evaluation, analysis, and subsequent improvement decisions

- leading: data are available for several years, with completed validity and reliability information about the use and interpretation of the data. The actual values of the data are higher than for the “operating” threshold, and data are routinely used to evaluate and improve preparation

A CAEP decision to award full accreditation would signal that the provider’s efforts and results substantially comply with the rigorous levels recommended by the Commission. Accreditation could be achieved if there are some areas where component evidence fails to reach the set threshold, with two exceptions. Meeting the “operating” threshold criteria would be required for:

- all components of standard 4 on program impact, and
- components 5.4 and 5.5 on continuous improvement.

Achieving an exemplary CAEP accreditation decision would signal that the provider’s evidence meets the “leading” classification for a specified number of standards, including standard 4 on program impact and standard 5 continuous improvement components.

Commissioners are aware that program impact data are not universally available. Asking providers to develop data collection systems individually raises challenges of costs, efficiency, and comparability of data. In the short term, CAEP must work with states and providers to develop the necessary information metrics and systems to gather data. CAEP collaboration with States and providers, and federal support through initiatives in statistics, research, and resources are necessary.

The qualities of evidence might be improved through actions of the provider, with the maturing of its quality assurance system and use of data for continuous improvement. However, Commissioners anticipate that, over time, the information available for accreditation decisions will grow much stronger, permitting a gradual shift in CAEP’s evidentiary expectations. The Commissioners especially draw attention to the statement in President Cibulka’s covering letter for this report:

As the knowledge base improves, CAEP standards and the evidence we use to measure performance against those standards can be revised to reflect what truly matters in producing effective teachers who improve P-12 student learning.

The anticipated revisions over time will enable CAEP to rely more on program outcomes and performance results, and less on inputs and processes to make its judgments.

The Commission proposes that CAEP undertake decisive steps to design and test this approach for exemplary accreditation over a specific timeline. The Commission’s vision for exemplary accreditation status may be implemented in a variety of ways, but it must be merited by performance beyond the rigorous expectations for full accreditation that the Commission is recommending, with the aspiring institutions displaying evidence that they have achieved a good number of “leading” evidence threshold ratings. A two level review process in which the second level would employ a special panel of peers to evaluate the higher performance expectations might be considered as a means of awarding exemplary status.

The CAEP design and test initiative for awarding exemplary status should engage appropriate technical and teacher education experts. It should refine and calibrate rubrics to guide designation of exemplary or “gold” level accreditation, and conduct validity and reliability studies of the judgments inherent in those decisions.

While the system for reaching exemplary-level accreditation decisions is under development, the Commission recommends that the CAEP Accreditation Council consider an interim process for recognizing truly outstanding preparation programs.

INTRODUCTORY SECTIONS

- 1 National Research Council. (2010). Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy. Retrieved from http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12882, 180.
- 2 Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO].(2012). Our responsibility, our promise: Transforming educator preparation and entry into the profession. Washington, D. C., Author, 22.

STANDARD 1, CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

- 3 Council of Chief State School Officers. (CCSSO) (2011). InTASC model core teaching standards. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Resources_Listing.html?search=model+core+teaching+Standards National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). (2002). What teachers should know and be able to do. Retrieved from <http://www.nbpts.org/resources/publications>.
- 4 Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(5), 389-407. Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.
- 5 Schacter, J., & Thum, Y. M. (2004). Paying for high- and low-quality teaching. *Economics of Education Review*, 23(4), 411-430. American Council on Education [ACE]. (1999). To touch the future: Transforming the way teachers are taught. An action agenda for college and university presidents. Washington, DC.: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.physics.ohio-state.edu/~jossem/REF/115.pdf>. Hill, H. C., Rowan, B., & Ball, D. L. (2005). Effects of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42 (2), 371-406.
- 6 Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- 7 Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Teacher learning that supports student learning. In B. A. Presseisen, (Ed). *Teaching for intelligence* (92-93). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- 8 Darling-Hammond, L. Power Point presentation, "Supporting Deeper Learning." Personal communication to Emerson Elliott, January 29, 2013.
- 9 Ball, D. L. (2000). Bridging practices: Intertwining content and pedagogy in teaching and learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 241-247.
- 10 Cochran, K. F., DeRuiter, J. A., & King, A. R. (1993). Pedagogical content knowing: An integrative model for teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(4), 263-272).
- 11 Shulman. (1987), 13.
- 12 CCSSO. (2011) , 8.

- 13 Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010). Frequently asked questions. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFAQ.pdf>.

STANDARD 2: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

- 14 National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE]. (2010). Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers. Washington, D. C.: Author.
- 15 Houck, J. W., Cohn, K. C., & Cohn, C. A. (2004). Partnering to lead educational renewal: High-quality teachers, high-quality schools. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- 16 Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (Eds.). (2005). A good teacher in every classroom: Preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 17 Grossman, P. (2010). Learning to practice: The design of clinical experience in teacher preparation. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Ronfeldt, M. (2012). Where should student teachers learn to teach? Effects of field placement school characteristics on teacher retention and effectiveness. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 34:1, 3-26.
- 18 NCATE (2010).
- 19 National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE]. (2008). Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions. Washington, D. C.: Author.
- 20 NCATE (2010). 5, 6.
- 21 Howey, K. R. (2007). A review of urban teacher residencies (UTRs) in the context of urban teacher preparation, alternative routes to certification, and a changing teacher workforce. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- 22 Educational Testing Service [ETS]. (2004) Where we stand on teacher quality: An issue paper from ETS. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Retrieved on August 4, 2012 at http://www.ets.org/Media/Education_Topics/pdf/teacherquality.pdf, 3.
- 23 Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2005), 38-39.

STANDARD 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT AND SELECTIVITY

- 24 National Center for Education Statistics [NCES]. (2011). American's high school graduates: Results of the 2009 NAEP high school transcript study. NCES 20111462. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=20111462>. The study shows high school grade point averages as 3.0 for "overall," 2.79 for "core academic" subjects and 3.14 for "other academic" subjects. SAT "top third" performance is about 1120, and

- ACT is about 22.8 for English and 23.0 for math. GRE top third on the new scale is about 154.6 for verbal and 154 for quantitative. The minimum criteria may change as standards for admission to teacher education programs become more competitive; the criteria should reflect high standards used by states and recommended by research.
- 25 NRC. (2010), 181.
 - 26 Morrell, J. (2010). Teacher preparation and diversity: When American preservice teachers aren't white and middle class. Online Submission. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/257521/_Teacher_preparation_and_diversity_when_American_preservice_teachers_aren't_white_and_middle_class.
 - 27 Zumwalt, K. & Craig, E. (2006). Teacher's characteristics: Research on the indicators of quality. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (157-260). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
 - 28 Boser, U. (2011). Teacher diversity matters: A state-by-state analysis of teachers of color. Center For American Progress. Retrieved from <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2011/11/09/10657/teacher-diversity-matters/>.
 - 29 Goldhaber, D., & Hansen, M. (2010). Race, gender, and teacher testing: How informative a tool is teacher licensure testing?. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(1), 218-251. Retrieved from <http://aer.sagepub.com/content/47/1/218.full.pdf>.
 - 30 Bireda, S. & Chait, R. (2011). Increasing teacher diversity: Strategies to improve the teacher workforce. Center For American Progress. Retrieved from: www.americanprogress.org.
 - 31 National Collaboration on Diversity in the Teaching Force. (2004). Assessment of diversity in America's teaching force: A call to action. Retrieved from <http://www.ate1.org/pubs/uploads/diversityreport.pdf>, 9.
 - 32 National Collaboration on Diversity in the Teaching Force (2004) and Bireda and Chait (2011).
 - 33 Bireda and Chait (2011), 30.
 - 34 Feistritzer, C.E. (2011). Profile of teachers in the U.S. 2011. National Center for Education Information. Retrieved from http://www.ncei.com/Profile_Teachers_US_2011.pdf.
 - 35 NCATE. (2010).
 - 36 Teacher Shortage Areas Nationwide Listing: 1990-1991 through 2012-2013. (April 2012). U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html>.
 - 37 Bushaw, W., Lopez, L. (2011). Betting on teachers: The 43rd annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan* 93(1), 8-26.
 - 38 American Federation of Teachers [AFT]. (2012), *Raising the bar: Aligning and elevating teacher preparation and the education profession*. Washington, D. C.: Author.
 - 39 Whitehurst, G. (2002). Strengthen teacher quality: Research on teacher preparation and professional development. White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers. U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/tchrqual/learn/preparingteachersconference/whitehurst.html>. NRC (2010)
 - 40 Auguste, B., Kihn, P., & Miller, M. (2010). Closing the talent gap: Attracting and retaining top-third graduates to careers in teaching: An international and market research-based perspective. McKinsey & Company. Retrieved from <http://mckinseysociety.com/closing-the-talent-gap/>
 - 41 Whitehurst, G. (2002).
 - 42 Levin, H. M. (1970). A cost-effectiveness analysis of teacher selection. *Journal of Human Resources*, 5(1), 24-33.
 - 43 Rockoff, J. E., Jacob, B. A., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2011). Can you recognize an effective teacher when you recruit one? *Education Finance and Policy*, 6(1), 43-74.
 - 44 Rockoff, J. E., Jacob, B. A., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2011), 43-74.
 - 45 Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(6), 1087-1101. Also see Haberman, M. (2000). What makes a teacher education program relevant preparation for teaching diverse students in urban poverty schools? (The Milwaukee Teacher Education Center Model). and Harding, H. (2012). Teach for America: Leading for change. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 58-61.
 - 46 Dobbie, W. (2011). Teacher characteristics and student achievement: Evidence from Teach for America. Harvard University. Retrieved from http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~dobbie/research/TeacherCharacteristics_July2011.pdf.
 - 47 Danielson, C. (2009). A framework for learning to teach. *Educational Leadership*, 66. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/summer09/vol66/num09/A-Framework-for-Learning-to-Teach.aspx>.
 - 48 Measures of Effective Teaching Project. (2010). Working with teachers to develop fair and reliable measures of effective teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.metproject.org/downloads/met-framing-paper.pdf>.
 - 49 Henry, T., et al. (2012). The effects of experience and attrition for novice high-school science and mathematics teachers. *Science*, 335, 1118-1121. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/335/6072/1118.full.pdf>.
 - 50 Noell, G., & Burns, J. (2006). Value-added assessment of teacher preparation: An illustration of emerging

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

- technology. *Journal of Teacher Education* Vol. 57, 37-50. Retrieved from <http://jte.sagepub.com/content/57/1/37.full.pdf+html>.
- 51 Whitehurst, G. (2002).
- 52 Johnson, S. (1980). Performance-based staff layoffs in the public schools: Implementation and outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 50(2), 214-233.
- Henry, T., et al. (2012).
- Noell, G., & Burns, J. (2006).
- Whitehurst, G. (2002).
- 53 NRC. (2010), and CCSSO. (2011).
- 54 CCSSO. (2011).
- 55 Danielson, C. (2009).
- 56 Note: Research has not definitively recognized a particular set of non-academic qualities that teachers should possess. There are numerous studies that list different characteristics, sometimes referring to similar characteristics by different labels. Furthermore, there does not seem to be a clear measure for these non-academic qualities, although a few of them have scales and other measures that have been developed. The CAEP Commission recognizes the on-going development of this knowledge base and recommends that CAEP revise criteria as evidence emerges.
- 57 See, for example, Rodgers, C. & Raider-Roth, M. (2006), Presence in teaching. *Teachers and teaching: Theory and Practice*, 12(3) 265-287. See also Barker, L. & Borko, H. (2011). Conclusion: Presence and the art of improvisational teaching. In Sawyer, R. K. (ed), *Structure and improvisation in creative teaching* (279-293). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 58 Joint project of Stanford University and AACTE to develop a preservice education "teacher performance assessment." See description at this URL: <http://edtpa.aacte.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/using-edTPA.pdf>.
- STANDARD 4: PROGRAM IMPACT
- 59 NRC. (2010).
- STANDARD 5: PROVIDER QUALITY, CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT, AND CAPACITY
- 60 Measures of Effective Teaching Project. (2013). Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET Project's three-year study. Retrieved from http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Ensuring_Fair_and_Reliable_Measures_Practitioner_Brief.pdf, 20.
- 61 The U.S. Department of Education, Code of Federal Regulations, 34 CFR 602 requires accreditors to include these resources, services, practices and communications in their standards.
- 62 Ruben, B. R. (2010). Excellence in higher education guide. An integrated approach to assessment, planning, and improvement in colleges and universities.
- Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers.
- Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. (2011). 2011-2012 Education criteria for performance excellence. Gaithersburg, MD: Author.
- 63 The use of "development" is based on InTASC's Standard #1: Learner Development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
- 64 NRC. (2010).
- Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L., & Lepage, P. (2005). In L. Darling-Hammond, & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world. What teachers should learn and be able to do* (1- 39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Conklin, H. G. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith, & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education*. (645-735). Mahwah, NJ: LEA.
- NCATE. (2010).
- 65 Ewell, P. (2012). Recent trends and practices in accreditation: Implications for the development of standards for CAEP. Washington, D.C.: CAEP.
- 66 Langley, G.L., Nolan, K.M., Nolan, T.W., Norman, C.L., & Provost, L.P. (2009) *The improvement guide: A practical approach to enhancing organizational performance* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- 67 Bryk, A.S., Gomez, L.M. & Grunow, A. (2010), *Getting ideas into action: Building networked improvement communities in education*, Stanford, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Essay retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/spotlight/webinar-bryk-gomez-building-networked-improvement-communities-in-education>.
- 68 Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. (2011). Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2010). *Handbook for periodic review reports*. Philadelphia, PA: Author.
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges. (2002) *Evidence guide. A guide to using evidence in the accreditation process: A resource to support institutions and evaluation teams*. Alameda, CA: Author.
- RECOMMENDATION ON ANNUAL REPORTING AND CAEP MONITORING
- 69 Ewell, Peter (2012).
- 70 NRC. (2010).



CCSSO RECOMMENDATIONS AND POLICY PROPOSAL FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LICENSURE

CCSSO 1 - States will revise and enforce licensure standards to support more demanding content and critical thinking standards.

A. Idaho is working to ensure that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline to advance learning of all students toward attainment of college and career readiness standards:

- a. Common Core implementation and effective instructional technology to support 21st century learning embedded in Framework for summative performance assessment of candidates. (CAEP 1.1 – 1.9)
- b. Pre-service standards for technology use, ELA across the curriculum and mathematical thinking created, and evidence of implementation will be a critical factor in ongoing state approval for the preparation of teachers (CAEP 1.1)

PROPOSED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION-DEEPER CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

- a. Degree must be in field of study, not a general teaching degree. (CAEP 1.1.)
 - Liberal Arts major for elementary
 - Major in content discipline required for secondary
 - No “education” majors so that candidates existed prior to certification will have a viable degree

B. Idaho is working to ensure that effective partnerships and high quality clinical practices are central to preparation; candidates develop the knowledge, skills and disposition necessary to demonstrate positive impact on student learning:

- a. Regular state review of clinical practice policies and quality of candidate experience will begin in 2014. (CAEP 2.1 & 2.2)
- b. Proof of Proficiency required for supervisors and cooperating teachers in order to effectively assess and guide candidate practice. (CAEP 2.2)
- c. Summative assessment with proof of minimum “basis” ranking to include review of growth on Student Learning Objectives. (CAEP 2.2)
- d. Selection process, criteria, training, proof of proficiency in effective teaching for cooperating teachers and supervisor faculty (CAEP 2.2)

PROPOSED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION- STRONGER CLINICAL PRACTICES

- e. Faculty/instructors must have practical experience in the field (perhaps Board action could include this as acceptable tenure track credit load). (CAEP 2.2)

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

- f. Faculty should be the supervisors, not adjuncts.
- g. Compensation to teachers in the field who provide the mentoring; revenue from extra fees charged to students in the program.

C. PROPOSED FOR CONSIDERATION – RIGOROUS PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

- a. Interviews of students prior to being admitted. CAEP 3.5 & 3.6)
- b. Disposition screening as a requirement (CAEP 3.5 & 3.6)
- c. GPA - May agree to 2.75 entrance standards into the program, but GPA within the program must be maintained at a standard of 3.0 or above; a pre-requisite for student teaching. (CAEP 3.4 & 3.6)

CCSSO 2 – States will influence the development of innovative licensure performance assessments that include multiple measures of performance and potential to impact student achievements and growth.

A. Idaho is developing measures to ensure that candidates can demonstrate impact on student learning, classroom instruction and the relevance of their preparation.

- a. In order for candidates to be recommended for certification, a summative assessment using the Framework must be successfully passed to include: proof of minimum “Basic” ranking across all four domains and a review of candidate impact on students achievement through growth, measured through Student Learning Objectives. (CAEP 4.1 & 4.2)
- b. Development of a professional development plan based on the summative assessment (Framework) to ensure on-going professional learning in order for candidates to be recommended for certification. (CAEP 4.1 & 4.2)

(Performance Assessment using the Framework for Teaching will be the foundation for an ongoing Individualized Professional Learning Plan. Data collected will be captured as part of the longitudinal data base on teacher performance and used as a measure of IHE performance. These processes are applicable to traditional or non-traditional preparation programs.)

CCSSO 3 –States will create multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a development continuum that reflects expectations and assessments that are linked to evidence of student achievement and growth.

A. Idaho is working toward the development of a multi-tiered system for certification

- a. Three year period of novice licensure that requires specified coursework and performance measures. (CAEP 4.3 & 4.4)
- b. Successful completion of the novice licensure phase, including verifiable teaching proficiency, will allow teachers to move on to full licensure. (CAEP 4.3 & 4.4)

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

- c. Required coursework during this period may include *Mathematical Thinking for Instruction, Literacy, and Problem Based Learning Strategies* to ensure *sustainable and successful integration of the common core*
 - i. Idaho- approved IHEs should be the designated as providers for this coursework, bridging the gap between pre-service and in-service and providing opportunities for IHEs to gather data on candidate and employer satisfaction
- d. Strengthens the connection between K-12 and Higher Ed and supports the critical concepts behind prolonged internships and mentoring. IHE involvement and oversight of professional development and formal performance assessments will inform teacher effectiveness data to be linked to student achievement data and prep program data. (CAEP 4.3 & 4.4)
- e. Idaho has developed Teacher Leader endorsements to support tiered structure.

CCSSO 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.

- A. Idaho will continue to work through the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement Committee with all states to inform processes.*

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPROVING EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

CCSSO 5 and 6 – States will hold preparation programs accountable by exercising the state’s authority to determine which programs should operate and recommend candidates for licensure, including establishing a clear and fair performance rating system *AND* States will adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards.

- A. Idaho is in the process of developing a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures is in place that informs continuous improvement and evaluates the effectiveness of its completers.*
 - a. First State Review to initiate 2-3 year cycle begins in fall 2014. Specific state reviews will be key in providing recommendations to the Professional Standards Commission for ongoing approval of Idaho teacher preparation programs. (CAEP 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
 - b. Data from the state longitudinal database matching student achievement with teacher performance by preparation program will be a significant factor in program approval. (CAEP 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
 - c. An updated training manual for Program Reviewers is currently in revision to ensure fidelity and consistency in reviewing individual programs across the state.

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

Teacher effectiveness measures and longitudinal data will link student achievement and back to preparation programs. (CAEP 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)

- d. Proposing that SBOE designated representatives may participate in state-specific program approval reviews to ensure that the unit is supporting faculty in meeting requirements. Once finalized, this process will be required of non-traditional preparation programs in addition to university programs.

CCSSO 7 - States will require alignment of content standards to PK-12 student standards for all areas in which candidates seek licensure areas.

- A. Current Professional Standards Commission practice ensures that a minimum of 20% of the P-12 Standards are reviewed annually to ensure alignment.*

CCSSO 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. Idaho is working toward linking student achievement back to preparation programs, but other sources of data and support are to be determined according to resources.*

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND REPORTING

CCSSO 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.

- A. Idaho has developed a longitudinal data system with the capability of reporting across the PK-20 continuum*
 - a. Idaho proposes consistent assessment of, and longitudinal data from, all teachers whether traditionally or non-traditionally prepared.*
- B. Idaho intends to continue the work with other states on sharing information*
 - a. The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification will be drafting recommendations for the 2015 iteration of the Interstate Agreement signed by all but 4 states. In October 2012, The Executive Board agreed to make it a goal for 2013 to gather feedback related to common preparation standards for initial licensure to determine how these might also become a part of the next revision of the Agreement. These recommendations*

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 18, 2013**

will be incorporated into the draft 2015-2020 agreement and presented at the 2014 Conference.

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

- A. Idaho is working toward developing a *quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures is in place that informs continuous improvement and evaluates the effectiveness of its completers.***
- a. Reporting/Accountability - Idaho has a plan in place to collect multiple measures of candidate effectiveness and track ongoing improvement within preparation programs. The next step is to apply the same metric to non-traditional providers.
 - b. A template or "Report Card" will be developed and required of each preparation program approved in Idaho to ensure transparency. (CAEP 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK