# Increasing Accountability for Teacher Preparation Programs

SREB

*"Every student is taught by qualified teachers."*

SREB *Challenge to Lead* Goals for Education

The need to ensure that teacher preparation programs are producing quality teachers has long existed, but the passage of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001,* requiring a "highly qualified" teacher in every classroom, has raised the stakes for most states. Today, states need to assess not only the knowledge and skills of graduates of teacher preparation programs, but also the graduates' ability to improve student academic performance.

## The Call for Accountability

SREB's *Challenge to Lead* Goals for Education call for states "to examine the performance measures and standards used to assess teachers and programs." Since the 1980s, SREB has advocated that states strengthen evaluation and accountability for such programs. In addition, the notable increase in the number of teaching certificates issued through alternative routes has made the inclusion of such programs in state accountability plans essential. This report identifies what SREB states are doing to respond to increased pressure for sound accountability systems and to ensure that alternative programs are producing qualified teachers for our schools.

Currently, all 16 SREB states have an accountability system for their teacher preparation programs. These systems vary in part by where accountability lies (with the entire institution or the school of education), by graduate performance criteria and by steps taken in the accountability process. (See the Table, Pages 3-5.)

Where accountability lies remains a major focus of debate. **SREB has long insisted that the entire college or university, not just the school of education, should be accountable for teacher preparation.** Six SREB states — Alabama, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina and Texas — hold colleges and universities responsible for producing quality graduates of teacher preparation programs. Other states should set similar policies.

Regarding graduate performance criteria, the rigor of the licensure tests and the low scores needed to pass in many states continue to be an issue. Most states now specify pass rates of between 80 percent and 90 percent on teacher licensure tests as a key indicator in state program approval. A number of states go beyond test scores to include additional criteria. Alabama,

December 2006

Southern Regional Education Board

592 10th St. N.W.
Atlanta, GA 30318
(404) 875-9211
www.sreb.org

This report was compiled by Jenny Jackson, research associate, Educational Policies. For more information, call (404) 875-9211 or e-mail jenny.jackson@sreb.org.

Kentucky and South Carolina require that on-the-job evaluations of beginning teachers be used as part of each state's program accountability system. Kentucky also requires an average pass rate on the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program. Florida requires graduates to show demonstration of all 12 of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. Louisiana has taken a large step forward with plans to evaluate the achievement of students taught by all graduates of teacher preparation programs and to conduct satisfaction surveys of alternative program completers and teaching mentors. States should move to link student progress with teacher preparation programs. (See the Table.)

The steps taken for programs whose graduates do not meet state standards are key to each state's accountability system. All SREB states provide some form of assistance to at-risk and low-performing programs and impose sanctions on those that do not respond to assistance. In recent years, several states have increased the pressure for programs to make improvements and have intensified program evaluation standards. Alabama has cut the time allowed for low-performing programs to improve from three years to two. Schools of education in Kentucky must now score higher on the state's Quality Performance Index to avoid being labeled at-risk or low-performing. **State leaders should ask for information about which teacher preparation programs in their state are identified as at-risk or low-performing, what assistance these programs receive, and whether such assistance is helping these programs improve.**

Improving the existing system of accountability should continue to be part of each SREB state's efforts to improve teacher education. However, the growing popularity of alternative programs now requires each state to broaden the scope of accountability. As recently as 10 years ago, most teachers in SREB states were trained in traditional teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities, although these programs did not produce enough graduates in some subject areas to meet state needs. Many SREB states developed alternative programs, especially to attract more teachers in subject-shortage areas such as mathematics and science. Alternative certification programs have evolved as a way to attract experienced professionals into the field of teaching, focusing on those who hold at least a bachelor's degree. In the past five years alone, many SREB states have nearly doubled the number of teaching licenses issued to persons who completed alternative programs. Kentucky and Texas have more than tripled their numbers.

Given the dramatic increase in the number of teachers earning licensure through alternative programs, it is essential that SREB states establish accountability measures for these programs to ensure that their outcome standards are equivalent to those of traditional programs. This does not mean that the preparation should be the same, but those who complete the programs ultimately should meet the same standards. States such as Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Tennessee and Texas evaluate graduates of alternative programs. Maryland is currently developing a system for assessing alternative teacher preparation programs.

Accountability systems for teacher preparation programs, both traditional and alternative, are critical to states' efforts to produce quality teachers for all students. Education leaders and policy-makers in SREB states must continue to push for university-wide accountability, rigorous graduate performance criteria, effective assistance strategies for programs in need, and continued research into what makes a teacher preparation program effective.

## Questions you should ask:

- What level of knowledge is needed to pass your state's licensure/certification test?
- Is your state accountability system for teacher preparation programs meeting state needs by ensuring the required number of quality teachers in all disciplines?
- Are your alternative teacher preparation program graduates held to the same standards as graduates of traditional programs?
- Does your accountability process identify programs in need of assistance, and is that assistance effective in improving teacher preparation programs?

## Accountability Systems for Teacher Preparation Programs in SREB States

| State<br>*Accountability Lies With . . .* | Graduate Performance Criteria † | Steps in Accountability Process |
|---|---|---|
| **Alabama** *<br>*Entire institution* | • Each graduate's performance on the Professional Educator Performance Evaluation (PEPE)<br>• Satisfaction surveys of superintendents, principals and graduates | **Institutions graded on an A-F scale:**<br>• No action for A or B grade<br>• C, D or F grade:<br>Unit must develop and submit improvement plan;<br>Candidate notification;<br>Recommendation to rescind approval of unit if grade is not raised to at least a B within two years of improvement plan implementation<br>**Individual programs graded on an A-F scale:**<br>• No action for A, B or C grade<br>• D or F grade:<br>Recommendation to rescind program that receives a grade of D or F for two consecutive years |
| **Arkansas** *<br>*School of education* | • 80% pass rates on Praxis I and II | **Low-performing:** Fails to meet three program quality and/or graduate performance criteria<br>• External assistance<br>• Technical assistance as needed |
| **Delaware** *<br>*School of education* | None | **Provisional approval:** Based on review of school's portfolio of program quality assessments<br>**Disapproval:** Based on review of portfolio<br>• Final report of areas for improvement<br>• External assistance |
| **Florida** *<br>*School of education* | • Demonstrated mastery on all parts of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination<br>• Satisfactory demonstration of all 12 of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices | Approval status determined through a program-by-program state approval process:<br>• Institutions are approved, conditionally approved or denied during an on-site visit every year.<br>• Institutional performance evaluation plans are submitted periodically for review between each site visit.<br>• External assistance<br>• Peer-reviewed process |
| **Georgia** *<br>*School of education* | • 80% pass rate on GACE<br>• Administrator satisfaction surveys | **At-risk:** Based on annual review of program quality and graduate performance criteria<br>**Low-performing:** Institution with at-risk status for three years |

## Accountability Systems for Teacher Preparation Programs in SREB States (continued)

| State<br>*Accountability Lies With . . .* | Graduate Performance Criteria [+] | Steps in Accountability Process |
|---|---|---|
| Kentucky *<br>*School of education* | Quality Performance Index, calculated by weighing three performance measures:<br>• Annual summary Praxis II pass rate<br>• Overall mean score on the Kentucky Educator Preparation Program new teacher survey<br>• Three-year average pass rate on the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program | Each institution's Quality Performance Index is calculated similarly to a student's grade-point average, with 4.0 the maximum score.<br>• A score of 4.0 to 3.5 indicates "excellent" performance.<br>• A score of 3.49 to 3.0 indicates "satisfactory" performance.<br>• A score of 2.99 to 2.75 indicates "at-risk of low performance" and identifies the educator preparation unit as "at-risk of low performing."<br>• A score of less than 2.75 indicates "low performance" and identifies the educator preparation unit as "low performing." |
| Louisiana *<br>*Entire institution* | A Performance Score is calculated by weighing three performance measures:<br>• Institutional Performance: Pass rates on Praxis I and II of traditional and alternative program completers, a satisfaction survey of traditional graduates, and (by 2007-2008) a satisfaction survey of alternative program completers, plus a satisfaction survey of the students' mentors regarding both alternative and regular program completers<br>• Quantity: Includes total number of graduates, number of racial minorities who complete programs and number of graduates in shortage areas, plus (by 2008-2009) a University-District Partnership: achievement of students taught by all graduates as measured by the Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model | Corrective Action, based on Performance Score<br>Level 1: At-risk programs only<br>• $10,000 grant for faculty development; use determined by university and Board of Regents (BOR) at all levels<br>• External assistance<br>• Public reporting of actions and progress<br>• Satisfactory within two years; otherwise, move to Level 2<br>Level 2:<br>• $10,000 grant for faculty development<br>• BOR will not approve new programs in any college of the university that offers courses to teacher education majors.<br>• Satisfactory within one year; otherwise, move to Level 3<br>Level 3: Low-performing institutions begin at Level 3.<br>• $10,000 grant for faculty development<br>• University-funded external assistance<br>• Student notification<br>• Low-performing: Satisfactory within two years; At-risk: Satisfactory within one year; otherwise, move to Level 4<br>Level 4:<br>• State approval of teacher preparation program denied<br>• Enrolled students may complete program; university must help students who want to transfer to approved institutions<br>After one year of planning, BOR and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education may approve reconstitution |
| Maryland *<br>*Entire institution* | • 80% pass rate on Praxis | **At-risk and low-performing:** Program approval on probation<br>• State monitoring and assistance<br>• Must be fully approved within two years |
| Mississippi *<br>*School of education* | • 80% pass rate on Praxis II<br>• Satisfaction surveys of administrators and graduates | **Approved With Reservation:** Less than 80% satisfactory<br>• Three-year plan of improvement<br>• External assistance |

## Accountability Systems for Teacher Preparation Programs in SREB States (continued)

| State<br>*Accountability Lies With . . .* | Graduate Performance Criteria + | Steps in Accountability Process |
|---|---|---|
| North Carolina *<br>*Entire institution* | • 70% pass rate on Praxis II<br>• 70% favorable rating on satisfaction surveys of employers and graduates | **Low-performing:** Fails three program quality and/or graduate performance criteria in one year, the same criterion twice in three years, or one criterion per year for three years<br>• Improvement plan<br>• External assistance |
| Oklahoma *<br>*School of education* | • 80% pass rate on Oklahoma Professional Education Competency Examination, which includes general education, subject area and professional teacher tests | **At-risk:** Determined through state approval process<br>• External assistance<br>**Low-performing:** Less than 80% pass rate for three years<br>• Accreditation revoked |
| South Carolina *<br>*Entire institution* | • 80% pass rates on Praxis II and on Principles of Teaching and Learning exam<br>• Graduates' performance on the Assisting, Developing and Evaluating Professional Teaching (ADEPT) beginning teacher evaluation | **At-risk:** Fails to meet one program quality or graduate performance criterion<br>**Low-performing:** Fails to meet two or more program quality and/or graduate performance criteria |
| Tennessee *<br>*School of education* | • 70% pass rate on Praxis II | **At-risk:** Pass rate between 70% and 80%<br>**Low-performing:** Pass rate below 70%<br>• External assistance<br>• Year 1: Temporary probation<br>• Year 2: Revocation of state accreditation |
| Texas [1]<br>*Entire institution* | • Initial pass rate of 70% (by Dec. 31 following completion) or final pass rate of 80% (by second Dec. 31 following completion) on Texas licensure tests | **Low-performing:** Failure to meet pass rates<br>• External assistance for up to three years<br>• After three years of failure to meet pass rates, school is no longer allowed to prepare candidates<br>• Spring 2007: Accountability ratings will be specific to discipline/grade level |
| Virginia *<br>*School of education* | • 70% pass rate on Praxis II | **At-risk:** Approval with stipulations in state review process<br>**Low-performing:** Year 2 of approval with stipulations. After Year 2 of low-performing status, school must be recommended either for approval or denial of accreditation |
| West Virginia *<br>*School of education* | • 80% pass rate on Praxis II (The state plans to raise this to a 90% pass rate.) | **Low-performing:** Fewer than 90% of students complete program for three consecutive years<br>• External assistance |

Note: Many states use The Praxis Series™ Assessments as part of their teacher certification process. Praxis I is a general test of reading, mathematics and writing skills; Praxis II tests cover knowledge of specific content areas. Because states set different passing scores, rates cannot be compared state to state.

+ State accountability systems traditionally include indicators of program quality (such as student entrance requirements and clinical experiences). To these systems, most states have added graduate performance criteria — measures of graduates' knowledge and of their performance during the first year of teaching. (The term "graduates" in this table includes those who complete programs.)

* State uses National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards and/or a partnership with NCATE for program accreditation. Some colleges and universities are accredited by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council.

[1] Texas is currently in the beginning stages of discussing a new partnership agreement with NCATE.

Sources: Title II teacher preparation reports, state departments of education and higher education agencies. Compiled by SREB staff, November 2006.

# Best Practices in the States

The following state-level examples from California, Louisiana, Ohio and Virginia illustrate a variety of approaches that address the issues identified in the national survey. They describe collaborations among state departments of education, universities and university systems, teacher preparation programs, and state and local school districts focused on the development of systems to gather data to improve teaching and learning.

Although each of the state efforts is unique, there are clear commonalities among them: (1) they are all structured as partnerships; (2) they propose to gather data to inform teacher preparation and promote improvement in P-12 student performance; and (3) they are supported by funds dedicated to studying the preparation and effectiveness of teachers. Extensive descriptions of these examples are available in Appendix A.

## California

The California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees launched systemwide efforts to improve teacher preparation in a policy titled *CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers* in 1999. In 2001 each CSU campus participated in the first Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs, an ongoing evaluation that provides data about the quality of the programs each year.

To implement the evaluation, CSU developed a Mosaic of Teacher Preparation Outcomes. In the mosaic, each tile represents a complex set of results that should be viewed as interconnected with each other. If the results of preparation are measured and assessed, the evidence will contribute to a comprehensive, accurate understanding of accomplishments as well as identify areas of concern.

The evaluation consists of six interrelated sets of outcomes that together provide a detailed picture of program quality and effectiveness.

**Outcome One** focuses on the intrinsic qualities of each program as reported by graduates when they finish the program. As candidates complete their teacher preparation programs, they are invited to participate in an exit survey. The survey contains a set of base questions, and campus administrators have the opportunity to add questions and access data in real time.

**Outcome Two** is the effectiveness of a program in terms of the level of each graduate's preparation as reported by the graduates during their first few years of K-12 classroom teaching. To compile evidence about the effectiveness of all CSU credential programs, the graduate survey attempts to include all of the programs' graduates one and three years after they complete their preparation.

**Outcome Three** is the effectiveness of a program as reported by the job-supervisors of graduates during their first years of teaching. CSU invites the school-site supervisors of teaching graduates to answer evaluation questions. Unlike most follow-up studies of this type, this survey provides each supervisor with the name of the first-year teacher who is guided and assisted by that supervisor, and whose preparation is to be assessed by the supervisor.

**Outcome Four** is the program's impact on teaching competence as reflected in an assessment that is a technically sound measure of teaching performance. Beginning in 2008-09, each candidate for a teaching credential will have to pass a teaching performance assessment in order to be recommended for a teaching credential. As a result, CSU and other teacher preparation institutions in California are gearing up to implement assessments that are more uniform, valid and reliable.

**Outcome Five** examines the retention of CSU graduates in teaching. The CSU has two studies in progress focused on teacher persistence in the profession. The first is a large-scale analysis of retention and attrition patterns among California's K-12 public school teachers. The second is an

analysis of state data on employment patterns among graduates of CSU teacher preparation programs.

**Outcome Six** examines the effects of teacher preparation on the learning gains of K-12 pupils who are taught by CSU graduates. CSU has formed partnerships with seven large school districts to provide pupil data linked to data about teachers, schools, and CSU programs. Using a value-added approach, the evaluation will sort out the impact of: (a) different levels of preparation among teachers; (b) substantively different methods of learning to teach; and (c) the demographic qualities and socio-economic conditions of schools.

### Where It Is Now?

These outcomes are examined or are scheduled to be examined as part of the Systemwide Evaluation. CSU has fully implemented the surveys and the first retention study. Teacher performance assessment and K-12 student learning gains, along with the second retention study, will be incorporated into the evaluation beginning in 2007-08.

## Louisiana

A Blue Ribbon Commission was developed by the Governor, Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Board of Regents in 1999 to identify strategies to effectively recruit, prepare, retain, and support teachers in Louisiana. The Commission was composed of state leaders, higher education representatives, K-12 representatives, business leaders, and parents. The Commission created a report with four major recommendations and 60 individual actions to improve student achievement. A grant from the U.S. Department of Education was awarded to implement activities from 2000–2005 and create a systemic state teacher quality initiative.

There were four major objectives for the initiative:

- coordinate new and existing partnerships between state agencies, universities, and districts to work together for improved teacher quality and student achievement;

- improve recruitment of qualified and certified teachers, particularly in teacher shortage areas;
- prepare teachers who possess in-depth content knowledge and effective teaching skills; and
- create environments and conditions that support and retain highly effective preservice teachers, new teachers, experienced teachers, and principals.

To address these objectives, the stakeholders created partnerships and policies to change the state's certification structure, created a new alternate certification structure, required all new teachers to undergo ongoing professional development, and mandated changes pertaining to the redesign of teacher preparation programs and the implementation of a new Teacher Preparation Accountability System.

Through the partnerships and policies, all public and private universities in Louisiana are measured by four levels of teacher preparation effectiveness:

**Effectiveness of Planning**

All universities were required to redesign their teacher preparation programs to address the new certification requirements for teachers. Each university formed teams composed of College of Education faculty, College of Arts/Sciences faculty, and PK-12 school faculty to redesign the curriculum. All teams had to align their teacher preparation programs with PK-12 state/national content standards, PK-12 state/national teacher standards, PRAXIS expectations, and NCATE expectations. External evaluators were hired to evaluate all redesigned teacher preparation programs to ensure quality across campuses.

**Effectiveness of Implementation**

All universities were required to develop a comprehensive assessment system to examine the ongoing performance of their candidates while participating in the teacher preparation programs. All universities were required to be accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

**Effectiveness of Impact**

A new Teacher Preparation Accountability System that generated a Teacher Preparation Performance Score for each institution was implemented in 2002. An Institutional Performance Index and a Quantity Index were calculated by the state to determine each Teacher Preparation Performance Score. Indicators for the Institutional Performance Index were passage rates of university program completers on the PRAXIS examinations and survey ratings of first year teachers pertaining to the effectiveness of universities in preparing new teachers to address the state's standards for teachers.

**Effectiveness of Growth in Student Learning**

A Value Added Teacher Preparation Program Model was developed and pilot-tested that predicts increases in academic achievement of students based on demographic variables and previous achievement, assesses actual increases in student achievement from one year to the next year, and identifies teacher preparation effectiveness values for each teacher preparation program based upon the increases in achievement of students taught by each university's new teachers.

### Where Is It now?

All university system presidents are required to report to the state legislature annually on the progress of improving the quality of teachers. All universities are now using the Professional Accountability Support System as a comprehensive system to assess their candidates. During 2004–2005, the Teacher Preparation Performance Scores were rated as exemplary at 14 out of 19 universities, an increase from two universities at the initial rating. During 2005–2006, the model is being piloted using grades four–nine achievement data from students in 68 school districts. In addition, qualitative researchers are investigating factors that may impact the teacher preparation effectiveness values generated by the Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model.

## Ohio

A unique statewide initiative, launched in 2003, is the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP), a comprehensive, longitudinal study of the preparation,

in-school support and effectiveness of Ohio teachers. As a research consortium of Ohio's 50 colleges and universities providing teacher preparation programs, the partnership is identifying how the preparation and development of new teachers affect their success in the classroom as measured by the academic performance of their students.

The partnership began through the impetus of two commissions (the Commission for Student Success and the Commission on Teaching Success) convened by Ohio Governor Taft. Among the recommendations of both commissions was the need to collect better data about new and practicing teacher performance and concomitant influence on student achievement. As a direct result of the commissions' conclusions, with support from the Ohio Board of Regents, the Ohio Department of Education, as well as private corporations, all of Ohio's colleges and universities joined together to create the Ohio Partnership of Accountability (now called the Ohio Teacher Quality Partnership).

The Ohio TQP research has four main aims:

- to determine and document how variables of teacher attributes, teacher preparation, induction experiences, and professional development relate to student learning;
- to identify the salient features of differently configured teacher education programs and to determine how they affect teacher development longitudinally along the continuum of teacher preparation;
- to identify how teachers' work relates to features of teacher preparation programs and student achievement as measured by value-added modeling, to assess novice teacher performance through value-added modeling, and to then track strengths and weaknesses back to the initial preparation programs; and
- to understand the unique elements of effective teaching for experienced teachers who are clearly adding value in terms of student achievement and to compare the achievement level of teachers licensed through both alternative and traditional pathways.

TQP is conducting five interrelated studies: (1) a five-year study that follows students preparing to become K-12 mathematics and English/

language arts teachers; (2) a novice teacher study focusing on student learning for new teacher education graduates as measured by value-added modeling, as well as other measures of student achievement; (3) an alternative licensure study examining how teachers licensed through alternative as opposed to traditional pathways perform in terms of affecting K-12 student achievement; (4) an experienced teacher study examining the classroom practices, the school climate and leadership, and the support received to determine if differences might be identified in the classrooms of high-value-added teachers; and (5) a study to examine the interaction between and among identified variables to better predict models of teacher development through the first three years of teaching, using structural equation modeling.

### Where Is It Now?

The design phase of TQP is complete and implementation of all strands is underway. The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), developed at the University of Virginia by Robert Pianta, is being used to observe Ohio's novice teachers (one–three years) and experienced teachers (eight–20 years). Survey data is currently reported back to institutions.

## Virginia

With funding from the U.S. Department of Education, the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE), the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV), and the Virginia Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (VACTE) have embarked upon a collaborative effort to develop a comprehensive data system that will expand the capacity of Virginia's college and university teacher education programs. The project, VITAL—Virginia Improves Teaching and Learning—(formerly known as the Teacher Education and Licensure [TEAL] System II), is a new longitudinal data system designed to provide key information to educators and policymakers who are responsible for preparation, licensure, employment, retention, and support of successful pre-K-12 teachers in the Commonwealth. VITAL serves as a major vehicle for improving teacher education programs; accountability and accreditation processes; informing policy and funding decisions; and furthering understanding of teacher development and effectiveness.

A 15-member steering committee oversees and advises all phases of the project. Members of the committee include VACTE representatives from two- and four-year public and private institutions, representatives from private industry, SCHEV, VDOE, and the Virginia Community College System.

VITAL is a comprehensive system designed to include all candidates in teacher preparation programs in Virginia, including those enrolled in nontraditional or alternative routes, such as the Virginia Career Switcher Alternative Route to Licensure Program. All practicing teachers in the Commonwealth also will be asked to participate in VITAL, providing important information about teacher development throughout their careers. Many school administrators will contribute to VITAL by evaluating outcomes of teacher preparation and partnership programs and describing mentorship programs in their divisions.

The VITAL system will:

- Track newly admitted teacher education program students longitudinally through completion of their programs, through required testing and application for licensure in Virginia, and through employment in a Virginia public school.
- Survey all teacher education graduates and their public school employers regarding the quality of the teacher preparation they received.
- Track the college and university courses and degrees that teachers take as part of their professional development activities.

The VITAL project will be conducted in the following four phases. The data will eventually be connected to other state databases:

**Phase One**

Teacher Pipeline Application, a Web-based data entry and management tool that provides basic reports, includes students enrolled in all/any types of teacher education programs, and integrates with SCHEV's existing data warehouse. The initial data procedures of this part of VITAL have been constructed and tested, and have been favorably reviewed by the steering committee.

**Phase Two**

Teacher Education Outcomes consists of a collection of surveys at various points in a student's educational and professional experience. Specific surveys, including expectations and plans will be conducted at the beginning of each term, at the end of the student's program of study, during student teaching, and at one, five, and ten years after the student enters the teaching profession.

**Phase Three**

School Descriptors/Performance Data includes integration of the Common Core of Data and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) from the National Center for Educational Statistics with other locally-developed qualitative indicators of school environment, such as wealth levels, crime rates, student diversity profiles, family environments, economic profiles, and community profiles.

**Phase Four**

Reporting, Analysis and Systems Support/Documentation phase will provide standard reports for each group of users, as well as dynamic (ad-hoc) reporting. Under the direction of the Research Division of SCHEV, the creation of restricted use licensing protocols and downloadable analysis files with the data altered/withheld for privacy protection also will be permitted.

VITAL is being designed to be a robust repository of research data. Once VITAL has been completed, the VDOE, SCHEV, teacher preparation programs in Virginia, and, with appropriate privacy safeguards, other investigators, will be able to conduct research that focuses on issues of teacher supply and teacher preparation quality.

## Where Is It Now?

Implementation of VITAL began in the fall of 2006. The system is operated and managed by SCHEV.

# TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONTD)

| QUESTIONS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| ***Phase-in Schedule of Indicators***<br><br>2. When will the indicators be integrated into the formula to calculate Teacher Preparation Performance Scores? | Not all indicators will be available for the system at the same time. As a result, the system will start with a limited number of variables, add some the second and third years, and reach its final state in 2004-2005. Because all indicators will be appropriately indexed, a programs score in one year will be comparable to that of previous years even though the previous years= scores contained only a subset of the indicators. A phase-in schedule has been provided below:<br><br>2001-2002 (a) Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests. (2000-2001 traditional and alternative program completers)<br><br>2002-2003 In addition to the above indicator for 2001-2002 program completers, phase-in the following indicators:<br>(a) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers (2001-2002 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort).<br>(b) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in *critical certification shortage areas* and number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in *critical rural district shortage areas* (2001-2002 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort).<br>(c) Number of *racial minority* and *teaching minority* traditional and alternate certification program completers (2001-2002 program completer cohort).<br>(d) Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their traditional teacher preparation programs to prepare them for their first year of teaching (2001-2002 traditional certification program completer cohort)<br><br>2003-2004 In addition to the above indicators for 2002-2003 program completers, phase-in the following indicators:<br>(a) Ratings by building level assessors of first year teachers regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs to prepare new teachers (2002-2003 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort).<br>(b) Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their alternate certification programs to prepare them for their first year of teaching (2002-2003 alternate certification program completer cohort).<br><br>2004-2005 In addition to the above indicators for 2003-2004 program completers, phase-in the following indicators:<br>(a) Retention of program completers at the end of their third year of teaching (2000-2001 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort).<br>(b) Achievement of growth targets of Professional Development Schools.<br><br>Future Cycle Phase in K-12 student achievement data. |

Identifies other data elements that could be included in the site visit process - a ~~total~~ score could inform approval decision (Louisiana)

# TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONTD)

| QUESTIONS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| ***Definitions of Indicators*** | ***a. Critical Shortages*** |
| 3. How will specific indicators be defined? | *Critical Certification Shortage:* A *critical certification shortage* will be the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers reported to the BOR who meet all program and state requirements to be certified to teach in the following areas: Biology, General Science, Chemistry, Physics, Mild/Moderate Special Education, Mathematics, and grades 4-8 certification.<br><br>*Critical Rural District Shortage:* The *critical rural district shortage* will be the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who select to teach in the following rural school districts who have the greatest percentage of uncertified teachers: Red River; East Feliciana; St. Helena; Madison; and Assumption.<br><br>The sum will be a "duplicated" count, meaning, for example, that someone coded both as "Mathematics" and teaching in "Red River School District" would count as two, not one.<br><br>***b. Number of Minority Graduates***<br><br>*Racial Minority:* A *racial minority* will be the sum of the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who take the PRAXIS exams, as reported by ETS, coded as any of the following:<br><br>(1) African-American.<br>(2) Asian-American.<br>(3) Hispanic.<br>(4) Native American.<br>(5) Pacific Islander.<br><br>*Teaching Minority*: A *teaching minority* will be the sum of the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who take the PRAXIS exams, as reported by ETS, coded as any of the following:<br><br>(1) Male and taking the "Early Childhood Education" test OR (2) Male and taking the "Elementary Education" test.<br><br>The sum will be a "duplicated" count, meaning, for example, that someone coded both as "African-American" and "male taking the Early Childhood Education test" would count as two, not one.<br><br>***c. Rating by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs***<br><br>A survey was developed and field-tested during spring of 2001 with 1999-2000 program completers and fall 2001 with 2000-2001 program completers. The survey examines teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of their programs in preparing them for their first year of teaching in a school setting. This survey will be administered to all teachers who complete a program the previous year and teach in a public school in Louisiana during the next year. Standards have been established for scores on the survey and raw scores are converted to a Teacher Survey Index. |

# TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONTD)

| QUESTIONS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| ***Definitions of Indicators***<br><br>3. How will specific indicators be defined? (Contd) | ***d. Rating by building level mentors of the quality of the preparation of first year teachers***<br><br>The survey will be completed by building level mentors that will be observing and assisting first year teachers in public schools throughout the state. This survey will contain questions that examine mentors' perceptions of the effectiveness of teachers programs in preparing teachers for their first year of teaching. Once standards have been established for scores on the survey, raw scores will be converted to an Assessor Survey Index.<br><br>***e. Retention of teachers***<br><br>The retention rate of teachers will be calculated by examining the number of program completers who are teaching in a Louisiana school three years after graduation, divided by the number of completers who started teaching in a Louisiana school the fall after graduation less the number who have moved out of state. |
| ***Formula to Calculate Full Teacher Preparation Performance Scores***<br><br>4. How will the overall Teacher Preparation Performance Score be calculated? | A key component of the Teacher Preparation Accountability System is *single composite scores* for individual universities, called *Teacher Preparation Performance Scores.* The calculation of these scores will be based upon a formula that examines how well universities perform on each of the indicators.<br><br>2002-2003 & 2003-2004: The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity and the average index for Institutional Performance divided by two.<br><br>Teacher Preparation Performance Score = (Teacher Quantity Index + Institutional Performance Index) / 2<br><br>2004 -2005: The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity, the average index for Institutional Performance, and the average index for Authentic University-District Partnerships divided by three.<br><br>Teacher Preparation Performance Score = (Teacher Quantity Index + Institutional Performance Index + University-District Partnership Index) / 3 |

# TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONTD)

| QUESTIONS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| ***Teacher Quantity Index***<br><br>5. How will a Teacher Quantity Index be calculated? | The Board of Regents approved a goal of a 15% increase in program completers beyond a Baseline Score as a target for universities to achieve an "A+" status for quantity. The 15% goal was jointly determined by members of the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education based upon percentage of uncertified teachers in the State and the anticipated capacity of universities to increase quantity.<br><br>It was determined that the increase could be exhibited by increasing the overall number of program completers each year or increasing the diversity of the completers (e.g., certification shortage, rural shortage, racial minorities, and teaching minorities).<br><br>System heads may require all institutions to increase by the same percentage, or they may adjust the degree of increase at individual institutions and require one institution to demonstrate a greater level of increase (e.g., 18%) and another institution to demonstrate a lower level of increase (12%) based upon the institution's capacity to increase. An overall 15% increase will be required for the total system. Individual public universities will have the right to present information to their system boards if they feel that the program completer target set for their institution is not appropriate. A 15% increase in the percentage of program completers has been established for all private universities who wish to participate in the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.<br><br>A Baseline Score will be calculated for each institution by determining the total number of regular and alternate certification students who completed the teacher preparation programs during the time period of July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001. This cohort was selected due to their completion immediately after the approval of the Teacher Preparation Accountability System by the Board of Regents and due to their scores being used to assign grades to institutions during April 2002 for passage of the PRAXIS examinations. The baseline will remain constant until the Teacher Preparation Accountability System is reexamined for 2005-2006.<br><br>A Quantity Score will be calculated for each institution by assigning one point to every regular and alternate certification program completer during a year. One-half a point will also be assigned for every program completer during that year that fits the definitions for: critical certification shortages, critical rural district shortages, racial minorities, and teaching minorities. The total number of program completers will be added to the bonus points to determine the Quantity Score<br><br>Quantity Score = Program Completers + (.5 * [Certification Shortage + Rural Shortage + Racial Minority + Teaching Minority])<br><br>The Quantity Score will be compared to the Baseline Score to determine the percentage of increase or decrease and the assigned grade.<br><br>A+ +15% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score (*Scaled Scores*: 125+)<br>A +5% to +14% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score (*Scaled Scores*: 100-124.9)<br>B -3% to +4% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score (*Scaled Scores*: 80-99.9)<br>C -4% to -15% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score (*Scaled Scores*: 50-79.9)<br>Below C -16% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score (*Scaled Scores*: 0-49.9)<br><br>Standard scores will be assigned to all percentages to create a Teacher Quantity Index for each institution. |

# TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONTD)

| QUESTIONS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| ***Institutional Performance Index***<br><br>6. How will the Institutional Performance Index be calculated? | Regression analysis will be used to convert individual values to individual scaled scores for each index.<br><br>***Certification Index***<br><br>Grades and specific scaled scores will be assigned to institutions based upon the overall percentage of program completers who passed the PRAXIS examinations. The grades and corresponding percentage ranges and scaled scores ranges are the following:<br><br>***Grades*** / ***Percentages*** / ***Scaled Scores***<br>A+ / 98%-100% / 125+<br>A / 92%-97% / 100-124<br>B / 87%-91% / 80-99<br>C / 80%-86% / 50-79<br>Below C / 0%-79% / 0-49<br><br>***Graduate Satisfaction Index***<br><br>Grades and specific scaled scores will be assigned to specific mean scores from surveys administered during the fall of each year to first year teachers who completed their programs the previous year. Teachers will use a 1 to 4 point scale to respond to questions pertaining to their preparation to teach within schools. The grades and corresponding ranges for mean scores and scaled score are the following:<br><br>***Grades*** / ***Means*** / ***Scaled Scores***<br>A+ / 128 and above / 125+<br>A / 117.0-127.9 / 100-124<br>B / 107.0- 116.9 / 80-99<br>C / 93.0 – 106.9 / 50-79<br>Below C / 0-92.9 / 0-49<br><br>***Assessor Survey Index and Retention Index***<br><br>Grades and scaled scores will be determined in the future.<br><br>***Institutional Performance Index***<br><br>The formula that will be used to calculate the Institutional Performance Index will be the following:<br><br>Institutional Performance Index = (Certification Index + Graduate Satisfaction Index + Assessor Survey Index + Retention Index) / 4 |

# TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONTD)

| QUESTIONS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| ***Less Than 10 Program Completers***<br><br>7. Will data be used if there are less than 10 program completers? | If data is available for less than 10 program completers at an institution during a given year, two consecutive years of data will be used to determine an average score. If two consecutive years of data are not available, the specific variable will not be integrated into the accountability formula until the data are available. |
| ***Labels for Teacher Preparation Programs***<br><br>8. How will labels be assigned to Teacher Preparation Programs? | The labels listed below will only be assigned to the overall Teacher Preparation Performance Score. However, individual grades will be assigned to the Quantity Index and Institutional Performance Index.<br><br>The Teacher Preparation Performance Scores will range from 0 to beyond 100, with a score of 100-124.9 indicating that a university possesses a High Performing program. All universities will be expected to achieve a Teacher Preparation Performance Score of 100 and achieve a "High Performing" status by April 2006.<br><br>**April 2003 & Beyond**<br><br>During April 2003 and beyond, universities will be assigned specific labels each year based upon the level of their Teacher Preparation Performance Scores. For the first four years (April 2003-April 2006), the following scores must be achieved to receive the following labels:<br><br>Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program = Performance Score of 125.0 and above<br>High Performing Teacher Preparation Program = Performance Score of 100.0 -124.9<br>Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program = Performance Score of 80.0 - 99.9<br>At-Risk Teacher Preparation Program = Performance Score of 50.0 - 79.9<br>Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program = Performance Score of 0 - 49.9<br><br>After 2003-2006, it is intended that the scores required to receive each label will increase over time. Beginning with 2006-2007, there will be a revised schedule of scores associated with the labels. Universities will be expected to demonstrate additional growth to meet the new criteria and maintain the labels. |

# TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONTD)

| QUESTIONS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| ***Rewards***<br><br>9. Should universities be rewarded for high performance and/or growth? | Universities should receive rewards if they attain Teacher Preparation Performance Scores that result in labels of "Exemplary" or "High Performing". They should also receive a reward if they have a "Satisfactory" label and demonstrate a predetermined amount of growth. Types of rewards should be:<br><br>***Exemplary Teacher Preparation Programs***<br><br>a. Universities receive a positive label.<br>b. Public ceremonies be held to recognize accomplishments.<br>c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports.<br>d. Universities receive professional development grants for faculties.<br>e. Universities receive fellowship funds for students in graduate programs.<br><br>***High Performing Teacher Preparation Programs***<br><br>a. Universities receive a positive label.<br>b. Public ceremonies be held to recognize universities.<br>c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports.<br>d. Universities receive professional development grants for faculty. |

| QUESTIONS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| ***Corrective Actions***<br><br>10. What will happen when a university obtains an "At-risk Teacher Preparation Program" label or a "Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program" label?<br><br>(NOTE: Movement to a lower level will be based upon cumulative years. Thus, if a university labeled as "At-risk" spends one year in Level 1, moves to "Satisfactory" the next year, moves back to "At-risk" the next, and does not reach "Satisfactory" the next year, the university will move to Level 2 corrective action due to the fact that it had an "At-risk" label for a total of two years.)<br><br>* Board of Regents will compile a list of experts to work with the universities. The universities may select from the list or hire another expert with similar expertise. | Universities should receive corrective actions if they attain Teacher Preparation Performance Scores that result in labels of "At-risk" or "Low Performing". Types of corrective actions are the following.<br><br>***For At-risk Teacher Preparation Programs Only***<br><br>***Level 1:***<br><br>a. Universities receive an "At-risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education.<br>b. Universities obtain an external expert to work with the PK-16+ Councils to conduct a rigorous program review and identify actions to improve the teacher preparation program.*<br>c. Universities report recommended actions to improve the teacher preparation program to the public.<br>d. Universities report progress in improving the teacher preparation program to the public on an annual basis.<br>e. Universities have two years to reach "Satisfactory" level.<br><br>***Level 2:***<br><br>a. Universities receive an "At-risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education.<br>b. Board of Regents refuse to approve new university programs in colleges that offer general education and major courses to teacher education majors.<br>c. Board of Elementary and Secondary Education assign private universities a "probationary status" as part of the state approval process.<br>d. Universities have one year to move to "Satisfactory" level. Universities that fail to demonstrate growth will move to Level 3 corrective actions.<br><br>***For Low Performing Teacher Preparation Programs or At-Risk Teacher Preparation Programs that Fail to Demonstrate Growth During Level 2 Corrective Actions***<br><br>***Level 3:***<br><br>a. Universities receive a "Low Performing" label for the U.S. Department of Education.<br>b. Universities are assigned an external team (funded by universities) to assist the program.<br>c. Universities contact students to inform them of the status and plans to improve the teacher preparation program.<br>d. Universities have two years to move to a "Satisfactory" level. (Note: Universities that have had an "At-risk" label for three years will have only one year to move to a "Satisfactory" level before moving to Level 4.)<br><br>***Level 4:***<br><br>a. Universities lose state approval of teacher preparation programs. |

# TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONTD)

| QUESTIONS | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| ***Non-approval***<br><br>11. What will happen once a university moves into Level 4 correction action? | Once a university reaches Level 4 of the corrective actions, the program will no longer be approved by the state. If the university wishes to reconstitute the program, it may not submit a plan for a new program until a minimum of one year is spent planning the reconstituted program.<br><br>Once a university loses its program approval, it may accept no new students into the teacher preparation program. Students already enrolled in the non-approved teacher preparation program may complete their program at the university and be employed in the state. A non-approved institution is expected to work with approved institutions and help students transfer credits to approved universities providing the students meet admission requirements at the approved universities.<br><br>The performance of students from non-approved institutions who enter approved institutions during their final 30 hours will not be calculated into the Teacher Preparation Performance Score of the approved institutions. |
| ***High Performing Status Not Reached in Four Years***<br><br>12. What happens if a "Satisfactory" university does not reach a "High Performing" status in four years? | If a "Satisfactory" university does not reach a "High Performing" status by April 1 (2006), the following will occur:<br><br>a. University obtains an external expert to work with the PK-16+ Council to conduct a rigorous program review and identify actions to improve the teacher preparation program.<br>b. University reports recommended actions to improve the teacher preparation program to the public.<br>c. University reports progress in improving the teacher preparation program to the public on an annual basis. |
| ***Corrective Action - New Accountability Cycle***<br><br>13. Can institutions be given a second label of "At-Risk or "Low Performing" based upon new indicators if they are already in Corrective Action? | Institutions that enter into Corrective Action will have two years to address the accountability indicators and reach a Satisfactory level. These institutions will not be assigned an additional label and will not be required to address new accountability indicators until they have exited Corrective Action at the end of the two year time period. |
| ***Corrective Action - Exit in One Year***<br><br>14. What happens if institutions enter into Correction Action and reach a "Satisfactory" or higher level in less than two years? | If a campus enters into Corrective Action and exits within a one year time period, the campus will have the "At-Risk" or "Low-Performing" label removed and exit Corrective Action. The campus will be given a one year grace period and assigned a label of "Transitional Teacher Preparation Program" for one year. Data for new indicators will be reported; however, the institution will not be held accountable for new indicators until the end of the second year. |

Dimension One

*Careful recruitment and selection of teacher candidates*

- What recruitment and selection criteria are used to ensure that teacher candidates have strong academic backgrounds and potential for teaching?
- How many candidates applied, were accepted, and enrolled in your program during the past three years?
- How do you monitor and make judgments about the academic success of students accepted into the teacher preparation program?
- How do recruitment and selection criteria for career-changers and candidates in "alternative" teacher preparation programs at your institution compare to criteria for "traditional" programs?
- How are your recruitment and selection criteria responsive to the needs of the schools and communities served by the institution?
- Of the school districts your institution primarily serves, what percentage of their new hires did you supply in the last two years?
- What efforts are made by the institution to attract candidates from diverse backgrounds?

***Assessment: Describe specific accomplishments and challenges:***

***Targeted Areas for Improvement: What does the team regard as the two most important areas needing action in the next year?***

THE SOUTHEAST CENTER FOR TEACHING QUALITY SECTQ

TEACHING QUALITY IN THE SOUTHEAST
Best Practices & Policies

ISSUE NO. 10 • MARCH 2002


# Raising the Standard: Georgia's Leadership in Teacher Preparation Reform

Earlier this year President Bush signed the "No Child Left Behind Act," providing education, business and community leaders renewed opportunities to improve teaching quality and student achievement. The Act calls for all teachers to be highly qualified by the 2005-2006 school year and will provide substantial funding to improve teaching, particularly in low performing schools where students need the most knowledgeable teachers.

Research on teaching and learning tells us that quality teachers are those who not only know their subject matter, but also know their students well, know how to manage classrooms, understand how students learn and can assess their learning, and know how to use diverse teaching strategies that enable their students to reach higher academic standards. These necessary qualities cannot be underestimated, given the growing diversity of America's student population. Today's teachers must know a great deal about teaching literacy at different ages, and working with second-language and special needs learners.

The **University System of Georgia** has taken major steps to strengthen its teacher education standards and to ensure that all the state's teachers — no matter how they enter the profession — meet the same high standards. The Center is pleased to highlight the progress the University System of Georgia has made in ensuring a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every student.

## The Goal: High Levels of Learning

The University System of Georgia's redesign of teacher education originates with a clear statement of purpose: *to produce teachers who are accomplished in bringing students from diverse groups to high levels of learning.* The foundation of this goal is shared responsibility for teacher preparation among three groups: teacher educators, arts and sciences faculty, and P-12 partner schools. New performance expectations for teacher candidates place greater emphasis on both content knowledge and school-based professional preparation.

## The Regents' Principles and the Guarantee

The Regents' 1998 and 2001 Principles call for revisions in preparation programs and for new outcomes for school educators. The Regents' Guarantee promises that, within the first two years after graduation, the System will "take back" any teacher who is teaching in-field, if a school district in Georgia determines the teacher's performance is less than effective. If taken back, a teacher will receive additional preparation at no cost to the teacher or school district.

## Standards-based Teacher Education Project (STEP)

Eight institutions in the state have been participating in the Standards-based Teacher Education Project (STEP), a collaborative project between the Council for Basic Education (CBE) and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). The goals of STEP are to ensure that teacher candidates know their subjects and how to teach them, and how to assess student learning.

## Georgia's Progress

The Georgia Regents' Principles provide a framework for institutions as they redesign programs to produce teachers who can bring diverse P-12 students to high levels of learning. As a result of this "work in progress":

- Teacher preparation is no longer just the responsibility of the college of education, but also of the arts and science, education, and P-12 school faculty.
- More teacher education now occurs inside of "partner schools," akin to the teaching-hospital model, where experienced teachers and teacher educators also grow professionally through interaction with pre-service teachers in authentic settings.
- Early childhood teacher candidates complete 12-15 semester hours in reading and in mathematics.
- Middle grades teacher candidates complete two 12-15 semester hour concentrations from among English, mathematics, science, and social studies.
- High school teacher candidates complete an academic major in the discipline to be taught.
- Teacher candidates complete 900 clock hours of field experiences in the public schools working with students, teachers, and university faculty.
- To be recommended for certification, teacher candidates must demonstrate their ability to integrate technology and manage classrooms effectively – and to help P-12 students from diverse groups learn at high levels.
- Graduate students must show evidence of accomplishment in the five core principles of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- System institutions admit only those students into teacher preparation who have at least a 2.5 GPA on all hours attempted in the first two years of college.
- During the first two years of teaching, System institutions provide support, assistance, and professional development to all graduates and guarantee they can meet performance expectations.

## Georgia's Next Steps

The need to increase learning and achievement for all students in Georgia's public schools is ongoing, as is the need to strengthen educator preparation. In the next phase of the state's redesign work, new directions focus on preparing teacher candidates to design curriculum, instruction, and assessment around P-12 standards. Other work centers on attracting and retaining an adequate and diverse teacher workforce, especially in critical need areas. Accordingly, the 2001 Principles emphasize the following goals:

- Institutions will increase the number of high quality teacher applicants, individuals from minority groups, and those desiring to teach in shortage fields through strong academic support, advisement to pre-education majors, and other strategies.
- Institutions will have at least an 80% annual pass rate on Praxis II for each reportable demographic group while maintaining or increasing the number of minority teachers prepared.
- Teacher candidates will be assessed on their ability to organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around high learning standards for all students; to customize instruction, and to use data to improve teaching and learning.

- After two years in the field, graduates of all programs will show advanced levels of accomplishment in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning.

To further support its teacher quality initiatives, the University System has extended the Regents' Principles to school leadership programs. For further information, visit the P-16 website at www.usg.edu/p16/tq/index.phtml.

## Conclusions

The leadership provided by the Georgia Board of Regents, Chancellor Tom Meredith, and Associate Vice Chancellor Jan Kettlewell, has been extraordinary. They are serious about reforming teacher education to ensure high levels of content and teaching knowledge for all Georgia teachers. Their efforts are especially laudable in a time when Georgia, like many states, faces a growing teacher shortage.

As Georgia moves forward with its teacher preparation reform initiatives, its leaders will need to grapple with several deep-rooted problems. For example, how will universities and school districts re-allocate the time of their respective faculties to support and assess new teachers? How will universities rethink education-school funding to support more labor-intensive clinical training? And how can the university system be more responsive to the need to prepare teachers for specific grade-level and specialty-area shortages?

Other states will want to watch closely as Georgia addresses these critical issues. Of equal interest will be University System's efforts to collect and analyze quality data that can help answer important policy questions, including how to document the effects of new teachers on student achievement, how arts and science faculty can best teach and prepare prospective teachers for subject-matter teaching tests, determining the true cost of high-quality teacher education, and helping universities reorganize and reallocate resources to meet the Regents' Guarantee.

Finding answers to these questions will not only serve Georgians but will be of great service to colleges and schools across the Southeast and the nation as they work on similar teaching quality issues. We admire and applaud the leadership of the University System of Georgia.

**More resources:**

- The three-volume set of *Studies of Excellence in Teacher Education* (2000) examines seven exemplary teacher education programs. Linda Darling-Hammond, editor; NCTAF & AACTE, co-publishers.
- Two documents from the **Wingspread 2000 Conference** - *The Eye of the Storm: Improving Teaching Practices to Achieve Higher Standards:*
  - **Improving Classroom Teaching: Enabling the Potential of Standards-Based Reform**
  - **Lesson Study as a Model for Improving Teaching: Insights, Challenges and a Vision for the Future**
- NCATE **Standards for Professional Development Schools** (Spring 2001)
- The **Holmes Partnership** is a network of universities, schools, community agencies and national professional organizations working in to create high quality professional development and significant school renewal to improve teaching and learning for all children.

## Teaching Quality Across the Nation

- Public Agenda's newest survey addresses overcrowding in our nation's schools, telling us that the American teacher corps gives large schools lower marks in maintaining high academic standards, providing help for struggling students, and allowing students to fall through the cracks or dropout. www.publicagenda.org/aboutpa/aboutpa3qq.htm
- A new white paper released by the American Association of School Administrators addresses the challenges of recruiting high-quality teachers and principals in hard-to-staff schools. www.aasa.org/issues_and_insights/issues_dept/challenges.htm
- "When educators accept responsibility for effective practice in their profession, they in turn ensure that standards support rather than prevent excellent curriculum." Carol Ann Tomlinson presents nine guidelines for aligning standards-based practices and instructional best practices in schools and classrooms. www.nassp.org/news/bltn_hl_qlty_clsrms201.htm
- The Cincinnati Enquirer reports on a study that shows teachers who rate highest under Cincinnati Public Schools' teacher evaluation system also show the greatest gains, on average, in their students' achievement on proficiency tests. enquirer.com/editions/2002/02/21/loc_study_links_teacher.html

## The Southeast Center at Work

- The Center is nearing the end of its data collection efforts for a long-range research study sponsored by the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy at the University of Washington, Seattle. The study aims to better understand the policy context and landscapes for creating teaching policies by examining teaching policy in California, New York, Washington and North Carolina. Reports and analysis from the study will be forthcoming over the next year.
- The Center has received positive feedback regarding its recent examination of recruiting teachers for "hard-to-staff" schools. For a copy of the publication, *Recruiting Teachers for Hard-to-Staff Schools: Solutions for the Southeast & the Nation*, visit www.teachingquality.org/resources/pdfs/hard_to_staff_schools_regional_brief.pdf or contact the Center at ContactUs@teachingquality.org.
- In conjunction with the Center's February Advisory Board meeting in Atlanta, the Center hosted a meeting of the Southeast Regional Title II Collaborative, a network of SE Title II Directors and their staffs. At this meeting, the Center launched its latest report on the region's teaching quality efforts. For a copy of the new report, *Teaching Quality in the Southeast: Meeting the Challenges*, visit www.teachingquality.org/resources/pdfs/MTC.pdf or contact the Center at ContactUs@teachingquality.org. The goal of the Collaborative is to foster the positive strides that Southeastern states have been able to make in their efforts to improve teaching quality via the federal Title II program and to utilize the new ESEA legislation as a vehicle to continue these efforts.

*For more information about the work of the Center, contact John Denning, Associate Director, at jdenning@teachingquality.org*

***Upcoming Dates & Meetings:***

**April 1-5**–Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association; New Orleans
**April 8-9**–Meeting of the Cisco Learning Institute Advisory Board, Phoenix
**April 12**–Meeting of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) Teacher Quality Initiative; Washington, D.C.
**April 17-18**–Meeting of the Public Education Network's Task Force of Teacher Quality; Washington, D.C.
**April 23**–Meeting of The Teacher Support Network Advisory Board; Washington, D.C.

***Teaching Quality in the Southeast: Best Practices & Policies*** is a monthly publication of The Southeast Center for Teaching Quality.
For more information, send an email to Contact_BestTQ@teachingquality.org, or visit our website at http://www.teachingquality.org.
**The Southeast Center for Teaching Quality • Barnett Berry, Executive Director**
The University of North Carolina, P.O. Box 2688, Chapel Hill, NC 27515-2688 (919) 843-9519

# Preparation: Data

TQ Source Home

Teaching Quality Topics

Resources

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality

The *TQ Source* interactive data tool allows you to extract valuable, customized information related to teacher preparation across schools, districts, states, and regions.

After you have selected a question below, you will be prompted to choose from several variables regarding teacher preparation. Your selections will generate a customized graph that reflects your desired information.

1. What is the demographic make-up of teachers?
   This question allows you to examine teachers by race/ethnicity and gender.

2. What is the highest degree attained by teachers?
   This question allows you to examine the levels of degrees earned by teachers.

3. How much time did new teachers spend in the classroom prior to full-time teaching?*
   This question allows you to see how much time teachers spent student-teaching prior to their first teaching position.

4. In their first year, were teachers prepared to handle a variety of classroom situations?*
   This question addresses the issues of classroom discipline and management.

5. In their first year, were teachers prepared to adjust their instruction and materials to meet the needs of the classroom?*
   This question addresses the ability of the teachers to adjust themselves to their students, as needed.

6. In their first year, were teachers prepared to assess their students effectively?*
   This question allows you to determine how well prepared teachers were to assess students.

7. What percentage of first-year teachers participated in a formal induction program?*
   This question allows you to determine many teachers participated in a formal induction program.

*TQ Source* data is based on the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) conducted by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics.

Nearly 45,000 U.S. public school teachers completed the SASS teacher survey for the 1999-2000 school year. SASS uses a complex stratified sampling design to report accurately for the nation and for each state at an affordable cost. But, SASS is not a census; it does not count every teacher. Hence, the numbers and percentages it reports are estimates of what a census survey would tell us. The TQSource data section allows the exploration of these rich data, nationally, by region, and for each state.

* These questions only examine those teachers who began teaching in the 1995–1996 school year. This is how the SASS defined "new" teachers