

Appendices XIV-XXI

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup

Final Report



November 1, 2017

Appendix XIV



Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
October 4, 2016 Meeting
Minutes

The 7th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 9:35 a.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross (MSDE), Amanda Conn (MSDE), Micheal Kiphart, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Fran Kroll (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Deborah Kraft (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Kathy Angeletti (University of Maryland System), Gail Bennett (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland), Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Derek Simmons (Attorney General's Office)

Absentees: Mariette English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Laura Wheeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals)

Miss Spross welcomed everyone to the 7th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016. She noted that everyone should have received the materials of interest and the draft interim report. The responsibility for the meeting is to review the interim report and offer feedback and comments. The workgroup also needs to identify if there were any egregious errors and then determine next steps.

Next, Ms. Spross asked everyone at the table, some of them substituting for workgroup members to introduce themselves. She then asked the group to look at calendar and project out for future meetings. The agenda includes looking at calendar dates, looking at the minutes, and an addition to the agenda, Mr. Simmons, Esq. will talk to the group about the requirements for the minutes and how we will move forward, then the group will look at the interim report.

The first item was the meeting schedule. Several dates provided were highlighted. Ms. Spross noted that in the beginning she asked the group to hold dates through 2017. These highlighted dates are in conflict with the State Board of Education. The dates need to be changed and she needs to confirm the library's availability at Arbutus, which can only be done 3 months out. Currently, all dates proposed have library availability. In August, there was a concern about how frequently teachers needed to be out of classroom and available to represent for MSEA. Ms. Spross looked at a variety of calendars and worked from that. Every other meeting will have committee work, so that will be every other month. When the calendar was reviewed there were only three upcoming meetings until June 17, 2017, that teachers were asked to be out of the classroom. Ms. Spross requested the workgroup look at the calendar and see if the dates look feasible for teachers. Hopefully, after June 20th schools will not be in session and the dates will work. Ms. Spross asked for comments and there were none. She then noted she is working hard to make the Arbutus Branch of Baltimore County Library as the future meeting place, it's a better location. As the dates are confirmed they will go onto the website at MSDE. Also, everyone will get notification. She then asked if that would work for everyone. Ms. Shurn was not sure about April, assessments may be on the calendar. Ms. Spross stated she tried to work around that as she considered spring break, holidays, and testing. Ms. Blumenthal noted July is a hard time with vacation, and as we get closer we should look if it is necessary to meet. Ms. Spross said she

could not agree more and we just wanted the dates on the calendar and at each meeting we will review for next meeting.

Ms. Spross noted with the arrival of Ms. Kroll, there was a quorum and the workgroup could vote on minutes.

Approval of minutes

Ms. Blumenthal is with elementary principals and not PSSAM. Deborah Kraft was in attendance and it was noted incorrectly.

Ms. Shurn made the motion and Ms. Conn seconded. Minutes accepted with corrections.

Mr. Simonsen provided the workgroup with information regarding the posting of minutes from the meetings. As of Oct 1, 2017, agendas and meeting dates need to be posted on the MSDE website. Minutes need to be posted as soon practicable. The open meeting compliance board has said that, if minutes are posted faster, they can be done by email. We are encouraging this practice. Minutes can be amended and updated by email and then posted on the website. The minutes can then be approved and at the next meeting, the minutes can be amended. Ms. Spross confirmed we will send out the minutes with a time frame for them to be approved and amended. We can amend the minutes at the next meeting.

Ms. Spross said the draft report is available for review by the workgroup. Everyone was given a copy of interim report prior to the meeting. It is a draft and it is confidential. Some is pro forma, what needs to go into place. The outline includes the charge and process, which the committee members are, committee assignments, and attendance. The report includes interim recommendations and there will be an appendix with all information provided and minutes. Ms. Spross asked the group in what way did they want to proceed.

Ms. Spross explained the information in the report, from the committees, is all from the minutes and what was reported. The committees made their reports and the workgroup voted on those recommendations and that is what is in the report. Ms. Kraft asked how the workgroup could be sure the report is accurate regarding what the committees reported. Ms. Spross noted we took the information from the minutes, from every meeting, and we tried to capture as much discussion as possible. The minutes are included in the appendix. Page seven starts the summary of the meetings with reference back to minutes. It is all transparent and all of the materials and the minutes are posted on the website. If someone has a question, they can go back to the minutes.

Ms. Kroll asked if the interim report could include the recommendation to do more research and exploration. Ms. Conn confirmed that this is typical of interim reports.

The workgroup considered the format of the interim report, which will be the same for the final report, and agreed on it.

Ms. Shurn provided feedback on edits to the report, including committee members.

Ms. Spross noted the next meeting is scheduled for the workgroup and the focus will be digesting recommendations and determining if they encompass everything the workgroup wants to see, or are we missing major holes. Committee II is looking at the IPC and teacher academies. Now do

we want to define what we want that committee to do? We need recommendation from that committee to know how we can move forward.

Ms. Kroll asked if the report is confidential or can it be provided to their constituents. It will be hard to bring feedback for the report without their input.

Ms. Spross reminded the workgroup that all of the recommendations are in the minutes and the minutes are public. Those would be appropriate to share. The minutes will go up tomorrow and all will be public.

Ms. Blumenthal noted the charge is to share with constituents and groups and ask if there are other topics that need to be discussed.

Ms. Spross noted it is impressive how many recommendations came out within a short amount of time and were still interconnected. At the first meeting there was the question, how can it be separate, but it was not. Everything touched on each topic. It became innovative. Committee II said IPC is not right, but how can we use this chance to make changes for Maryland Students in 2017 and beyond. What do we need to recruit and retain teachers? Is it pensions? What are the things we know worked in other states or here in MD? We need to address what is in the best interest of students. We need to take this to the next level. Committee III said we should not pursue the PEC issue, they do not have access to students and there is no way to provide induction. We are not proponents and it's okay to say not all ideas are good ideas.

Ms. Blumenthal asked for clarification on the mentor requirements, specifically on the five years teacher experience with a minimum of three. Ms. Spross confirmed the preferred idea was for the mentor to have five years, but there should be a minimum of three.

Ms. Kroll noted there are sensitive issues and feelings around what should be legislated and what should be MSDE/MHEC and local. She liked the way it is general and does not lock ourselves into long term recommendations. It should not all be legislation. We need autonomy.

Ms. Spross stated the workgroup, in definition, gave autonomy to make decisions. We need to be out in front of it. If we do not make recommendations, people will make decisions for us. PSTEB has looked at lots of legislation. We need to be ahead of issues such as school systems having a hard time recruiting. We are not providing enough teachers to fill all the vacancies. It can be done in legislation or policy.

Ms. Shurn asked if we should ask LEAs to participate so they buy into this work. Ms. Spross noted Committee I has language around the stipend to expand it to be more inclusive. Committee I should be directed to expand on this and be more specific.

Dr. Angeletti followed up on Ms. Kroll's question regarding sharing the draft and having it vetted by member, she wanted to confirm some issues such as EdTPA. Ms. Spross explained everything in the draft is also in the minutes. The draft and has not gone through the entire review process. What you see here today could change.

Dr. Angeletti was concerned with the language from Dr. Robertson about EdTPA and wished to confirm what was in the report with her. Ms. Spross asked Dr. Angeletti to provide any edits once she had them.

Ms. Spross advised the workgroup that we will be adding a representative from the Alternative Preparation Programs. It was not appropriate to include them in conversation if they are not at the table and in the conversation. Alternative prep and traditional prep are different ways to get into pipeline and both should be part of the conversation. They will also be able to put people on committees

Ms. Blumenthal asked if the representative would be from Higher Ed. Ms. Spross said we will discuss how to best represent that community without dictating who is on committee. They too need autonomous.

Dr. Angeletti asked how do you envision Committee IV moving forward? Ms. Spross said it will not be moving forward. She continued that 20 or 25 people on a committee is too big. Those on the committees can be changed. Committee II may need to be two separate groups. There will be one group to look at IPC and another group to look at the other requirement in the bill. We will be talking about the IPC at the next meeting. What is the future and what do we need?

Ms. Bennett asked if it is too late for PSSAM to add someone to Committee IV? Ms. Spross said you can add a representative at any time, but just one per committee. The more voices we have solving the issues the better off we will be.

Ms. Kroll asked if the money for Anne Arundel had been appropriated. Ms. Conn explained there is a mandatory requirement for the Governor to include the money for 2018.

Dr. Angeletti asked for clarification on the adjunct certificate. Ms. Spross noted the committee is exploring adding another teaching certificate that focused on someone who wants to teach in a high needs area, like nanotech, but does not want to teach full time. How can we do it? Current requirements have a specialized area certificate. It was added for Baltimore School for the Arts to teach violin. The certificate still includes pedagogical classes. How do we best meet the needs of someone with high level expertise? How do we make the requirements match the need without watering it down? Ms. Conn explained this came from a bill from last session allowing Anne Arundel County to create their own adjunct certificate.

Dr. Angeletti asked if there is anywhere in here to better integrate Higher Ed with the PK-12 induction process. Ms. Spross noted Committee III was working on induction, and in the final paragraph it includes exploring better integration between PK-12 and IHEs to collaborate to better.

Ms. Spross noted one thing needed to be clear. National Board is a not for profit. Ms. Kroll asked if the school systems pay for that. Ms. Blumenthal noted Frederick does. Ms. Spross noted every district is different. It also depends on if you are working in comprehensive or non-comprehensive needs school. This bill increased \$2000 to \$4000. There is also a second subsidy program that is a bit different for counties (they can exceed) for National Board. It is 80/20 copay. State pays 80% of cost to get National Board certification. Not all counties participate. Frederick County put together a comprehensive partnership with an IHE out of county. The partnership pays for teachers to get National Board Certified. Dr. Angeletti asked how this applies to initial certification. How does that work? Ms. Spross explained that someone from out of state with NBC could automatically qualify for an Advanced Prof. Cert or other. Is this a new way to come in? The committee needs to explore this more. Maryland has five routes to certification. You can come in from other states with specific requirements. You can come in with an out of state teacher education program. There is also Maryland approved programs,

alternative education programs, transcript analysis, out of state professional and out of state approved programs. NASDTEC has an interstate agreement.

The question was put forth in regards to Committee II, Teacher Preparation Academies. Whether or not the academies were for high school students?

Ms. Spross stated that this is out of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Ms. Kroll asked a question in regards Committee II's recommendation to the legislation about whether a teacher academy or university-based academy, are all held under the same high standards? Also, who will be on the receiving end of this? This information needs to be clearer.

Ms. Conn stated that is up to the general assembly what will be done. The interim report is very clear that this is just a general idea.

Ms. Kroll asked Ms. Conn if she was expected to make a presentation to the Senate. Ms. Kraft asked if there may be a time when the committee might want other information added into the report?

Ms. Conn stated that really depends on the committee, if they want to hear an update.

Ms. Spross asked if there were any last minute comments?

Ms. Kroll, ask for a point of clarification. So when we discuss this with our constituents, do you want the information right away or at the next meeting?

Ms. Spross stated that here is where we are. Has the workgroup or committee missed something? The interim report with the exception of what Ms. Angelitti mentioned will be going in with this report.

The next meeting for the Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 will be held on Monday, November 14 at the Arbutus Library from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.

Meeting Adjourned

Mr. Sarah Spross entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION: Ms. Amanda Conn/Ms. Tess Blumenthel To approve the adjournment
of the meeting.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Meeting adjourned 11:30

Appendix XV



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
Materials of Interest
October 4, 2016 Meeting**

Chapter 740 (SB 493) Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016

http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2016rs/chapters_noln/ch_740_sb0493e.pdf

Statute that requires the State Department of Education to establish a workgroup, the participants, sets forth the elements to be reported on and the dates (November 1, 2016, November 1, 2017, and December 1, 2021) by which the interim and final reports must be submitted to the governor.

Materials of Interest from the Learning Policy Institute (all article descriptions provided by the Learning Institute)

Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S.* Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute

Report: <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/coming-crisis-teaching>

Brief: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/A_Coming_Crisis_in_Teaching_BRIEF.pdf

“This in-depth report examines the current indicators of a national teacher shortage, analyzes the severity and persistence of the labor market imbalance, discusses the impact on students and schools, and proposes evidence-based policies that could help create a sustainable supply of well-prepared teachers in subjects and states where they are needed.”

Understanding Teacher Shortages: A State-by-State Analysis of the Factors Influencing Teacher Supply, Demand, and Equity., Learning Policy

https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/understanding-teacher-shortages-interactive?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_content=National%20Interactive%20Map&utm_campaign=UA-67199435-1

This map highlights a number of key factors that reflect and influence teacher supply and attrition and signal whether states are likely to have an adequate supply of qualified teachers to fill their classrooms. Based on these data—which treat compensation, teacher turnover, working conditions, and qualifications—each state is assigned a “teaching attractiveness rating,” indicating how supportive it appears to be of teacher recruitment and retention and a “teacher equity rating,” indicating the extent to which students, in particular students of color, are assigned uncertified or inexperienced teachers. Ratings are on a 1-5 scale, with 1 (the lightest color) being the least desirable and 5 (the darkest color) being the most desirable.

Podolsky, A., Kini, T., Bishop, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *Solving the Teacher Shortage: How to Attract and Retain Excellent Educators*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

Report: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Solving_Teacher_Shortage_Attract_Retain_Educators_REPORT.pdf

Brief: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Solving_Teacher_Shortage_Attract_Retain_Educators_BRIEF.pdf

“Shortages in the teaching force have been growing across the country, reaching crisis proportions in some fields and in locations where wages and working conditions are least attractive. This report provides a detailed analysis of the factors contributing to a shortage of fully prepared teachers and offers local, state, and federal policy recommendations for attracting and retaining a prepared, effective, and diverse teacher workforce.”

Why do Teachers Leave Infographic

https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/Teacher_Exodus_Infographic.pdf

This infographic provides reasons for teachers leaving and provides policy ideas to slow the teacher exodus.

Ingersoll, R. & May, H. (2016) *Minority Teacher Recruitment, Employment, and Retention: 1987 to 2013*, Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Minority_Teacher_Recruitment_Employment_Retention%20_BRIEF.pdf

“This brief summarizes the results from a study of the recruitment, employment, and retention of minority k-12 teachers. The study examines the extent and sources of the minority teacher shortage—the low proportion of minority teacher in comparison to the increasing number of the minority students in the school system.”

Guha, R., Hyler, M.E., and Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *The Teacher Residency: An Innovative Model for Preparing Teachers*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

Report: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teacher_Residency_Innovative_Model_Preparing_Teachers_REPORT.pdf

Brief: <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/LPI-Brief-TeacherResidencies.pdf>

“Emerging teacher residency programs offer an innovative approach to recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers for hard-to-staff schools and subjects. Building on the medical residency model, teacher residencies provide an alternative pathway to teacher certification grounded in deep clinical preparation. This report summarizes the features of these programs and research related to their practices and outcomes.”

Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. *Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of the Research* (Palo Alto: Learning Policy Institute, 2016).

Report: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teaching_Experience_Report_June_2016.pdf

Brief: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teaching_Experience_Brief_June_2016.pdf

“This report analyzes the effect of teaching experience on student achievement based on a review of 30 recent, methodologically rigorous studies. It finds that teachers become more effective as they gain experience, especially if they work in supportive settings. In addition to a detailed analysis of the research, the report offers strategies to attract, retain, and develop teachers who have opportunities to learn and grow throughout their careers.”

Kini, T. & Podolsky, A (2016) *How Effective Are Loan Forgiveness and Service Scholarships for Recruiting Teachers?* Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute
[.https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/How_Effective_Are-Loan_Forgiveness_and_Service-Scholarships_Recruiting_Teachers.pdf](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/How_Effective_Are-Loan_Forgiveness_and_Service-Scholarships_Recruiting_Teachers.pdf)

“In times of shortages, state and federal policy makers are exploring a variety of strategies to recruit and retain high-quality teachers. This policy brief discusses the research related to forgivable loans and service scholarships that underwrite preparation in exchange for service in high-needs fields and locations.”

Linda Darling-Hammond, Roberta Furger, Patrick Shields, and Leib Sutcher, *Addressing California's Emerging Teacher Shortage: An Analysis of Sources and Solutions* (Palo Alto: Learning Policy Institute, 2016).

Report: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/LPI-Report-AddressingCA_TeacherShortage.pdf

Brief: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/LPI-4pp-Brief_AddressShortages.pdf

Interactive Map: <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/california-teacher-shortage-county#/>

“Growing teacher shortages are making it difficult for districts to find enough fully prepared teachers to staff all of their classrooms. This report analyzes the genesis of the current shortages, evaluates the factors that will determine future trends, and makes recommendations for addressing these problems”

Materials of Interest

“ Fact Sheet: Education Department Encourages Support for Educators and Teaching Profession through Title II, Part A”, September 27, 2016 (Attachment III)

The guidance released by the US Department of Education encourages states and districts to prepare, train and recruit high quality teachers and principals to increase student achievement. The guidance highlights ways local leaders can use the dollars to support the educator workforce.

“ The Ghost of Teacher Shortages Past...”, NCTQ, September 26, 2016

<http://www.nctq.org/commentary/article.do?id=293>

This commentary by Kate Walsh, President, NCTQ, provides an alternative perspective on the issue of teacher shortages.

“Analysis Projects Growing National Shortfall of Teachers”, Education Week, September 14, 2016

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/09/14/analysis-projects-growing-national-shortfall-of-teachers.html>

This article discusses the national trends regarding the teacher supply and demands as reported in the recent release of the Learning Policy Institutes reports. It reports that there are tremendous shortages in math, science, and ESOL. Also of concern is the number of high-poverty schools that are experiencing teacher shortages. In addition to shortages the teacher attrition rates are high and teacher-preparation program enrollments have fallen 35% nationwide.

“Teacher-Prep Accreditation Group Seeks to Regain Traction: CAEP standards in full force this fall,” Education Week, August 23, 2016

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/08/24/teacher-prep-accreditation-group-seeks-to-regain-traction.html>

This article highlights the current challenges faced by CAEP.

“Baltimore Area Teachers work to hang on to new teachers,” The Baltimore Sun, August 21, 2016

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/maryland/education/bs-md-first-day-of-school-20160821-story.html>

This article provides information on how one Baltimore County Public School, Deer Park is approaching teacher mentoring

“What Matters Now”: Empower Teachers, Reorganize Schools for Success, EdPrepMatters, August 15, 2016

Provided by: Laurie Mullen, Committee 2 Member

<http://edprepmatters.net/2016/08/what-matters-now-empower-teachers-reorganize-schools-for-success/>

This report highlights the recent report completed by the National Commission of Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) entitled, “What Matters now: A New compact for Teaching and Learning”. The report indicates that a more “innovative and customized” approach is necessary and makes six recommendations

1. Policy makers should establish and broadly communicate a new compact with teachers.
2. Every state should establish a Commission on Teaching, Learning, and the State’s Future.
3. States and districts should codify and track whether all schools are “organized for success.”
4. Teacher preparation should be more relevant and clinically based.
5. States should support all new teachers with multiyear induction and high-quality mentoring.
6. Education leaders should evaluate all professional learning for responsiveness and effectiveness.

No Time to Lose: How to Build a World-Class Education System State by State, National Conference of State Legislatures', August 2016

Provided by: Nancy Shapiro, Workgroup Member

[http://www.ncsl.org/documents/educ/EDU International final v3.pdf](http://www.ncsl.org/documents/educ/EDU_International_final_v3.pdf)

This article provides a comprehensive look at how to reshape the American education system based on the best practices of world-class systems. Common elements identified include: strong early childhood programs, a more professional teacher workforce, strong career and technical programs, and a comprehensive aligned system.

How do school districts mentor new teachers? April 2016

Provided by: Nancy Shapiro, Workgroup Member

https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/central/pdf/REL_2016125.pdf

This report provides information on how school districts in five states (Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota) mentor new teachers. This survey included 1,000 school districts with a 70% response rate. Report indicated that most mentors surveyed are full time teachers with no release time for their mentor responsibilities; most mentor programs end after one year; and only half of the districts surveyed provide a stipend to mentors

"Partnerships for Preparing Teachers: Transforming Teacher Preparation and Professional Development on Maryland," Governor's Maryland P-20 Leadership Council Task Force on Teacher Education Report (Attachment I)

Provided by; Nancy Shapiro, Workgroup Member

In November 2013 the P-20 Task Force was charged with making recommendations and creating an action plan to ensure that all teacher preparation programs in Maryland will produce high quality teachers. Recommendations were made in four key areas; Pre-service teacher preparation, pre-tenure teacher induction, professional development for current teachers, and continuous improvement through accountability. Specific recommendation may be found in this report.



NEPC

NATIONAL EDUCATION
POLICY CENTER

INDEPENDENT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

APOCRYPHAL CLAIMS, ILLUSORY EVIDENCE

Ken Zeichner

University of Washington

September 2016

National Education Policy Center

School of Education, University of Colorado Boulder
Boulder, CO 80309-0249
(802) 383-0058
nepc.colorado.edu



This brief is made possible in part by funding from the Great Lakes
Center for Education Research and Practice: greatlakescenter.org



Kevin Welner

Project Director

Patricia Hinchey

Academic Editor

William Mathis

Managing Director

Alex Molnar

Publishing Director

Briefs published by the National Education Policy Center (NEPC) are blind peer-reviewed by members of the Editorial Review Board. Find NEPC publications at <http://nepc.colorado.edu>.
NEPC editorial board: <http://nepc.colorado.edu/editorial-board>.

Suggested Citation:

Zeichner, K. (2016). *Independent Teacher Education Programs: Apocryphal Claims, Illusory Evidence*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved [date] from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/teacher-education>

This material is provided free of cost to NEPC's readers, who may make non-commercial use of the material as long as NEPC and its author(s) are credited as the source. For inquiries about commercial use, please contact NEPC at nepc@colorado.edu.

INDEPENDENT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS: APOCRYPHAL CLAIMS, ILLUSORY EVIDENCE

Ken Zeichner, University of Washington

Executive Summary

Teacher education provided in U.S. colleges and universities has been routinely criticized since its inception in the early nineteenth century, sometimes deservedly. These programs are uneven in quality and can be improved. What makes today's situation different is an aggressive effort by advocacy groups and self-proclaimed social entrepreneurs to deregulate the preparation of teachers and to expand independent, alternative routes into teaching. This effort has gained considerable momentum and legitimacy, with venture capitalists, philanthropy, and the U.S. Department of Education all providing sponsorship and substantial funding. The strength of this effort is such that the U.S. may quickly proceed to dismantle its university system of teacher education and replace much of it with independent, private programs. The resulting system of teacher preparation may differ dramatically in its governance, structure, content and processes, moving away from its current location alongside legal, medical, and other professional preparation that pairs academic degrees with professional training.

Given the enormity of this prospective shift, policymakers should consider carefully the extant evidence about the nature and impact of different pathways into teaching, including the entrepreneurial, stand-alone programs that advocates proclaim to be the future of teacher preparation. This consideration is particularly critical because, to date, these new alternatives focus almost exclusively on preparing teachers to teach "other people's children" in schools within high-poverty communities—not on public school teachers in advantaged communities. Therefore, their entry into the field raises important questions not only about effectiveness, but also about equity.

After surveying historical and contemporary trends in teacher preparation, this policy brief reviews what is known about the quality of five of the most prominent independent teacher education programs in the U.S., including their impact on teacher quality and student learning. Independent teacher education programs should be understood to be a subset of alternative routes to teaching, and the five examined in this brief were included because they: (a) are not university-based, and (b) themselves provide most or all of the candidates' preparation. These five independent programs are: The Relay Graduate School of Education (Relay), Match Teacher Residency (MTR), High Tech High's Internship (HTH), iTeach, and TEACH-NOW. Excluded from this review are other alternative programs such as Teach for America (TFA) and TNTP (The New Teachers Project), because they differ significantly in that they have substantive partnerships either with universities or with other independent entities (such as the five listed above) that provide much of the candidates' preparation.

Two bodies of work are included in the analyses of what is known: 1) findings from syntheses of peer-reviewed research on alternative pathways into teaching, and 2) research and other sources of information about the five specific programs reviewed, including claims that enthusiasts make about program quality and internal evaluations of program impact. While many advocates assert that independent programs are bold, innovative, and successful in

accomplishing their goals, the analysis here demonstrates that such claims are not substantiated by independent, vetted research and program evaluations. This analysis indicates that the promotion and expansion of independent teacher preparation programs rests not on evidence, but largely on ideology. The lack of credible evidence supporting claims of success is particularly problematic given the current emphasis on evidence-based policy and practice in federal policy and professional standards.

The analysis also concludes that two of the programs, MTR and Relay, contribute to the inequitable distribution of professionally prepared teachers and to the stratification of schools according to the social class and racial composition of the student body. These two programs prepare teachers to use highly controlling pedagogical and classroom management techniques that are primarily used in schools serving students of color whose communities are severely impacted by poverty. Meanwhile, students in more economically advantaged areas have greater access to professionally trained teachers, less punitive and controlling management practices and broader and richer curricula and teaching practices. The teaching and management practices learned by the teachers in these two independent programs are based on a restricted definition of teaching and learning and would not be acceptable in more economically advantaged communities.

Findings from the analysis of research on alternative pathways into teaching and from the analysis of available evidence on the nature and impact of independent teacher education programs have several implications for teacher-education policymaking. The following four specific recommendations are based on those findings:

- State and federal policymakers should not implement policies and provide funding streams that promote the development and expansion of independent teacher education programs unless and until substantive credible evidence accrues to support them. There currently is minimal evidence.
- State policymakers should be very cautious in authorizing “teacher preparation academies” under a provision in the new federal education law (Every Student Succeeds Act, or ESSA). Such authorization would exempt those programs from the higher standards for teacher preparation that states typically seek to enforce for other teacher education programs. Policies should hold all teacher preparation programs to clear, consistent, and high standards.
- Teacher education program quality should be determined by an analysis of the costs and benefits of multiple outcomes associated with the programs. Policymakers should thus reject the argument made by two of these five programs (MTR and Relay) that the sole or overriding indicator of teacher and program quality should be students’ standardized test scores.
- State and federal policies that are designed to support the development of independent teacher education programs should include monitoring provisions to ensure that they do not contribute to a stratified system, where teachers serving more economically advantaged communities complete programs in colleges and universities to become professional educators, while teachers serving low-income communities receive only more technical, narrow training on how to implement a defined set of curricular, instructional and managerial guidelines.

INDEPENDENT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS: APOCRYPHAL CLAIMS, ILLUSORY EVIDENCE

I. Introduction

Over the last 25 years, a variety of people and organizations have been increasingly critical of teacher education programs in colleges and universities, which some in the media have branded “an industry of mediocrity.”¹ Such criticisms typically focus on issues regarding programs’ intellectual rigor, practical relevance, and ability to meet schools’ staffing needs. This is not a new development, however. Teacher education programs in colleges and universities have been criticized from their inception.² What is new about the current critiques is that these criticisms have—with the help of philanthropists, think tanks and advocacy groups, the U.S. Department of Education, and policymakers—been coupled with aggressive promotion of new programs outside of higher education intended to “disrupt” the teacher education field and stimulate innovation.³

These new programs, developed by so-called social entrepreneurs—people who apply business approaches to social services and needs—have been referred to as 2.0 programs. Advocates of these programs have declared college and university programs obsolete and warned that if they are not realigned with the newer programs, they will disappear.

The next decade will see the proliferation of teacher prep 2.0 models as the benefits of their collective approach to teacher education become better known and more widely recognized... Those programs that fail to join this learning community will soon reveal their obsolescence and find themselves struggling to justify their existence. Demand will shift to more relevant, affordable and flexible programs where teachers are held to high professional standards of knowledge and skill under advisement of strong instructors and coaches who are committed to improving a teacher’s effectiveness.⁴

To determine whether such claims and predictions are grounded in credible evidence, this brief analyzes what is known about the quality of independent teacher education programs in the U.S., including their impact on teacher quality and student learning.⁵

Independent teacher education programs should be understood to be a subset of alternative routes to teaching, and they are included in this brief if they (a) are not university-based, and (b) themselves provide most or all of the candidates’ preparation. Included in the analysis are five independent teacher education programs initiated within the last 15 years: The Relay Graduate School of Education (Relay), Match Teacher Residency (MTR), High Tech High Internship (HTH), iTeach, and TEACH-NOW. While these five programs differ from each other in some ways, they also share some similarities, as detailed below. Excluded from the review are alternative programs not based at universities that outsource much of their teacher preparation to universities or other independent providers. These excluded programs include, for example, TFA (Teach for America), TNTP (The New Teacher Project), Urban Teachers, Aspire Teacher Residency, and the Chicago Teacher Residency.

Given recent state and federal policies and incentives that have supported the rapid growth of independent programs, and given the declining enrollments in many college and university programs,⁶ it is important to examine the quality of the evidence available to support

this significant shift in U.S. teacher preparation. Close examination is also important because the countries that lead in international comparisons of educational equity and quality rely on consistent and substantial government investment in strong university systems of teacher preparation—in contrast to current U.S. trends.⁷ There are no examples of high-performing education systems that have relied heavily on the kind of deregulation and market competition, grounded in test-based accountability, that many supporters of independent teacher education programs promote.⁸

The need to critically consider current trends is also important because teacher quality is interwoven with equity issues. The teachers prepared by these programs overwhelmingly teach in schools located in lower-income communities of color. At a time when inequities among U.S. schools have been documented over and over again, and when schools are steadily becoming increasingly segregated⁹, it is especially important to understand the impact of new programs intended to supply teachers most likely to teach “other people’s children”¹⁰ in schools within communities suffering high levels of poverty. It is, after all, the perceived lack of highly qualified teachers in such schools that is often used to justify the push for new forms of teacher education.

II. Alternative Pathways into Teaching in the U.S.: Past, Present and Future

The Past

Historically the U.S. has had many different pathways to teaching, including school district sponsored programs, academies, seminaries, teacher institutes, normal schools, teachers colleges, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities. In fact, for much of the nation’s history, most teachers entered teaching through what would be referred to today as “alternative routes,”¹¹ including a substantial number of teachers who were prepared in school district programs and in programs developed to prepare African Americans, Native Americans, and Latinos to teach in segregated schools in their communities.¹² For only a very brief period (approximately 1960-1990) did colleges and universities hold a virtual monopoly in teacher education.¹³

Beginning in the mid-1980s, there has been steady growth in the number of alternatives to the traditional undergraduate and post-graduate college and university models of teacher education. Some of the earliest of these included programs run by states (such as the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program begun in 1985) and school districts (such as the LA Unified School District Teacher Trainee Program launched in 1984, and the Houston Independent School District Teacher Trainee Program initiated in 1985).¹⁴ During this early period, the state of Florida required all districts to offer competence-based alternative certification programs, developed either by the state for a district or developed by a district and approved by the state.¹⁵

Additionally, many colleges and universities sponsored alternative programs. These typically offered either the standard institutional program at more convenient times and locations, to attract people with commitments that precluded their participation in the traditional program, or were alternative academic programs with reduced requirements.¹⁶ The majority of the alternative routes to teaching have been sponsored by colleges and universities.¹⁷

There are several reasons for the growth of alternatives to the campus-based teacher education programs that had dominated the field for three decades. Perhaps the most often cited rationale for alternative programs has been the need to address real or projected shortages in particular disciplines and in hard-to-staff schools in urban and remote rural areas, where high teacher attrition rates are common. The specialty areas often said to have shortages include special education, bilingual/ English-learner education, mathematics and science. To meet perceived needs, alternative routes can potentially draw people into teaching who might not otherwise consider becoming teachers and can potentially attract people seeking career changes—retired military personnel and engineers, for example. Other efforts tried to attract more people of color into teaching, so that the nation's teaching force would better reflect the diversity of American society and of the pupils in public schools.¹⁸

In addition, the financial costs and time commitment of university teacher education might be a barrier keeping potentially good teachers out of teaching, thus making lower cost and less lengthy alternatives desirable.¹⁹ Also, new pathways to teaching were seen by some policymakers as better alternatives to the large number of "emergency" credentialed teachers that existed in some areas of the country.²⁰

Persistent criticism of schools and colleges of education also fueled the reemergence of alternative pathways. Critics charged that traditional programs did not prepare teachers willing to teach in the hard-to-staff schools that needed them, and they also charged that even those who were willing to try were not adequately prepared to be successful over time.²¹ Pointing out (correctly) that students who most needed high-quality teachers instead typically are given the nation's least prepared and least experienced teachers,²² critics of schools and colleges of education attributed this problem to inadequate preparation of teachers willing and able to teach in urban and remote rural schools in high-poverty areas.²³

Finally, some support for alternative certification programs came from within the college and university teacher education community, based on the supposition that new programs would stimulate innovation in the field.²⁴

The Present

The founding of Teach for America (TFA) in 1990 marked the beginning of a shift in the nature of the alternatives provided for students and schools in high-poverty areas. Rather than academic institutions, states, and districts, private entities began assuming a significant role in developing alternative programs. Initially, because of the "highly qualified" teacher provisions in No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and in state certification policies, TFA and other programs like it (such as The New Teacher Project, or TNTP)²⁵ partnered with accredited college and university programs. However, changes in federal and state regulations²⁶—incentivized in part by the U.S. Department of Education²⁷—later made it possible for independent teacher education providers to offer their own programs independent of colleges and universities.²⁸

Generally, then, since the time of early authorization of internship and teacher trainee programs in California as well as similar programs in Texas and New Jersey during the 1980s, there has been a steady increase in alternative certification programs. And, during the last decade, there has also been a steady increase in independent programs that provide all of the preparation themselves, with no partnering college or university.

The expansion of such independent programs seems partially linked to the shortages of teachers nationwide that are a result of three factors: declining enrollments in college and university preparation programs, the lack of alignment between the teachers who are prepared to teach and the hiring needs of districts, and the salaries and working conditions for teachers.²⁹ For example, in the fall of 2015, there were still approximately 300 unfilled teaching positions on the opening day of school in the Denver Public Schools, and then in May 2016, Relay announced that it would soon be setting up a new campus of its teacher certification program there. College and university teacher education program enrollments are declining in many parts of the country,³⁰ and some states that are facing teaching shortages are actively seeking the entry of new program providers. This is true even in states like Washington that historically have resisted expanding teacher preparation beyond colleges and universities. For example, in June 2016, as a result of teacher shortages in Washington in certain subjects and in particular geographical areas, the Washington Professional Educator Standards Board issued a call for new providers to offer alternative programs:

Seeking New Alternative Route Program Providers

Our Alternative Route program provider interest is growing in the community college, non-profit, and university systems. We are excited to see new providers interested in becoming approved programs and offering Alternative Route programs. If you are interested in becoming an approved Alternative Route provider, please contact... We will be hosting provider information sessions for interested parties in the Summer and Fall.³¹

The growth of independent alternative route providers has also been driven by the steady growth of national charter school networks, such as Rocketship and the Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP). These networks can and do run their own programs specifically designed to prepare teachers for their schools.³² For example, Relay was founded by the leaders of three charter school networks (Achievement First, KIPP, and Uncommon Schools), and both Match and High Tech High charter schools founded their own independent teacher certification programs (MTR and HTH). Philanthropic and government resources have supported such growth by promoting the deregulation of teacher education, which has allowed independent teacher education programs and networks to compete with college and university teacher education programs.³³

A concurrent decline in philanthropic support for college and university-based teacher education has been coupled with substantial reductions in state funding for the public universities that prepare most of the nation's teachers, sparking tuition increases and exacerbating the disincentive of cost.³⁴ The attractiveness of a shorter and cheaper alternative route increases if the price tag goes up for the higher-education option. Such declining support for the public universities where most U.S. teachers are still prepared is, not surprisingly, creating a two-tiered system of teacher preparation. Increasingly, non-university programs are preparing teachers who will serve students in high-poverty communities ("other people's children"), while colleges and universities continue to prepare teachers who will predominantly serve students in more economically advantaged middle class communities. Unless the alternative routes taken by teachers heading to less advantaged communities are of high quality, this extension of the bifurcation of the public school system in the U.S. is likely to widen the opportunity gaps for learning that currently exist.³⁵

The twin trends noted earlier—deregulation and the fostering of competitive environments—are associated with the ascendancy of a market ideology of education reform. Placing their confidence in private sector solutions to social problems, advocates of greater deregulation

and market competition consistently work to foster greater and greater choice and competition in the education “marketplace.”³⁶ Philanthropic and government entities have adopted this perspective and supported the growth of privately run charter schools to compete with public schools overseen by local school districts.³⁷ Similarly, philanthropists, venture capitalists, and the U.S. federal government have all promoted policies and provided substantial funding to enable expanded development of independent teacher education programs,³⁸ asserting that the new independent programs will pressure college and university programs to innovate and thus raise the overall quality of teacher preparation. For example, Rick Hess of the American Enterprise Institute has argued:

...weaker teacher preparation programs would likely fall by the wayside. The fact that Schools of Education could no longer rely on a captive body of aspiring teachers would expose them to the cleansing winds of competition. Schools would have to contribute value by providing teacher training, services, or research that created demand and attracted support—or face significant cutbacks.³⁹

Implicitly endorsing this perspective, the federal government has recently enacted legislation—the “teacher preparation academy” provision in the 2015 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)—that provides a potentially significant push toward an even more competitive environment for teacher education, with fewer safeguards on teacher quality.

Going Forward

The teacher preparation academy provision is part of ESSA’s Title II. The concept was first promoted in 2011 under the title of the “Great Teachers and Principals Act” (or GREAT Act) and failed to pass Congress in two different sessions. It was originally developed by leaders of the New Schools Venture Fund, the Relay Graduate School of Education, and several members of Congress as a way to provide additional financial support for the growth of programs like Relay.⁴⁰ Importantly, states are not required by this ESSA provision to authorize the academies; if they do, they will open the door to lower standards for teacher preparation programs in several specific ways.

For example, states that authorize academies and use their Title II funds to support them will be required to allow the teacher-education students to serve as teachers of record while enrolled in the academies—essentially allowing individuals with little or no preparation to serve as professional teaching staff. States will also be required to exempt academies from “unnecessary restrictions” on their operational methods. Specifically, states will not be able to do any of the following: require academy faculty to have advanced degrees; require academies to seek accreditation; or impose regulations on undergraduate or professional coursework. For example, states will not be able to require teacher candidates in academies to have an academic major in the subjects they teach. These sorts of requirements are generally mandated by states for traditional college and university teacher education programs.

About the Rationale for Current Trends

Two primary narratives underlie the desire by philanthropists, venture capitalists, and federal policymakers to disrupt the field of teacher education and bring in new programs developed by social entrepreneurs. First is a derisive narrative about university teacher education that insists schools of education have failed and therefore their role in preparing teachers

should be reduced.⁴¹ Second is the contention that deregulation and market competition will raise the quality of teacher preparation.

The first contention does find some support among researchers and leaders; there are indeed problems in university teacher education programs that have been documented for many years.⁴² Attempts to address these problems have focused on raising the standards for entry to and exit from teacher education programs, strengthening the connections between the coursework and clinical components of programs, and a stronger focus on teaching teachers how to enact research-based teaching practices.⁴³ Today's charge that university programs have totally failed (and should therefore be replaced) is overstated. This overstatement is grounded in part on instances of advocates manipulating or misrepresenting research and then using the distorted pictures of research evidence to discredit university programs and to promote non-university programs.⁴⁴

For example, in a 2012 Congressional hearing on Alternative Certification, both the committee chair and members of the "expert panel" stated that a 2005 report⁴⁵ sponsored by the American Educational Research Association, synthesizing research on the effects of alternative pathways into teaching, concluded that "there were no differences in teacher efficacy or teaching competence, as measured by classroom observations, between alternatively and traditionally certified teachers."⁴⁶ This and similar statements made during the hearing contradict the actual conclusions of the research review. In fact, the review itself explicitly warned against selective use of research evidence to support specific positions on pathways to teaching, and it found extant credible research insufficient to provide a definitive answer to the exceedingly complex question of comparative program quality.⁴⁷ Additional discussion of this point appears below, in a review of existing peer-reviewed literature.

III. Characteristics of the Five Independent Programs

The five post-baccalaureate independent programs reviewed in this brief vary along several dimensions (see Table 1). One dimension is how much, if any, preparation students receive before assuming responsibility for a classroom. In the iTeach Internship option, TEACH-NOW, and High Tech High Internship (HTH) program, many of the students are teachers of record while they complete most or all program requirements. This is also true for all of those enrolled in the original Relay model.⁴⁸ In contrast, both MTR, and Relay's new Teacher Residency option provide students with a year of preparation under the guidance of a mentor teacher before they become teachers of record. In the iTeach clinical option (which is a very small part of the iTeach enrollment), iTeach students are not teachers of record until they first complete coursework and a 12-week supervised clinical experience under the supervision of a mentor teacher.⁴⁹

Table 1- Independent Certification Programs

Name of Program and Date of Establishment	Who Runs the Program	2015-2016 Enrollment	Length of Program(s)	Type of Program: Early entry¹ or Residency²	Location(s)	Regional and National Accreditation	Online Learning Components
Relay GSE ³ 2011	Relay Graduate School of Education	Certification - 120 Degree & certification - 836	Residency program - 2 years Master of Arts in Teaching certification program - 2 years	Residency Program Master of Art in Teaching program - Early Entry	Baton Rouge ⁴ Chicago Connecticut ⁵ Delaware Denver ⁶ Houston Memphis Nashville ⁷ New Orleans New York City Newark Philadelphia & Camden	Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation & Middle States Commission on Higher Education Accreditation	Residency Program - around 40% of content is delivered online ⁸ Master of Arts in Teaching - around 40% of content is delivered online ⁹
Match Teacher Residency ¹⁰ 2012	The Charles Sposato Graduate School of Education	First-year students - 41 Second year students - 38	2 years	Residency	Boston	Has applied for regional accreditation from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges	None
High Tech High Intern Program ¹¹ 2004	High Tech High Credentialing Program	Intern Program- Year 1 - 38 students Internship program - 2nd year - 45 students ¹²	2 years	Early Entry	San Diego county, California	None	1-2 preservice courses are delivered online

iteachU.S. ¹³ 2003	iteachU.S.	2,049	<p>Internship option-- 2 semesters of internship as the teacher of record (Students have up to 2 years to finish the program)</p> <p>Clinical teaching- one semester of clinical teaching under the supervision of a mentor teacher along with self paced coursework that can be completed in 6 months-1 year</p>	<p>Internship Program – Early Entry¹⁴</p> <p>Clinical Teaching program option-</p> <p>Residency</p>	<p>Texas-Internship and Clinical option</p> <p>Louisiana and Hawaii-Internship option only</p>	<p>Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation</p>	<p>All coursework is completed online</p>
TEACH-NOW ¹⁵ 2012	TeachNow / Educators School of Education	800	<p>Teacher Preparation Certificate Program - 9 months</p> <p>Master's degree programs - 12 months</p>	<p>Teacher Preparation Certificate Program – both options are available</p> <p>Master's degree in Education with Teacher Preparation program – both options available</p> <p>Master's degree in Education with Globalization and Research Emphasis – both options available</p>	<p>Online International program</p>	<p>Has applied for accreditation by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation and the Distance Education Accrediting Commission.</p>	<p>Coursework, is completed online with virtual class sessions</p>

- 1 Early entry means the candidate receives some summer training courses and is the teacher of record during the rest of the teacher preparation program.
- 2 Residency here means the candidate receives training and works under the supervision of a practicing teacher for at least a school year before becoming the teacher of record.
- 3 <http://www.relay.edu/> Relay was piloted as Teacher U within Hunter College 2008-2011.
- 4 The Relay Baton Rouge campus plans to open and offer two programs in 2016, <http://www.relay.edu/campuses/baton-rouge>

- 5 The Relay Connecticut campus hopes to open and offer two programs in 2016 by obtaining institutional and licensure approval. <http://www.relay.edu/campuses/connecticut>
- 6 The Relay Denver campus only offers the Teaching Residency Program. <http://www.relay.edu/programs/relay-teaching-residency-denver/admissions>
- 7 The Relay Nashville campus plans to open and offer two programs in 2016. <http://www.relay.edu/campuses/nashville>
- 8 <http://www.relay.edu/programs/relay-teaching-residency-philadelphia-camden/details>
- 9 <http://www.relay.edu/programs/chicago-teaching-residency/details>
- 10 <http://www.matcheducation.org/sposato/overview/>
- 11 <http://gse.hightechhigh.org/teacherInternProgram.php>
- 12 Experienced teachers in the program can apply to take an exam that changes the program completion time from two years into one year. There are some of these students included within the year two enrollment numbers.
- 13 <http://www.iteach.net/>
- 14 The iTeach internship is a different type of early entry program because teachers are not required to complete coursework before they enter the classroom.
- 15 Please see <http://teach-now.com/>

Programs also vary in length and accreditation status. The length of four of the programs ranges from nine months (TEACH-NOW) to two years (HTH, MTR, and Relay). In iTeach, students complete their program in six months to two years depending on the program option selected. And, while all the programs are authorized by the states in which they are located, two are also nationally and/or regionally accredited: iTeach, and Relay by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. Relay is also regionally accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education Accreditation.

iTeach offers a teacher education program and a principal certification program in Texas and Louisiana, and the other four (MTR, Relay, TEACH-NOW and HTH) have formed graduate schools of education that offer a range of programs in addition to their initial teacher certification programs, including programs for principals, already certified teachers, and in one case (MTR), for tutors.⁵⁰

Additionally, all three of the charter-affiliated programs have formed partnerships with other charter schools that share their philosophies. For example, Relay has formed partnerships with additional charter organizations in different cities, such as the Noble charter network in Chicago, which offers the Noble-Relay Teaching Residency. The Boston-based MTR has formed partnerships with charter schools in Dallas, Chicago, Denver, and New Orleans.

One similarity within the group of charter-affiliated programs is that all claim to minimize the division between teacher education coursework and clinical practice that is common in university teacher education programs. For example, it is asserted that in the HTH Intern program, "There is a direct connection between what students learn and do in courses and what's happening in their classrooms."⁵¹

Another similarity within this group is that the MTR, Relay and HTH programs all use the particular philosophies and preferred teaching methods in their associated charter schools as a base for teacher preparation and certification. Each program is, in fact, highly prescrip-

tive about teaching methods. For example, the MTR website states that “The program is direct and prescriptive in its teaching of specific pedagogical moves and habits.”⁵² And, not surprisingly, these programs seek and admit candidates who appear philosophically aligned with their respective missions.

Philosophically and practically, however, the charter-affiliated programs overall reflect a variety of visions and goals. Relay and MTR pursue the narrow goal of preparing teachers who can raise students’ standardized test scores; therefore, their programs offer instruction in classroom management and teaching strategies focused on raising those scores. Both require graduates to demonstrate a certain level of proficiency in raising student test scores, and both promote their alleged effectiveness to potential applicants and districts and charters schools by claiming that their graduates have proven records of classroom success based on raising test scores. Although it is also affiliated with charter schools, HTH’s much broader mission is to prepare reflective teachers who can develop democratic classrooms in socioeconomically diverse schools; it promotes project-based learning as a methodological means to that end.

None of the five independent programs appears to employ more than a few traditional doctorally prepared university teacher educators as instructors.

The two programs not affiliated with charters also take a different approach, basing their programs on common set of national teaching standards. The iTeach program and TEACH-NOW use the INTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CSSO)⁵³

and used as the basis for many state standards. Additionally, a central focus in TEACH-NOW’s cohort and activity-based program is on preparing teachers to use technology and digital tools in their teaching.

The five programs utilize online instruction to varying degrees. While HTH and MTR provide little or no online instruction, Relay, iTeach, and TEACH-NOW use extensive online instruction, ranging from Relays’ approximately 40% of the curriculum housed online to iTeach and TEACH-NOW’s online placement of all curriculum except for the clinical component. Some advocates promote online instruction as one way of lowering operational costs and helping to develop a “sustainable business model.”⁵⁴

Another common characteristic among the charter-affiliated programs is that instruction and mentoring are typically provided by teachers who have mastered the methods taught in the program (and used in the charter schools). In the two non-charter-affiliated programs (TEACH-NOW and iTeach), experienced K-12 teachers not affiliated with any particular set of teaching practices provide most of the instruction. This approach stands in contrast to conventional teacher education programs, where clinical instructors of this type are also used but only as an addition to professors and doctoral students. As is the case with other professional schools (law, business, medicine, etc.), these scholar-instructors are also generally former practitioners, but they supplement that practitioner knowledge with research knowledge.

None of the five independent programs appears to employ more than a few traditional doctorally prepared university teacher educators as instructors. In addition, all five programs—but particularly those associated with charter schools—claim to provide significantly more feedback and coaching to their teachers than university programs provide (often with video playing a role). HTH also employs student feedback: “student consultants” in the charter schools provide regular observations of and feedback on interns’ teaching.

Ongoing expansion is yet another common characteristic. Some programs discuss plans relevant to “going to scale” and increasing the number of teachers they prepare in different sites across the U.S., and in one case—TEACH-NOW—even around the world. In 2015, TEACH-NOW leaders stated that globally, they hoped to prepare 10,000 teachers in the next five years.⁵⁵ Relay began as Teacher-U in 2008 in New York City and soon thereafter expanded to Newark; in 2016 it will operate in 12 sites around the country and has plans to continue growing.⁵⁶ Both MTR and HTH began by preparing teachers for their own charter schools, but now both have developed additional partnerships to prepare teachers for other charter schools with philosophies and methods similar to their own. iTeach, which began in Texas, has expanded to Louisiana and Hawaii.

With the exception of iTeach, which receives no external funding, all of the programs have received external funding from groups such as the Gates Foundation and the New Schools Venture Fund which, along with many private funders, promote the “scaling up” of programs.⁵⁷ Julie Mikuta, who was with the New Schools Venture Fund when it first supported MTR and Relay, has been quoted as saying that two motivations for funding such programs were to drive change in the larger field of teacher education and to lower the cost of preparing teachers—so that what individuals pay for a program is appropriate for the salaries they will receive.⁵⁸

IV. Peer-Reviewed Syntheses of Research on Teacher Education Pathways

Four peer-reviewed syntheses of credible research on various approaches to teacher education spanning more than a decade have reached the same conclusions: credible research has not yet demonstrated one specific approach to teacher education as superior to others.⁵⁹ This conclusion regarding insufficient evidence is not the same as a finding that there is no difference. As noted above, despite the frequent assertion by programs themselves (and in the media and the halls of Congress) that research has shown a particular program or programs to consistently produce better teacher and/or student outcomes than others, or that research has shown various types of teacher education to make no practical difference, credible research in fact supports neither of those claims. Instead, these four peer-reviewed syntheses of the existing research on alternative pathways find that key questions about teacher preparation still lack definitive answers.

For example, in 2010 a National Research Council panel of experts reviewed the existing body of research and concluded: “There is currently little definitive evidence that particular approaches to teacher preparation yield teachers whose students are more successful than others.”⁶⁰ In the studies that were reviewed by the panel, success in teaching was measured almost entirely by growth in pupil test scores for teachers who were prepared in different programs. Occasionally, other factors such as classroom management problems were considered. Importantly, the panel report also emphasized that this conclusion about the lack of clear findings

does not mean that the characteristics of pathways do not matter. Rather it suggests research on the sources of variation in preparation such as selectivity, timing, and specific components and characteristics is needed.⁶¹

The most recent peer-reviewed synthesis of this research, in the American Educational Research Association's 2016 *Handbook of Teaching*, reaches similar conclusions:

Not surprisingly, studies in this line of research, which compared the impact on students' achievement of teachers with alternative certification and/or from "alternative" pathways or compared the impact of teachers from a particular "alternative" program with those from other sources of new teachers, are inconsistent and ultimately inconclusive at a broad level in terms of what they tell us about the effects of particular programs. . . .⁶²

The findings of these two peer-reviewed research syntheses aligned with the conclusions of two earlier syntheses, one sponsored by the American Educational Research Association, and one sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education—that not enough is yet known to gauge comparable merit of programs and approaches.⁶³

The fact that all four research syntheses have reached the same conclusions indicates that claims boasting research support for any one approach or program are overstated and inaccurate—as are claims that the type of preparation a teacher candidate receives makes no difference in teacher performance. While much or most of the descriptive material available on independent program websites and in promotional articles in the media proclaim independent pathways to teacher education to be bold, innovative efforts that represent the future of teacher education,⁶⁴ credible evidence to support such judgments simply does not appear in existing research.

IV. Other Evidence on the Impact of Independent Teacher Education Programs

There is in fact very little peer-reviewed research that has been conducted on the impact of specific independent teacher education programs. Although some efforts in this vein are in progress,⁶⁵ only one study was identified in research for this brief. It examined the effects of communicating with families using strategies⁶⁶ that are a part of the MTR Curriculum. This study⁶⁷ found several positive effects of using MTR methods of teacher-family communication. Specifically, sixth and ninth grade students received a daily phone call and written text message at home during a mandatory summer school program. Such MTR techniques for frequent teacher-family communication increased student engagement as measured by homework completion rates, on-task behavior, and class participation. However, only a single element of a summer school program was examined—shedding little or no light on the impact of the full MTR approach. Beyond this one study, other evidence on the five programs' effectiveness is found only in various claims the programs make about their effectiveness, supported primarily by testimonials from those involved and by non-rigorous claims regarding standardized test scores—the former neither an unbiased nor random sample, the latter an inadequate single measure backed by no solid studies, as discussed below. Additional sources of documentation include other internal measures unique to particular programs.

Programs often cite the graduates' opinions as offering evidence of a program's effectiveness, as in this example from TEACH-NOW:

The TEACH-NOW program provided me a better understanding of effective instructional strategies, collaboration skills, and classroom management. Their 21st century platform shapes the minds of educators by pairing a multilayered curriculum with innovative tools and strategies. I walked away with a new view of what differentiation looks like in a classroom and fresh knowledge on how to more effectively reach all of my students. Additionally, I was introduced to

several websites, graphic organizers and tools that I was able to use in my classroom. In short, the experience was amazing.⁶⁸

Testimonials have also been reported secondhand by the journalists and advocates of the deregulation of teacher education, who promote the expansion of independent programs and who are often connected to think tanks, advocacy groups, or to the funders. The following example was published in *Education Next*, a journal that is sponsored by the Hoover Institution, Thomas Fordham Institute, and the Harvard Kennedy School Program on Education Policy and Governance.

Many also told me that Relay's lessons have changed their classroom culture. "The culture went from being compliant to being invested," said Max Silverstein, a Penn State business major now teaching in an early childhood classroom at Newark Legacy charter school. I heard the same thing from Alonte Johnson, a Moorehouse College English major who is teaching middle school English at King's Collegiate Center School in Brooklyn. A few days earlier his students designed a seating chart that paired the better and slower readers. "The environment is more interdependent instead of everyone working for me," he said.⁶⁹

Another claim about the effectiveness of independent programs associated with some charter school networks is that student test scores increase in the charter schools where the program graduates teach. While the links between the allegedly successful charter schools and the preparation programs they run are not explicitly made, it is strongly implied that their teacher education programs are high quality because of the record of the charter schools in raising test scores. For example, a Pioneer Institute report on MTR asserted that:

In the 2012-13 school year Match 10th graders placed first state-wide among high schools where more than 70 percent of students are low-income: they placed 22nd among all 305 high schools in the Commonwealth... Match High School has been cited by the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) as one of the nation's best charter high schools, and Match Middle School, and High School have both received the prestigious EPIC award, which recognizes value-added proficiency gains by students, for each five years between 2008 and 2012.⁷⁰

Given the emphasis on raising test scores in MTR's teacher preparation program, information on student test performance can be offered by advocates as indirectly demonstrating that program's effectiveness. But studies such as this, whatever their strengths and weaknesses, were not even designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the underlying teacher preparation programs. No credible causal inferences could possibly be made about the teacher education programs, merely from the charter school evaluations.

Two of the programs (Relay and MTR) also present data from their own internal analyses of their graduates' teaching effectiveness. Relay sets student learning goals for teachers and then asks the teachers to set their own goals within those parameters. At the program's end, teachers discuss results at their master's defenses. Several examples of goals set by Relay teachers in the 2014 cohort are presented on the program website:

(1) On average, my students will achieve a year's worth of growth as measured by the STEP Literacy Assessment; (2) On average, my fifth grade students will achieve 70% mastery of the fifth-grade state science standards; and (3) On average, my students' average writing rubric scores will improve 1.5 levels as measured by a five-point, 6 Traits rubric.⁷¹

Teachers must set both minimum goals in two content areas, and they are encouraged to set ambitious goals in each area. Several examples of teachers' ambitious goals are provided on Relay's website, such as, "At least 80% of my students will meet their student-specific goals in reading as measured by the STEP Literacy Assessment."⁷²

Relay also presents a list of what are termed "notable achievements" of their 2014 cohort in relation to the teachers' goals.⁷³ For example: "94% of graduate students in our New York M.A.T. program met or exceeded their minimum learning goals for students and 54% of them met their ambitious goal in at least one content area related to their teaching placement." The implication is that Relay's teacher preparation is effective because a large percentage of teachers meet minimum achievement goals and many meet ambitious achievement goals.

There is nothing in the design of these internal evaluations though that would support causal inferences attributing the meeting of student achievement targets to the teacher education program. Even in many of the well-funded studies of the impact of alternative pathways into teaching, researchers have been unable to distinguish the effects of the programs studied from those of the individual characteristics candidates bring to the programs and of the contexts in which they teach.⁷⁴

The Relay website also presents summary data on their graduates' and employers' perspectives about the program. For example, with regard to their graduates' perspectives, it is stated, "Across a variety of indicators, 92% of the graduates in the class of 2014 reported their agreement with the effectiveness of Relay faculty and instruction." With regard to the perceptions of employers (who, keep in mind, are not independent of the Relay program), it is stated, "Across a variety of indicators, 92% of employing school leaders affirmed their satisfaction with the performance of their teachers who were enrolled at Relay."⁷⁵

MTR also presents vague internal data about its teachers' effectiveness, in its 2014 annual letter from Sposato GSE, the institution in which MTR is situated. The letter claims that "students taught by first-year teachers trained by Sposato grow more than 64% of students with comparable academic histories (many of who are taught by veteran teachers)."⁷⁶ A footnote associated with this claim states that evaluation data from three sources during 2010-2014 were averaged to generate the data supporting this conclusion. These evaluations included: (1) principal evaluations that rate MTR teachers and other teachers in their schools at the end of the school year; (2) students' anonymous evaluations of their teachers; and (3) outside expert evaluations—blind evaluations of MTR graduates and graduates from other programs in the same school after they have been teaching from four to seven months.

Internal claims and analyses add little or no evidence of these programs' effectiveness.

The evaluators, described as "school leaders and master teachers," observed and scored a lesson based on an internally developed rubric and did not know which were the MTR graduates. MTR did not specify what types of evidence principals, students and outside evaluators offered to document their opinions.

Collecting such internal data is good practice, potentially helping with program improvement. But there are real problems with policymakers using such data to make evaluative judgments. As noted, the validity of internal analyses like those just discussed are open to question and less reliable than evidence based on independent and vetted research efforts. Many questions arise because websites for both Relay and MTR provide minimal information about the specifics of the evaluations and no information about how to obtain more detailed information on the internal assessments.

Beyond internal assessments, Relay seems to intend to bolster its case for effectiveness with yet one other claim: it asserts that its training approach is based on practices that research has proven effective. The former research director at Relay claimed in an American Enterprise Institute publication that Relay and programs like it (referred to as 2.0 programs) "are deliberately anchored in best practices and insights drawn from classroom and school experience and educational research."⁷⁷

Relay, for example, has proudly proclaimed that faculty member Doug Lemov's classroom management strategies for "Teaching like a Champion"⁷⁸ are the core of its curriculum.⁷⁹ However, Lemov's strategies are based solely on his own observations and conversations with teachers and administrators in various charter schools that he claims are high performing. By any reasonable standard, the assertion that Lemov's strategies represent "best practices" does not possess the kind of rigorous scientific evidence-based validity that is being called for in teacher education programs.⁸⁰

Thus, internal claims and analyses add little or no evidence of these programs' effectiveness. Given that neither program-specific reports nor syntheses of credible research demonstrates the effectiveness of the five programs analyzed (or of others like them), there is no case to be made in support of the current huge investment of resources into such independent programs or their expansion. Rather, as noted earlier, program branding and marketing have co-opted the term "research" and offered misleading summaries of legitimate research findings, all to make a case for "disruptive innovation"⁸¹ in teacher education based on ideology rather than evidence.⁸²

V. What is Meant by Effective, and What are the Costs and Benefits of Various Approaches?

Studies of the impact of two of the independent programs examined here (MTR and Relay) are currently being conducted by Mathematica and the Center for Education Policy Research at Harvard University. Even if these studies show that graduates of MTR and Relay are able to raise student tests scores to a greater extent than graduates from comparison programs, this would not be sufficient evidence that they are successful programs.⁸³ Partly, this is because of a lesson from the NCLB era: test scores are a limited measure of success. And partly this is because MTR and Relay have narrowed their focus toward preparing future teachers to succeed on test-score outcomes and, in doing so, have likely sacrificed other areas of teacher preparation.

Scholars have argued for many years that the quality of teacher education programs should not be gauged by any single measure. Instead, quality should be determined by examining the costs and benefits associated with a variety of outcomes.⁸⁴ These would include, for example, considering to what extent graduates of different programs are able to promote higher achievement test scores but also increased socio-emotional learning, aesthetic learning, civic development, creativity, problem solving and critical thinking abilities.⁸⁵

Another critical factor is retention: how much do graduates of different programs contribute either to teacher stability in schools or to disruptive "teacher churn"—especially in the high-poverty schools where graduates from the charter-affiliated independent programs primarily teach?⁸⁶ Little is known in this area, in part because independent teacher education programs are so new that retention data on graduates is lacking. Research on teacher retention in alternative pathways generally is mixed, and it suggests that a complex set of

factors affect retention outcomes, including the relationships between the characteristics and abilities of the people being prepared, the quality of their preparation, and the conditions in the schools where they teach.⁸⁷

Although claims are made that teacher retention is higher for alternatively certified than traditionally certified teachers, these analyses have not taken into account selection effects and the effects of school contexts. The most recent vetted analysis of teacher retention data nationally using Schools and Staffing Study (SASS) data shows, controlling for school contexts, that alternatively certified teachers are more likely to leave the profession than traditionally certified teachers.⁸⁸ In the end though, claims about teacher retention that are not designed to distinguish program effects from *both* selection and school context effects, and that present only unadjusted turnover rates, are not very useful to policymakers.⁸⁹ Broad statements about alternative certification programs are also not nearly as useful as analyses of specific programs or types of programs.

In addition, assessment should take into account not only benefits of particular programs but also their costs and unintended consequences. For example, there is clear evidence that one unintended consequence of the recent singular focus on improved test scores has been the narrowing of the curriculum, which has produced a range of negative effects.⁹⁰ The same prioritizing of test scores has led to the “no excuses” classroom management practices emphasized in independent programs like MTR and Relay, and research has also demonstrated negative effects of such practices on students.⁹¹ Based on studies like these, a singular or overarching focus on raising student test scores often reinforces persistent inequities in public schools.⁹²

Raising student test scores cannot be considered an obvious good that is intrinsically more valuable or desirable than all other goals, especially given that it is already known that such narrow focus demonstrably comes at the cost of other legitimate goals—including the goal of reducing existing opportunity gaps for student learning in high-poverty areas.⁹³ The evidence supports a more nuanced analysis of the costs and benefits associated with a variety of desired outcomes for teachers, students, and schools.

VI. Discussion and Recommendations

Advocates of deregulating teacher education and expanding 2.0 programs argue that university teacher education is a questionable investment, given limited evidence that those university programs are actually creating effective teachers.⁹⁴ As noted above, however, the same is true of newer, independent alternatives: there is essentially no evidence of their effectiveness.⁹⁵ That point applies to the five programs discussed here. That is, not enough is known to reach definitive judgments.

What does exist in the literature, however, is credible evidence about the characteristics of programs that are linked to desired outcomes for teachers and their students, including alternative certification programs.⁹⁶ One example of a program characteristic that appears to be associated with high-quality programs is program coherence, which includes a shared understanding across the program of the specific goals of the preparation.⁹⁷ Other examples of the characteristics of exemplary programs include extended clinical experiences that are carefully developed “to support the ideas and practices presented in simultaneous, closely interwoven coursework,” and “curriculum that is grounded in knowledge of child and adolescent development, learning, social contexts, and subject matter pedagogy, taught in the

context of practice.”⁹⁸

In reality, there is as much or more variation in quality *within* program types than there is *across* types (although it does seem reasonable to assume that “quality” and “effectiveness” are likely to be defined very differently by programs focused on “market share” and “going to scale” than by a traditional, university-based program).⁹⁹ As more is learned about which program features link to which desired outcomes, assessment of programs will be better informed and much more nuanced. Informed judgments about program quality—contemporary apocryphal claims notwithstanding—will have to wait until then. Funding for research that further illuminates the characteristics of high-quality university and non-university programs is an important investment that would help narrow the range of quality in these programs as state and national accreditation accountability systems incorporate what is learned from the research.

The call for more research to identify the characteristics of high-quality teacher education programs should not be interpreted as support for the continued expansion of independent teacher education programs until research somehow settles the issue of their quality. Fundamentally, the question of how high-quality programs should be defined is a question of values informed by, but not determined by, research.

It has been argued that raising students’ standardized test scores, in and of itself, should not be taken as the sole measure of success for teachers and teacher education programs. This brief has called for examination of the costs and benefits associated with multiple outcomes.

Given the undisputed evidence of the negative consequences associated with an exclusive focus on raising student test scores such as the narrowing of the curriculum, and negative consequences for students’ psychological well-being of some of the controlling and punitive management systems taught to teachers in programs like MTR and Relay, policymakers should be very careful in lending support to non-university programs. The kind of teaching and management techniques that are taught in programs like Relay and MTR have been described as part of a “pedagogy of poverty” that reinforces the gap between those students who have opportunities to interact with knowledge in authentic and meaningful ways and those who do not.¹⁰⁰

Based on the above analysis, then, it is recommended that:

- State and federal policymakers should not implement policies and provide funding streams that privilege the development and expansion of independent teacher education programs unless and until substantive credible evidence accrues to support them. There currently is minimal evidence.
- State policymakers should be very cautious in authorizing “teacher preparation academies” under a provision in the new federal education law (Every Student Succeeds Act, or ESSA). Such authorization would exempt those programs from the higher standards for teacher preparation that states typically seek to enforce for other teacher education programs. Policies should hold all programs to clear, consistent, and high standards.
- Teacher education program quality should be determined by an analysis of the costs and benefits of multiple outcomes associated with the programs. Policymakers should thus reject the argument made by two of these five programs (MTR and Relay) that the sole or overriding indicator of teacher and program quality should

be students' standardized test scores.

- **State and federal policies that are designed to support the development of independent teacher education programs should include monitoring provisions to ensure that they do not contribute to a stratified system, where teachers serving more economically advantaged communities complete programs in colleges and universities to become professional educators, while teachers serving low-income communities receive only more technical, narrow training on how to implement a defined set of curricular, instructional and managerial guidelines.**

Notes and References

- 1 Keller, B. (2013). An industry of mediocrity. *New York Times*. Retrieved October 20, 2013, from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/21/opinion/keller-an-industry-of-mediocrity.html?_r=0
- 2 Fraser, J. (2007). *Preparing America's Teachers: A History*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- 3 Wilson, S. (2014). Innovation and the evolving system of U.S. teacher preparation. *Theory into Practice*, 53, 183-195.
- 4 Gastic, B. (2014). Closing the opportunity gap: Preparing the next generation of effective teachers. In R. Hess & M. McShane (Eds.), *Teacher quality 2.0*. Cambridge, (pp. 91-108). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- 5 Information about each program was obtained by reading everything on the program websites including following links and reading reports and articles about the programs. Interviews with a representative of each program were also requested in January 2016. During the winter and spring of 2016, interviews were conducted with a representative from Teach-Now, iTeach, and HTH. Relay and MTR did not respond to repeated requests for an interview, but in July 2016, they verified that there is currently no research available about their programs beyond what is discussed in this brief.
- 6 Currently alternative programs, including those not based at universities, prepare about one third of teachers in the U.S. despite the decline in university program enrollments. https://title2.ed.gov/Public/42653_Title_II_Infographic_Booklet.pdf
- 7 Darling-Hammond, L., Burns, D., Campbell, C., Goodwin, A.L., Hammerness, K., Low, E.L., McIntyre, A., Sato, M., & Zeichner, K. (2017, in press). *Empowered Educators: How Leading Nations Design Systems for Teaching Quality*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 8 Tucker, M.S. (2016). The view from abroad: Does American education suffer from a deficit of innovation. In F.M. Hess & M.Q. McShane (Eds.), *Educational entrepreneurship today* (pp. 95-104). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- 9 U.S. Government Accountability Office (April, 2016). *K12 education: Better use of information could help agencies identify disparities and address racial discrimination*. Washington, D.C: Author. Retrieved July 2, 2016 from <http://gao.gov/products/GAO-16-345>
- 10 Delpit, L. (2012). *Multiplication is for white people: Raising expectations for other people's children*. New York, NY: New Press.
- 11 Different definitions of "alternative certification" programs have been used by policymakers and scholars. Some have defined alternative programs as those other than four or five-year undergraduate programs at colleges and universities while others have included university postbaccalaurate programs within the definition of "traditional programs." Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 645-735). New York, NY: Routledge. The term "alternative program" is used here in a broad way to include the different definitions that exist in different states. Many scholars have moved away from the use of the term alternative and focus more on the specific characteristics of programs rather than on general labels. Grossman, P. & Loeb, S. (2008) (Eds.). *Alternative routes to teaching: Mapping the new landscape of teacher education*. Cambridge MA: Harvard Education Press.
- 12 Anderson, J. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the south: 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill, N.C: University of North Carolina Press;
Fraser, J. (2007). *Preparing America's teachers: A history*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press;
Maestas, S. (2011). *Children of the Normal School, 60 Years in El Rito, 1909-1969*. Santa Fe, NM: Sunstone Press.
- 13 Fraser, J. (2007). *Preparing America's Teachers: A History*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- 14 Stoddard, T. & Floden, R. (1996). Traditional and alternative routes to teacher certification: Issues,

- assumptions, and misconceptions. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M.L. Gomez (Eds). *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 80-106). New York, NY: Teachers College Press;
- Feistritz, E. & Haar, C. (2008). *Alternative routes to teaching*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson;
- Cooperman, S. & Klagholz, L. (1985). New Jersey's alternative route to certification. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 66, 691-695.
- 15 Feistritz, E. & Haar, C. (2008). *Alternative routes to teaching*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson.
 - 16 Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teaching and knowledge: Policy issues posed by alternative certification for teachers. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 67(3), 123-154.
 - 17 Feistritz, E. & Haar, C. (2008). *Alternative routes to teaching*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson.
 - 18 Villegas, A.M. & Irvine, J.J. (2010). Diversifying the teaching force: An examination of major arguments. *Urban Review*, 42, 175-192.
 - 19 Corcoran, T. (2009). Human capital policy and the quality of the teacher workforce. In D. Goldhaber and J. Hannaway (Eds). *Creating a new teaching profession*. (pp. 29-52). Washington DC: The Urban Institute.
 - 20 Oliver, B. & McKibbin, M. (1985). Teacher trainees: Alternative credentialing in California. *California Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), 20-23.
 - 21 Haberman, M. (1971). Twenty-three reasons universities can't educate teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 22(2), 133-40.
 - 22 Peske, H., & Haycock, K. (2006, June 1). *Teaching inequality: How poor minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality*. Washington, DC: Education Trust.
 - 23 Eubanks, E. & Parish, R. (1990). Why does the status quo persist? *Phi Delta Kappan* 72(3), 196-197;
Peske, H. & Haycock, K. (2006, June). *Teaching inequality: How poor and minority children are shortchanged*. Washington, D.C: Education Trust.
 - 24 Wisniewski, R. (1986). Alternative programs in the reform of teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 8(2), 37-44.
 - 25 Now referred to as TNTP. Both TFA and TNTP continue to partner with universities, but TNTP now also does some of its own preparation and TFA partners with non-university programs like Relay in some locations.
 - 26 The repeated approval of a waiver from the highly qualified teacher provision of No Child Left Behind enabled non-university programs to prepare teachers on their own without outsourcing some of the preparation to a college or university. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2013/08/27/how-the-public-is-deceived-about-highly-qualified-teachers/>
 - 27 For example, the Race to the Top Competition led to changes in the certification laws in many states that broadened the definition of who could be authorized to offer teacher education programs. Crowe, E. (2011, March). *Race to the Top and teacher preparation: Analyzing state strategies for ensuring real accountability and fostering program innovation*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
 - 28 Alternative certification programs based at IHEs are referred to by the U.S. Department of Education as "Alternative route programs not IHE-based." U.S. Department of Education (2013, April). *Preparing and credentialing the nation's teachers: The secretary's ninth report on teacher quality*. Washington, D.C: Author. Because some of these programs partner with universities, the term "independent" programs will be used here to indicate those alternative programs that do their own preparation of teachers.
 - 29 It is frequently argued that teacher shortages are a result of poor or not enough teacher preparation. This assumption has been challenged and it has been argued that the shortages are more a result of teacher attrition caused mostly poor working conditions and other factors other than teacher preparation. Ingersoll, R. (2003, September). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* Seattle, WA: Center for Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.
 - 30 Retrieved April 12, 2016 from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2016/03/teacher_preparation_enrollment_declines.html

- 31 Washington Professional Educator Standards Board Newsletter, June 16, 2016.
- 32 Stitzlein, S.M. & West, C.K. (2014). New forms of teacher education: Connections to charter schools and their approaches. *Democracy and Education*, 22(2). Retrieved December 1, 2014, from democracyeducationjournal.org/home
- 33 Zeichner, K. & Conklin, H.G. (2017). Beyond knowledge ventriloquism and echo chambers: Raising the quality of the debate in teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 119(4). Retrieved January 5, 2016, from <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=18148>
- 34 Zeichner, K. (2016). The changing role of universities in U.S. teacher education. In R. Moon (Ed), *Do universities have a role in the education and training of teachers: An international analysis of policy and practice*. (pp. 107-126) Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- 35 Carter, P. & Welner, K. (Eds), (2013). *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- 36 Carey, K. (2009, December 13). "Teacher U": A new model in employer-led higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved June 24th, 2010, from <http://chronicle.com/article/Teacher-U-A-NewModel-in/49442>;
- Chubb, J.E. (2012). *The best teachers in the world: Why we don't have them and how we could*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.
- 37 Reckhow, S. (2013). *Follow the money: How foundation dollars change public school politics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- 38 Zeichner, K. & Pena-Sandoval, C. (2015). Venture philanthropy and teacher education policy in the U.S.: The role of the New Schools Venture Fund. *Teachers College Record*, 117(5), 1-44.
- 39 Hess, F.M. (2002). Break the link. *Education Next*, 2(1). Retrieved July 25, 2008, from educationnext.org/break-the-link/break-the-link/
- 40 Zeichner, K. & Pena-Sandoval, C. (2015). Venture philanthropy and teacher education policy in the U.S.: The role of the New Schools Venture Fund. *Teachers College Record*, 117(5), 1-44.
- 41 Keller, B. (October, 2013). An industry of mediocrity. *New York Times*. Retrieved October 20, 2013, from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/21/opinion/keller-an-industry-of-mediocrity.html?_r=0
- 42 Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.;
- Holmes Partnership (2007). *The Holmes Partnership trilogy: Tomorrow's teachers, tomorrow's schools, and tomorrow's schools of education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.;
- Labaree, D. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 43 Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass;
- Hollins, E. (2016) (Ed). *Rethinking field experiences in preservice teacher education: Meeting new challenges for accountability*. New York, NY: Routledge;
- Grossman, P. (2011). Framework for teaching practice: Brief history of an idea. *Teachers College Record*, 113(12), 2836-2843.
- 44 See additional examples of the misrepresentation of research in Zeichner, K. & Conklin, H. (2017) Beyond knowledge ventriloquism and echo chambers: Improving the quality the debate on teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 119(4). Retrieved January 5, 2016, from <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=18148>
- 45 Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 645-735). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 46 Retrieved August 24, 2016, from <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-112hhrg75109/html/CHRG-112hhrg75109.htm>
- 47 Zeichner, K. & Conklin, H. (2017) Beyond knowledge ventriloquism and echo chambers: Improving the quality

the debate on teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 119(4). Retrieved January 5, 2016, from <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=18148>

- 48 The Relay residency option is a two-year program where teacher candidates work under the supervision of a mentor teacher for a full academic year. In the traditional Relay model, teachers complete the program while they are serving as teachers of record fully responsible for classrooms.
- 49 Currently, only about one percent of candidates opt for the ITeach clinical option, choosing instead to become a teacher of record without prior training. Personal Communication, June 1, 2016 with Diann Huber, program founder.
- 50 The Relay Graduate School of Education (founded in 2011), Sposato Graduate School of Education (MTR) (founded in 2012), and the HTH Graduate School of Education (founded in 2007) are all authorized to award master's degree by their respective states although only MTR and Relay offer Master's degrees to teacher credential candidates. Teach-Now has also formed an independent School of Education to house its certification programs (Educatore), but it is not affiliated with any particular charter schools.
- 51 Griswold, J. & Rlordan, R. (2016). Another innovation from High Tech High- Embedded teacher training, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 97(7), 25-29.
- 52 Retrieved July 10, 2016 from <http://www.sposatogse.org/about/overview/>
- 53 Retrieved August 15, 2016 from http://www.ccsso.org/resources/publications/InTasc_model_core_teaching_standards_and_learning_progressions_for_teachers_10.html;
http://www.ccsso.org/resources/publications/InTasc_model_core_teaching_standards_and_learning_progressions_for_teachers_10.html
- 54 Arnett, T. (2015, June). *Startup teacher education*. Redwood City, CA: Clayton Christensen Institute for Disruptive Innovation. (p.2). Retrieved June 29, 2016, from <http://www.christenseninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Startup-Teacher-Education.pdf>
- 55 Brenneman, R. (2015, September 2). New online teacher-certification program plans for rapid expansion. *Education Week*. Retrieved September 8, 2015, from <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2015/09/teach-now-online-certification-scaling-up.html?r=59094252>
- 56 The growth of the Relay and MTR models includes expansion internationally to countries like UK and South Africa. <http://www.instill.education/> and http://www.ippr.org/files/publications/pdf/beyond-the-plateau_July2016.pdf?noredirect=1
- 57 Zeichner, K. & Pena-Sandoval, C. (2015). Venture philanthropy and teacher education policy in the U.S: The role of the New Schools Venture Fund. *Teachers College Record*, 117(5), 1-44.
- 58 Candal, C. (2014, February). *Matching excellent students to excellent teachers: How a Massachusetts charter school organization innovates with teacher preparation*. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute.
- 59 Cochran-Smith, M. & Villegas, A.M. (2016). Research on teacher preparation: Charting the landscape of a sprawling field. In D. Gitomer & C. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching (5thed.)*.(pp. 439-538) Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association;
National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States, Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press;
Wilson, S., Floden, R. & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research: Content knowledge, gaps, and recommendations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education;
Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 645-735). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 60 National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States, Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 41-42.

- 61 National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States, Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2.
- 62 Cochran-Smith, M. & Villegas, A. M. (2016). Research on teacher preparation: Charting the landscape of a sprawling field. In D. Gitomer & C. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching (5thed.)*. (p. 453) Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- 63 Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 645-735). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum;
- Wilson, S., Floden, R., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research: Content knowledge, gaps, and recommendations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- 64 Gastic, B. (2014). Closing the opportunity gap: Preparing the next generation of effective teachers. In R. Hess & M. McShane (Eds), *Teacher quality 2.0*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press;
- Kronholz, J. (2012). A new type of ed school: Linking candidate success to student success. *Education Next*. 12(4). Retrieved March 15, 2013, from <http://educationnext.org/a-new-type-of-ed-school/>;
- Schorr, J. (2012). A revolution begins in teacher education. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved August 9, 2014 from http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/a_revolution_begins_in_teacher_prep;
- The Economist (June, 2016). Teaching the teachers. *Economist*. Retrieved on August 1, 2016 from <http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21700385-great-teaching-has-long-been-seen-innate-skill-reformers-are-showing-best>
- 65 Mathematica is currently conducting a study of the effectiveness of graduates of Relay teaching in New York City on student test scores in reading and language arts. Also, the Center for Education Policy Research at Harvard Graduate School of Education is conducting a study of the graduates of the Match Teacher Residency in comparison with the graduates of other teacher education programs. At this time, no findings have been shared publicly from either study.
- 66 Goldstein, M. (2013). *Phoning Parents*. Boston, MA: Match Education.
- 67 Kraft, M. & Dougherty, S. (2013). The effect of teacher-family communication on student engagement: Evidence from a randomized field experiment. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 6(3), 199-222.
- 68 Statement from program graduate Samantha Koonce, District of Columbia, U.S. Retrieved July 20, 2016, from <http://teach-now.com/case-studies/>
- 69 Kronholz, J. (2012). A new type of Ed school: Linking candidate success to student success. *Education Next*, 12(4). Retrieved June 1, 2013 from <http://educationnext.org/a-new-type-of-ed-school/>
- 70 Candal, C. (2014, February). *Matching students to excellent teachers: How a Massachusetts charter school innovates with teacher preparation*. Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute.
- 71 Retrieved July 18, 2016, from <http://www.relay.edu/about/results>
- 72 Retrieved July 18, 2016, from <http://www.relay.edu/about/results>
- 73 Retrieved May 25, 2016, from <http://www.relay.edu/research/impact/institutional-assessment> http://www-cloud.relay.edu/research/Public%20Information_SGA_Final_2016.pdf
- 74 National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States, Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- 75 Retrieved July 18, 2016, from <http://www.relay.edu/research/impact/publicinformation>
- 76 Retrieved June 1, 2016, from <http://www.sposatogse.org/annual-letter/>
- 77 Gastic, B. (2014). Closing the opportunity gap: Preparing the next generation of effective teachers. In R. Hess & M. McShane (Eds), *Teacher quality 2.0*. (p. 96). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

- 78 Lemov, D. (2010). *Teach like a champion: 62 techniques that put students on the path to college (K-12)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 79 Otterman, S. (2011, July 21). Ed schools' pedagogical puzzle. *The New York Times*. Retrieved July 24, 2011 from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/24/education/edlife/edl-24teacher-1.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- 80 Pianta, R.C. (2011, November). *Teaching children well: New evidence-based approaches to teacher professional development and training*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- 81 Schorr, J. (2012). A revolution begins in teacher education. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved August 19, 2013 from http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/a_revolution_begins_in_teacher_prep;
- Liu, M. (2013). Disrupting teacher education. *Education Next*, 13(3). Retrieved August 24, 2016 from <http://educationnext.org/disrupting-teacher-education>
- 82 Zeichner, K. & Conklin, H. (2017) Beyond knowledge ventriloquism and echo chambers: Improving the quality the debate on teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 119(4). Retrieved January 5, 2016, from <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=18148>
- 83 Zeichner, K. & Conklin, H.G. (2017). Beyond knowledge ventriloquism and echo chambers: Raising the quality of the debate in teacher education. *Teachers College Record*. 119(4). Retrieved January 5, 2016, from <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=18148>
- 84 Levin, H. M. (1980). Teacher certification and the economics of information. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 2(4), 5-18;
- Feuer, M., Floden, R., Chudowsky, N., & Ahn, J. (2013) *Evaluation of teacher education programs: Purposes, methods, and policy options*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Education.
- 85 Goodlad, J. (2004). *A place called school. (2nd edition)*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- 86 Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wycoff, J. (2013, February). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 4-36.
- 87 Grossman, P. & Loeb, S. (2008) (Eds.). *Alternative routes to teaching: Mapping the new landscape of teacher education*. Cambridge MA: Harvard Education Press.
- 88 Redding, C. & Smith, T.M. (in press). Easy in, easy out: Are alternatively certified teachers turning over at increased rates? *American Educational Research Journal*. Retrieved August 9, 2016, from <http://aer.sagepub.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/content/early/2016/06/17/0002831216653206.full.pdf+html>
- 89 Grissom, J. (2008). But do they stay? Addressing issues of teacher retention through alternative certification. In P. Grossman & S. Loeb (Eds.), *Alternative routes to teaching: Mapping the new landscape of teacher education*. (pp. 129-156). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- 90 Berliner, D. (2011). Rational responses to high-stakes testing: The case of curriculum narrowing and the harm that follows. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(3), 287-302.
- 91 Goodman, J. (2013). Charter management organizations and the regulated environment: Is it worth the price? *Educational Researcher*, 42(2), 89-96.
- 92 Rose, M. (2013). The mismeasure of teaching and learning: How contemporary school reform fails the test. In M.B. Katz & M. Rose (Eds.), *Public education under siege* (pp. 9-20). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press;
- Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of American education: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York, NY: Crown Publishers;
- American Psychological Association (2012, August). *Ethnic and racial disparities in education: Psychology's contributions to understanding and reducing disparities*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved August 5, 2016, from <https://www.apa.org/ed/resources/racial-disparities.pdf>
- 93 Berliner, D. (2011). Rational responses to high-stakes testing: The case of curriculum narrowing and the harm that follows. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(3), 287-302;
- Tienken, C. & Zhao, Y. (2013). How common standards and standardized testing widen the opportunity gap.

- In P.L. Carter & K.G. Welner (Eds), *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child a chance*. (pp. 111-122). New York, NY: Oxford University Press;
- Pacheco, M. (2010). English language learners' reading achievement: Dialectical relationships between policies and practices in meaning-making opportunities. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45(3), 292-317;
- Lafer, G. (April, 2014) *Do poor kids deserve lower quality education than rich kids? Evaluating school privatization proposals in Milwaukee, Wisconsin*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved July 10, 2014, from <http://www.epi.org/publication/school-privatization-milwaukee/>
- 94 Liu, M. (2013). Disrupting teacher education. *Education Next*,13(3). Retrieved January 10, 2014, from <http://educationnext.org/disrupting-teacher-education/>
- 95 Zeichner, K. & Conklin, H. (2017) Beyond knowledge ventriloquism and echo chambers: Improving the quality the debate on teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 119(4). Retrieved January 5, 2016, from <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=18148>
- 96 Grossman, P. & Loeb, S. (Eds.), (2008). *Alternative routes to teaching: Mapping the new landscape of teacher education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- 97 Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 645-735). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 98 Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 41.
- 99 National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States, Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- 100 Haberman, M. (1991). The pedagogy of poverty vs. good teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(4), 90-294.

II

**Partnerships for Preparing Teachers:
Transforming Teacher Preparation and Professional Development in Maryland
Report Prepared for
Governor's P-20 Leadership Council Task Force on Teacher Education**

Charge: The P-20 Task Force on Teacher Education is charged with making recommendations and creating an action plan that will ensure high quality teacher education programs that are responsive to the needs of the prekindergarten through grade 12 schools, aligned with Maryland College and Career Ready Standards (MDCCRS), and designed to support student success for all Maryland students. Specifically the Task Force will:

- Examine Maryland policies and regulations on teacher education in the context of the new Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards to identify gaps and alignment needs;
- Build on the outcomes of the October 11, 2013 Teacher Education Summit, and review pertinent research on global best practices in teacher education;
- Make recommendations to the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council for appropriate changes in (a) policy and regulations, (b) curriculum and instruction, (c) induction and internship programs, and (d) resource allocations in order to advance the quality of teacher education programs in Maryland.

**Partnerships for Preparing Teachers:
Transforming Teacher Preparation and Professional Development in Maryland
Report Prepared for
Governor's P-20 Leadership Council Task Force on Teacher Education**

Task Force Membership

Tim Chandler, co-chair, Towson University
Jack Smith, co-chair, Maryland State Department of Education,
James Ball, Carroll Community College
Tina Bjarekull, Maryland Independent College and University Association
Joann Boughman, University System of Maryland (Zaklyia Lee, designee)
Margaret Dammeyer, Catholic Schools' Archdiocese of Baltimore
Colleen Eisenbeiser, Anne Arundel Community College
Richard Green, The New Teacher Project
Darren Hornbeck, Maryland State Education Association
Catherine Shultz, Secretary of Higher Education Commission
Deborah Kraft, Stevenson University
Melinda Kramer, Prince George's Community College
Kristina Kyles, Baltimore City Public Schools
Tawana Lane, Maryland State Education Association
Elizabeth Ysla Leight, Maryland PTA
Bernadette Sandruck, Howard Community College
Jean Satterfield, Maryland State Department of Education
Nancy Shapiro, University System of Maryland
Robert Stevenson, Beall Elementary School
Deborah Sullivan, Prince George's County Public Schools
Karen Verbeke, Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Henry Wagner, Public School Superintendents of Maryland
Patricia Welch, Morgan State University
Donna Wiseman, University of Maryland, College Park

Subcommittees

Teacher Education, the Common Core and Other Current Reforms

Chair: Bernadette Sandruck, Howard Community College

Diane Hampton, Maryland Independent College and University Association

Danette Howard, Maryland Higher Education Commission

Andrea Kane, Anne Arundel County Public Schools

Melinda Kramer, Prince George's Community College

Dana McCauley, Cecil County Public Schools

Carolyn Teigland, Cecil County Public Schools

Internships and Induction Continuum

Chair: Tina Bjarekull, Maryland Independent College and University Association

Portia Bates, Morgan State University

Colleen Eisenbeiser, Anne Arundel Community College

Tawana Lane, Maryland State Education Association

Elizabeth Ysla Leight, Maryland PTA

Henry Wagner, Dorchester County Public Schools

Patricia Welch, Morgan State University

Donna Wiseman, University of Maryland, College Park

Criteria for Teacher Education Programs and External Accreditation Requirements

Chair: Jean Satterfield, Maryland State Department of Education

Margaret Dammeyer, Catholic Schools Archdiocese of Baltimore

Darren Hornbeck, Maryland State Education Association

Deborah Kraft, Stevenson University

Fran Kroll, Howard Community College

Zakiya Lee, University System of Maryland

Maggie Madden, Maryland State Department of Education

Karen Verbeke, University of Maryland Eastern Shore

Alternative Teacher Education Pathways and Leveraging Pipelines

Chair: Krisina Kyles, Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals

James Ball, Carroll Community College

Michelle Dunkle, Maryland State Department of Education

Richard Green, The New Teacher Project

Scott Pfeifer, Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals

Bob Stevenson, Allegany County Public Schools

Deborah Sullivan, Prince George's County Public Schools

Staff

Gail Hoerauf-Bennett, Maryland State Department of Education

Dewayne Morgan, University System of Maryland

**Partnerships for Preparing Teachers:
Transforming Teacher Preparation and Professional Development in Maryland
Report Prepared for
Governor's P-20 Leadership Council Task Force on Teacher Education**

Abstract

On November 18, 2013, the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council charged a P-20 Task Force on Teacher Education with making recommendations and creating an action plan to ensure that all teacher preparation programs in Maryland will produce the high quality teachers our students deserve. Co-chairs Jack Smith, Deputy Superintendent, Maryland State Department of Education, and Tim Chandler, Provost, Towson University, convened five meetings of the Task Force between December 2013 and April 2014. The appointed members included representatives from Prekindergarten through grade-12 (PreK – 12) schools, the higher education community, parent organizations and teacher associations. In addition to the monthly Task Force meetings, the co-chairs presided over targeted sub-committee meetings, conference calls, and electronic reviews of documents.

Building on a strong foundation of educational excellence in Maryland, and taking lessons from many sources, the P-20 Task Force on Teacher Preparation offers recommendations in four key areas:

1. Pre-service teacher preparation
2. Pre-tenure teacher induction
3. Professional development for current teachers
4. Continuous improvement through accountability

Key recommendations:

Pre-Service Teacher Preparation:

1. Establish higher Maryland standards for admission to all teacher preparation programs.
2. Align teacher preparation programs, including Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) programs, with Maryland College and Career Readiness Standards (MCCRS).
3. Transition to Professional Learning Networks built on a model of internships and residencies to increase the number and variety of field placements for teacher candidates.
4. Increase the number and variety of field placements to promote adaptive expertise, with the final placement organized in a way that simulates what is expected in the first year of teaching.
5. Prioritize in-state programs for field placements, internships, and post-baccalaureate residencies.
6. Invest in scholarships, loan forgiveness, and early college/teacher academies to recruit highly qualified students into teaching careers.

Pre-Tenure Induction

1. Establish a 3-year residency model for all pre-tenured teachers that engages higher education teacher preparation programs in collaborative partnerships with school districts.
2. Establish collaboratively supported Teaching Innovation Centers (hubs of innovation).
3. Fund three initial pilot Teaching Innovation Centers with state "seed" money and subsequently with savings from reduced teacher attrition.

Professional Development for Current Teachers

1. Establish career-long professional development programs and career ladders for educators that are aligned with the high expectations of MCCRS.
2. Establish a school/university partnership process for building professional development programs for educators.
 - a. Programs should be collaboratively developed by PreK-12 and higher education.
 - b. Programs should build strong content and pedagogy competencies.
3. Reallocate existing funds for professional development to support the new collaboratively developed models.

Continuous Improvement through Accountability

1. Build Maryland accountability recommendations around the ideal conditions that contribute to the development of highly effective teachers and set a high bar for qualifications and expectations for all teacher preparation programs.
2. Align current Institutional Performance Criteria to reflect school reform initiatives.
3. Ensure that higher education institutions have access to all data necessary for continuous improvement research.
4. Align elements of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards for accreditation with Maryland's priorities to ensure efficient and effective use of resources.

Regulatory Revision

As a co-requisite to the implementation of these recommendations, the Task Force recommends that the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), in collaboration with representatives from the Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE) review current regulations for clarity and revise or propose new regulatory language aligned with the recommendations and priorities identified in this report.

Fiscal Impact

These recommendations represent the current best practice and scholarship in the policy area of teacher preparation and teacher professional development. The Task Force arrived at consensus on these recommendations as the priorities for Maryland's teacher preparation policy framework, with the understanding that subsequent work will be needed to develop a fiscal analysis and implementation plan.

Overview of the Process

On November 18, 2013, the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council charged a P-20 Task Force on Teacher Education with making recommendations and creating an action plan to ensure that all teacher preparation programs in Maryland will produce the high quality teachers Maryland's students deserve. Co-chairs Jack Smith, Deputy Superintendent, Maryland State Department of Education, and Tim Chandler, Provost, Towson University, convened five meetings of the Task Force between December 2013 and April 2014. The appointed members included representatives from PreK-12 schools, the higher education community, parent organizations and teacher associations. In addition to the monthly Task Force meetings, the co-chairs presided over sub-committee meetings, conference calls, and electronic reviews of documents.

In responding to the charge, the Task Force examined national research reports and policy documents assembling categories of best practices, reviewed existing Maryland statutes and regulations related to teacher preparation, reached out to stakeholder groups, and circulated multiple drafts of the recommendations. The Task Force engaged with a variety of stakeholders including deans and directors of education at Maryland's two-year and four year colleges and universities, principals and Professional Development Coordinators convened by the University of Maryland, local school district superintendents, teachers and teacher association representatives, alternative certification providers, parent organizations, a number of national professional organizations, and the business community.

Maryland has also been a leader, through the use of Race to the Top (RTTT) funding, in reflecting global priorities. The increase in the quality and quantity of teachers in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) areas has been a focus for the last four years. Additionally RTTT prioritized preparing principals and teachers to be effective in challenging schools. The Task Force recommendations underscore the belief that closing the achievement gap is paramount in preparing all of Maryland's students for college and for successful careers.

The recommendations in this report draw on ideas and suggestions from all these sources. Three drafts (4/12/14; 4/18/14 and 4/23/14) of the report were sent out for review to the broad community of stakeholders and the recommendations were presented to the Governor's P-20 Council on Education on May 7, 2014. The list of the sources that the Task Force used is included in the references section of this report.

Just as the Task Force was completing its work, President Barack Obama issued his call for action on teacher preparation.

[T]he vast majority of new teachers – almost two-thirds – report that their teacher preparation program left them unprepared for the realities of the classroom. Moreover, for decades, institutions that prepare teachers have lacked the feedback needed to identify their strengths and weaknesses, and had little information on where program graduates go to teach, how long they stay, and how they perform in the classroom. Existing federal regulations on teacher preparation focus on information that is not sufficiently meaningful to preparation programs, potential teachers or potential employers.

Today, President Obama directed the U.S. Department of Education to lay out a plan to strengthen America's teacher preparation programs for public discussion by this summer, and to move forward on schedule to publish a final rule within the next year. The Administration will encourage and support states in developing systems that recognize excellence and provide all programs with information to help them improve, while holding them accountable for how well they prepare teachers to succeed in today's classrooms and throughout their careers. (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/04/25/fact-sheet-taking-action-improve-teacher-preparation>).

We believe that the recommendations included in this report anticipate and directly respond to President Obama's call for action.

Purpose of the Task Force:

The Task Force on Teacher Preparation grew out of a Teacher Education Summit, October 11, 2013 at Towson University. The keynote speaker, Chancellor Nancy Zimpher of the State University of New York, challenged the assembled participants to think broadly about their aspirational goals and the changing context of teaching and teacher preparation. The Task Force accepted the charge, and has framed a set of recommendations that attempts to balance the on-the-ground realities with transformational best practices. The Task Force agreed that the recommendations should:

- **Address the gap between teacher preparation programs and the on-the-ground realities in schools.**
 - **Align and integrate teacher preparation programs with the world of classroom teachers.**
 - **Prepare all teachers with background and strategies to understand and adapt to changing student populations, including cultural differences, poverty, and special learning, social and emotional needs.**
- **Recognize that while new teachers must be adequately prepared in advance to enter the classroom, preparation must link seamlessly with school district induction and embedded professional development to ensure a successful and long-lasting teaching career.**

- Use multiple qualitative and quantitative measures to study teacher preparation and look for evidence-based ways that lead to building continuous improvement
- Develop a common Maryland framework that, while allowing for program flexibility and innovation, holds all education preparation providers, both traditional and alternative, accountable to a common set of rigorous expectations.
- Address the need for cycles of regular review and evaluation.

Building on a strong foundation of educational excellence in Maryland, and taking lessons from many sources, the P-20 Task Force on Teacher Preparation offers recommendations in four key areas:

1. Pre-service teacher preparation
2. Pre-tenure teacher induction
3. Professional development for current teachers
4. Continuous improvement through accountability

The Task Force recognizes the importance of scholarship and research to guide the work (for example, Darling-Hammond and Sykes, 2003; Lampert and Ball 1998; Wilson, Floden, and Ferrini-Mundy, 2001), and the necessity of building in a continuous improvement system of accountability in recognition of the dynamic nature of teaching and research in this field. (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012) Changes in technology, increased knowledge, changing student populations, and new brain research are only a handful of the many transformational currents affecting teaching and educator preparation. The Task Force began its work by asking the question: How do we prepare future professionals to have the knowledge, skills and dispositions to meet the needs and unanticipated realities of the future?

Maryland's current policy is grounded in the work of a 1991 Task Force, which developed the original criteria for State program approval. Maryland's current Institutional Performance Criteria include four key elements:

1. Strong Academic Content
2. Extended Clinical Experiences
3. Performance Assessment
4. Linkage with PreK-12 Priorities

The P-20 Teacher Preparation Task Force took a close look at the current policies and offers recommendations intended to revise the current policies to align them more closely with the rapidly changing context of teaching and teacher preparation. Building on Maryland's strong history of partnership, and Professional Development Schools as original "communities of practice," the Task Force recommends revisiting the current model to align it more closely with current realities; Maryland is a majority minority state, with a decreasing PreK-12 enrollment projected over the next ten years. According to the most recent National Center for Education Statistics publication, public school enrollments are expected to decrease 9 percent between

2008–09 and 2020–21 for students who are White; decrease 6 percent between 2008–09 and 2020–21 for students who are Black; and increase 63 percent between 2008–09 and 2020–21 for students who are Hispanic (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013008.pdf>).

Teacher preparation and professional development need to be reconsidered in light of the changing nature of the reality on the ground. While the economic outlook is murky and technology has progressed in ways that no one imagined even five years ago, teachers must not only have technological competencies, but be culturally proficient to effectively teach in diverse classrooms. In addition, new models must include these competencies and layer them onto content, assessment, and classroom management expertise. Finally, teacher preparation must prepare individuals to build strong, positive relationships with students.

The Task Force recommends that MSDE, in collaboration with representatives from MACTE review current regulations for clarity and revise or propose new regulatory language aligned with the recommendations and priorities identified in this report.

The first three categories of recommendations below are tightly inter-connected. They can best be understood as a three-legged stool that supports a high quality teaching profession that is developed and designed to support success for all students. If the medical profession has as its mission “First, do no harm,” the teaching profession’s mission may best be captured by the comment most closely associated with Christa McAuliffe, as she boarded the space shuttle Challenger: “I touch the future. I teach.”

The last category—continuous improvement through accountability - is in service of this greater vision.

Recommendations

I. Key recommendations in the area of pre-service preparation

A comprehensive policy approach to pre-service teacher preparation should include investments in recruitment (scholarships and loans), investments in urban and rural programs to expand training into high need locations, attention to teaching diverse student populations, and clear, competency-based exit standards for teachers graduating from programs and entering classrooms. The recommendations related to pre-service preparation are drawn from multiple sources.

All of the key sources recommend that an academic/intellectual threshold be based on grade point average (GPA) and test scores for entrance into teacher preparation programs be balanced against the need for social and cultural understandings, communication skills, grit and perseverance.

The intent of the recommendations below, the first of our three-legged stool, is to affirm that candidates should not qualify for internships until they have met a high standard, and they do not exit without exhibiting high levels of independent performance.

1. Establish higher standards for admission to teacher preparation programs using multiple indicators, recognizing that successful candidates will embody different types of exceptional qualities. (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005)
 - a. Raise GPA requirements for entry into teacher preparation programs. Ensure that the average GPA of students accepted into teacher preparation programs (traditional and alternative) meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum GPA of 3.0. (Ball, Hill, & Rowan, 2005) (American Federation of Teachers, 2012) (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012) (Council for the Accreditation for Educator Preparation, 2013) (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2013)
 - b. Following practices of other professions (LSAT, MCAT) require that teacher candidates pass Praxis I prior to admission to all teacher preparation programs.
 - c. Require that teacher candidates demonstrate a minimum level of performance on essential classroom culture and instructional skills in order to complete a pre-service training program. (Haberman, 1996)

2. Align all teacher preparation programs (traditional and alternative) with Maryland's College- and Career- Ready Standards (MCCRS). Two-year Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) programs should be promoted and aligned with four-year programs and state priorities.

3. Transition Professional Development Schools to Professional Learning Networks built on a model of internships and residencies.¹
 - a. Both higher education and school districts must be involved in the preparation of teachers, and in the design and development of the networks. Development and design of the networks must respect logistical and capacity issues.
 - b. Provide state resources for school district-college/university collaborations.
 - c. Support existing and new professional networks through partnerships between schools and teacher preparation programs at Institutes of Higher Education (IHE), (both community colleges and four-year universities) and Maryland Approved Alternative Certification Programs.

4. Increase the number and variety of field placements to promote adaptive expertise, with the final placement organized in a way that simulates what is expected in the first year of teaching. This will include:
 - a. "Wall-to-wall" field placements (continuous placement from admissions to graduation, scaffolding greater degrees of sophistication and responsibility, including team teaching and collaborative teaching experiences);
 - b. Variety in grade levels within the certification range;
 - c. Variety and diversity in the students and communities served (e.g.: medical school rounds, legal education model, post-doc fellowship model, CPA model);
and

¹ <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Teacher-Residencies-2014.pdf>

- d. Autonomous functioning in a real classroom setting for an appropriate length of time to ensure that teachers have extensive “active teaching practice,” with ongoing direct feedback, in order to be prepared to enter classrooms as teachers of record.
- 5. Prioritize in-state programs (traditional and alternative) over out-of-state programs for purposes of field placements, internships, and post-baccalaureate residencies. Collect and analyze data on the impact of out-of-state programs on the availability of quality field placements, internships, and post-baccalaureate residencies.
- 6. Invest in scholarships, loan forgiveness, and early college/teacher academies to recruit highly qualified students into the teaching profession.

II. Key recommendations in the area of pre-tenure induction

The Task Force envisions a robust and revolutionary Induction period that needs to be conceptualized as building a bridge between pre-service and fully empowered classroom teachers. Taking the lead from the CCSSO Task Force on Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession (2012):

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) 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. (p. 16) NCTAF has estimated the annual cost of teacher turnover in Prince George’s County Public School System to be \$23,292,500 and the annual cost for Baltimore City was estimated to be \$19,013,750. (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF), 2007) (Zimpher, 2013)

The intent of the recommendations below builds on the pre-service recommendations and can be seen as the second leg of the three-legged stool. During the induction period, it should be clear that only teachers who exhibit the highest standards of performance with reasonable support will be promoted to tenured positions.

- 1. Establish a three-year residency model, in collaboration with higher education, for all pre-tenured teachers of record that would include ongoing direct feedback and continuous practice through extended mentorship, continuing communities of practice, and opportunities for pre-tenure teachers to participate in professional development at teaching innovation centers. (National Education Association, 2014)
 - a. Research and analyze costs of recommended new models to school districts and institutions of higher education. Such costs might include: substitutes, stipends, and mileage.

- b. Integrate community college AAT programs into continuing communities of practice and innovation centers.
 - c. Research and analyze creating a specialized post-baccalaureate/master's program or endorsements in Teacher Leadership for mentors and content-specific instructional leaders.
 - d. Research and analyze the impact of mentoring and other new teacher professional development on multiple measures of teacher performance, by using classroom observations and including student outcome and growth measures.
2. Establish collaboratively supported Teaching Innovation Centers (hubs of innovation) where pre-service and in-service teachers can be exposed to state-of-the-art professional development.
- a. Centers should be collaboratively supported by two-year and four-year institutions of higher education and school districts.
 - i. Centers are envisioned as regional pilots to explore "out of the box thinking" about preparation and professional development.
 - ii. Centers would be venues to explore virtual learning and social networking as learning vehicles in addition to traditional, research-based instructional practice.
 - b. Centers should include capacity to anticipate the impact of technology and focus on preparing teachers for future classrooms where teaching and learning may happen differently than it does now.
 - c. Centers should include capacity to offer simulations to pre-service and in-service educators.
 - d. Community colleges should be looked at as possible venues for centers of innovation.
3. Provide funding for Centers initially with state "seed" money, and subsequently with savings from reducing teacher attrition.
- a. Analyze costs associated with teacher attrition and realistically estimate savings.
 - b. Evaluate Centers after three years using multiple sources of data.

III. Key Recommendations in the area of professional development for current teachers

Finally, as the third leg of the stool, the recommendations below offer a framework for professional progression with high accountability for continued strong performance and cutting edge professional development experiences. Such experiences should be based on action research, learning and teaching theory, and evidence-based current best practices.

Reimagining teacher preparation only addresses a small percentage of current teachers. The Task Force makes recommendations for continuing professional development for all current teachers, since they will have the most immediate impact on student success. Additional research and policy studies recommend that colleges and universities "be at the table where teacher career ladders are being developed...because...the promise of options has a major impact on teacher education recruitment efforts...and because the quality of teacher education

Increasingly depends on the ...inclusion of practicing teacher as teacher educators(Clark, 1985, p77).²

1. Establish career-long professional development programs and career ladders for educators that are aligned with Maryland's prekindergarten through grade 12 curriculum.
2. Establish school/university partnership processes for building professional development programs for educators.
 - a. Programs should be collaboratively developed by school districts and higher education.
 - b. Programs should build strong content and pedagogy competencies.
3. Reallocate existing funds for professional development to support new collaboratively developed models.

IV. Key recommendations in the area of continuous improvement through accountability

These recommendations are in service to the three previous recommendations and they echo President Obama's call for high quality teacher preparation programs. Key points include:

- *Build on state systems and efforts and the progress in the field to encourage all states to develop their own meaningful systems to identify high- and low-performing teacher preparation programs across all kinds of programs, not just those based in colleges and universities.*
- *Ask states to move away from current input-focused reporting requirements, streamline the current data requirements, incorporate more meaningful outcomes, and improve the availability of relevant information on teacher preparation.*

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/04/25/fact-sheet-taking-action-improve-teacher-preparation>

1. Set a high bar for qualifications and expectations for all teacher preparation programs. Establish a "level playing field" for program accountability for all programs, holding all Maryland approved programs to the same high standards. (Hill, 2009)
2. Align current Institutional Performance Criteria to reflect school reform initiatives such as Maryland College- and Career- Ready Standards, dual enrollment and early college.
3. Ensure that IHEs have access to all program data from higher education and prekindergarten through grade 12 that contribute to research for continuous improvement.
 - a. Incentivize universities and their faculties to research "problems of practice," recognizing that colleges and universities have different capacities to provide research grants and incentives.

² Richard J. Clark, 1985, The logical link between career ladders and teacher education, November, *Education Leadership*, pp 77-81)

- b. Align the appointment, review and tenure practices of higher education institutions to reward scholar-practitioners, prioritizing scholar/practitioner research with respect to its value to practicing educators.
 - c. Prioritize partnership relationships between researchers and practitioners with incentive funding (Snow, C., AERA, 4.4.14).
 - d. Build accountability systems from the beginning of teacher preparation programs through the induction years (years 1-3).
 - e. Identify indicators of program quality and impact based on multiple sources of evidence, including school/district input, surveys, classroom performance and impact on student outcomes. (Darling-Hammond, 1999)
 - f. Develop a systematic approach to formative assessment of the teacher candidate's ability to influence student learning.
4. Align educator preparation assessment systems with Teacher and Principal Evaluation systems in school districts whenever possible (i.e.: Danielson³ and edTPA⁴ or PPAT⁵).

³ <http://www.danielsongroup.org/>

⁴ <http://edtpa.aacte.org>

⁵ <http://www.ets.org/ppa/>

Immediate Next Steps

- P-20 Council Executive Committee will review the report and recommend next steps.
- Possible next steps include:
 - Establish a working group of district level leadership (both instructional and administrative), teacher educators at IHEs, school district principals, and MSDE staff tasked with identifying models of teacher preparation that involve systematic preparation across the five-year pre-service/pre-tenure period. The work group should:
 - Propose models
 - Identify specific steps to implementation
 - Calculate the associated costs and likely benefits
 - Project a budget for recommended actions
 - Establish a working group of PreK-12 and higher education educators and policy advisors (including industry, community, and government representatives) to review and adjust teacher certification and licensure regulations to reflect the shared assumption that "less is more" with respect to regulatory language. New regulations should focus less on inputs and more on outcomes and accountability.
 - Ensure that institutions of higher education have access to school system curricula/instructional materials through website access, collaborative meetings, and greater transparency.
 - Establish a workgroup of MSDE staff and MACTE deans to review, revise and propose new regulatory language aligned with the recommendations of the Task Force.

SWOT Review of Recommended Action Items:

In addition to the major recommendations, the Task Force raised a number of action items that require further analysis of implementation challenges and unintended consequences. The Task Force recommends that P-20 Leadership Council charge a group to do a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) of the recommendations below. These action items are organized according to the four categories of the report: Pre-service, Pre-tenure induction, Professional development for current teachers, Continuous improvement and accountability.

Pre-Service

- Establish ongoing programs of scholarships and loan forgiveness to support individuals who prepare to teach in shortage content areas shortage fields and hard to staff locations.
- Review the existing AAT transfer agreements to ensure transferability among IHEs and alignment with Maryland College and Career Readiness Standards, Next Generation Science Standards, and teacher shortage areas.

- Explore impact of dual certification in special education
- Design pre-service programs to ensure that all pre-service teachers develop knowledge and skill sets to work with students with a broad spectrum of cultural, language and learning needs
- Review, evaluate and revise program entrance requirements to ensure highest quality candidates. Consider the following and ensure alignment with CAEP standards:
 - State-approved basic skills test (i.e., Praxis I) for entry into a teacher education program rather than as a certification requirement
 - Successful completion of a state-approved content test for program completion
 - Raising GPA requirements for entry into programs.
- Align pre-service models with educational reform priorities including, but not limited to: cultural competence, classroom management, multi-campus Professional Development sites that include challenging schools, intern rotations, and paid Internships.
- Revisit, revise and update the requirement for the number of reading courses required for teacher candidates for all content/grade level areas.
- Revisit, revise and update current mathematics requirements for elementary education teacher candidates.
- Develop a cost/benefit analysis of the potential impact of requiring all teacher candidates to have a bachelor's degree in a content area before beginning a teacher preparation program, including but not limited to impact on higher education institutions and other providers and school districts.
- Investigate innovative programs such as UTeach at Towson University and Terps Teach at the University of Maryland, College Park that could serve as models for teacher preparation programs.

Induction

- Establish regional P-20 councils where IHEs and PreK-12 school districts can work on local and regional issues. Regional Councils would set their own agendas, engage in collaborative leadership, and report regularly to the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council.
- Bridge pre-service and induction by creating alignments between pre-service and in-service professional development experiences and strengthening the structure for induction by creating opportunities for IHE engagement.
- Restructure the school schedule/calendar to include opportunities for collaborative planning between experienced and new teachers.

Professional Development

- Restructure school calendars to employ teachers on regular 12-month contracts, allowing time for professional development, extended year experiences for students and annual leave opportunities for teachers
- Restructure higher education calendars to ensure that faculty members involved in Professional Development are employed and available in the summer months.
- Establish new specialist roles to bridge the technological challenges of digital teaching, learning and assessments

- Utilize technological tools for professional communities of practice.
- Schedule annual statewide and/or regional teacher preparation forums focused on sharing proven best practices, highlighting common challenges and identifying potential solutions.

Continuous Improvement and Accountability

- Reward programs that produce high quality teachers and teacher leaders:
 - Offer subsidies and expanded capacity, with focused scholarships, for programs that recruit and prepare a highly qualified, diverse pool of effective educators in high-need fields and locations,;
 - Allocate reduced attrition savings to IHEs that prepare teachers who are retained in school districts beyond three years.
 - Create new pathways into teaching that align the resources of Maryland community colleges and universities with supports for candidates willing to commit to working in high-need schools;
 - Recognize existing pathways, such as Teacher Academy of Maryland, with support for tuition or loan repayment.
 - Offer incentives and high-quality accessible pathways for already licensed teachers to become cross-trained in shortage areas like special education, English language acquisition, bilingual education, mathematics or science.

References

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006). *Teacher Induction Programs: trends and opportunities*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.aascu.org/uploadedFiles/AASCU/Content/Root/PolicyAndAdvocacy/PolicyPublications/TeacherInduction.pdf>
- American Federation of Teachers. (2012). *Raising the Bar: Aligning and elevating teacher preparation and the teaching profession*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.aft.org/pdfs/highered/raisingthebar2012.pdf>
- Ball, D., Hill, H., & Rowan, B. (2005). Effects of Teachers' Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching on Student Achievement. *Educational Research Journal*, 42 (2), 371-406.
- Clark, R. J. (1985). The logical link between career ladders and teacher education. *Educational Leadership*, 43 (3), 77-81.
- Council for the Accreditation for Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP 2013 Standards for Accreditation of Educator Preparation*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2012). *Our Responsibility, Our Promise: Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2012/Our%20Responsibility%20Our%20Promise_2012.pdf
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Educating teachers for the next century: rethinking practice and policy. In G. A. Griffin, *The Education of Teachers* (pp. 221-256). Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (2003). Wanted: A national teacher supply policy for education. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 11 (33).
- Darling-Hammond, L., Holtsman, D. J., & Heilig, J. V. (2005). Does Teacher Preparation Matter? Evidence about teacher certification, Teach for America, and teacher effectiveness. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13 (42). Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/147>
- DeMonte, J. (2013). High-Quality Professional Development for Teachers. Center for American Progress. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/DeMonteLearning4Teachers-1.pdf>
- Goldrick, L., Osta, D., Barlin, D., & Burn, J. (2012). *Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/147/273>
- Haberman, M. (1996). Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In J. P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton, *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 747-760). New York: Macmillan.

Hill, H. C. (2009). Fixing Teacher Professional Development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90 (7), pp. 470-476.

Hussar, W. J., & Bailey, T. M. (2013). *Projections of Education Statistics to 2021 (NCES 2013-008)*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Lambert, M., & Ball, D. L. (1998). *Teaching, multimedia, and mathematics: Investigations of real practice*. New York City: Teacher College Press.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating School Teachers*. The Education Schools Project. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED504144.pdf>

Levine, A. (2014). *We Need Ed Schools*. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED504144.pdf>

Maryland State Department of Education. (2012). *Teacher Staffing Report: 2012-1014*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/F3F5D904-0F5E-4FC7-87CE-464FC17DABB5/33624/MarylandTeacherReport20122014.pdf>

National Academy of Education. (2005). *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom: Preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve*. (L. Darling-Hammond, & J. Baratz-Snowden, Eds.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future . (2007). *The High Cost of Teacher Turnover*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/NCTAFCostofTeacherTurnoverpolicybrief.pdf>

National Council on Teacher Quality. (2013). *NCTQ Teacher Prep Review standards*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from http://nctq.org/dmsView/Standard_Book_1

National Education Associaton. (2014). *Teacher Residencies: redefining preparation through partnerships*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Teacher-Residencies-2014.pdf>

National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing Teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

The New Teacher Project. (2014). *Fast Start: training better teachers faster, with focus, practice and feedback*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_FastStart_2014.pdf

Wilson, S. W., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2011). *Teacher preparation research: Current Knowledge, gaps, and recommendations*. Seattle, WA: U.S. Department of Education.

Zimpher, N. (2013). Maryland Teacher Education Summit Keynote Address. Towson, MD.

**U.S. Department of Education
Office of Communications & Outreach, Press Office
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202**

CONTACT:

Press Office, [\(202\) 401-1576](tel:(202)401-1576) or press@ed.gov

FACT SHEET: Education Department Encourages Support for Educators and Teaching Profession through Title II, Part A

The U.S. Department of Education today released non-regulatory guidance to help support the nation's educators and elevate the teaching profession. The guidance encourages states and districts to prepare, train, and recruit high-quality teachers and principals to increase student academic achievement. With the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), states and districts have the opportunity to reimagine the way Title II, Part A funds can be used through driving innovation and building on evidence to better support educators.

“As an educator, a student, teacher, and principal, I know firsthand the value of making a positive powerful difference for educators make in our children’s future,” said U.S. Secretary of Education John B. King, Jr. “Educators play a critical role in securing our nation's economic future and preserving the delivering on the promise of an excellent education for all children, especially those who have been historically underserved. That’s why we are releasing guidance to help us better support our educators and ensure they not only have a seat at the table, but their voices are heard. We don’t just want educators to be part of the change; we need them to lead it.”

A great teacher can be one of the most important in-school factors impacting student achievement. The nation must make the investments needed to attract and keep top talent, and ensure that high-need schools have the resources, support, and teachers they need. Support for educators is also critical to mitigate the high economic cost of teacher turnover—an estimated \$7 billion per year.

ESSA provides multiple opportunities to better innovate and build on evidence with Title II, Part A dollars. This guidance highlights some of the key areas local leaders can invest these critical dollars to support the workforce through better preparation, mentorship and induction, increase diversity, and bolster teacher leadership. The guidance focuses on the importance of aligning state strategies that support effective instruction with Title II, Part A investments to not only improve student outcomes, but sustain those improvements. The guidance offers suggestions across multiple domains:

Supporting Educators

- **Multiple Pathways to Teaching and Leading:** Provides ways in which Title II, Part A funds may be used to support multiple pathways into the profession, including to support: teacher and school leader residency programs; teacher, principal and other school leader preparation

academies; alternative routes to certification; and reform of preparation standards and approval, certification, licensure, and tenure.

- **Induction and Mentorship:** Encourages states and districts to use Title II, Part A funds to establish and support high quality educator induction and mentorship programs that are: evidence-based; designed to improve classroom instruction, student learning, and student achievement; and increase the retention of effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.
- **Meaningful Evaluation and Support:** Describes how states and districts may use Title II, Part A funds to support evaluation and support systems that continually improve instruction by relying on multiple measures and meaningful input from educators and other stakeholders as well as maintaining principles for what high-quality evaluation and support systems should include.
- **Strong Teacher Leadership:** Provides ways in which Title II, Part A funds may be used to support meaningful teacher leadership opportunities, leveraging the professional experience and expertise of practitioners.
- **Transformative School Leadership:** Describes how states can work to improve school leadership by: (a) devoting a significant portion of its state activities funds; and (b) considering its flexibility to reserve an additional three percent of Title II, Part A district subgrants for state activities to improve school leadership. Title II Part A funds may be used to support principal supervisors, as well as activities to support the professional learning of principals.

Promoting a Diverse Educator Workforce across the Career Continuum

Research shows that diversity in schools, including representation of underrepresented groups among educators, can provide significant benefits to all students. Improving the diversity of the educator workforce may be particularly beneficial for historically-underserved students who can benefit from shared lived experiences and identities of educators. This guidance suggests that when considering how to better support educators, states and districts should consider supporting a diverse educator workforce as a critical component of all strategies across the career continuum. States and districts may use Title II, Part A funds to improve the recruitment, placement, support, and retention of culturally-competent and responsive educators.

Leveraging Teacher Expertise and Leadership

Teacher leadership is a concept and practice that continues to gain momentum around the country. The availability of teacher leadership opportunities positively impacts teacher recruitment and retention, job satisfaction, and student achievement. Over the last two years, the Department's Teach to Lead initiative has worked to meet a growing demand for teacher's voices in developing and implementing effective reforms in our schools. Through Teach to Lead summits and leadership labs, the Department has engaged with more than 3,000 teachers from across the country about how educators can lead from the classroom. Those educators have created more than 170 action plans for improvements at the school, district, state, and national level.

This guidance aims to build on these efforts by ensuring significant teacher input into the application and planning process for local subgrants. This approach would give educators,

parents and community members a meaningful role in determining the best use of program funds to both improve professional practice and help make schools great places to work. This approach recognizes that great teachers are more likely to stay in schools where they have meaningful input in developing and implementing solutions that will improve student learning.

This guidance also encourages schools to work collaboratively with teachers to address and improve the barriers to attracting and keeping the best educators in the schools where they are needed most, resulting in the transformation of some of the least-equipped and hardest-to-staff schools into destinations for educators and students alike.

Providing Equitable Access to Effective Educators

Part of the purpose of the Title II is to provide students from low-income families and students of color greater access to effective teachers, principals and other school leaders. In order to realize this outcome, states and districts are strongly encouraged in the guidance to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers. Further, the guidance will address the proposed regulations that clarify a state's authority to direct a district to use a portion of its Title II, Part A funds to provide greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders, provided that it does so in a manner that is consistent with the allowable activities outlined in ESSA. For example, Title II, Part A funds can be used to attract and retain effective educators in high-need schools through advancement opportunities, teacher-led professional development, improved working conditions, and compensation. Title II, Part A funds can also support the creation of school environments where teachers and leaders have time to collaborate, and opportunities to lead and grow as professionals.

Strengthening Title II, Part A Investments

Consultation to Strengthen Title II, Part A Investments

Consultation is a critical part of ensuring that Title II, Part A funds are used effectively and decisions about resource allocation are fully informed. States and districts must engage in meaningful consultation with a broad range of stakeholders from diverse backgrounds (e.g., families, students, educators, private school officials, community partners), as required by ESEA.

A Cyclical Framework for Maximizing Title II, Part A Investments

Title II, Part A interventions are more likely to result in sustained, improved outcomes for students if:

1. Chosen interventions align with **identified local needs**;
2. The **evidence base and the local capacity** are considered when **selecting a strategy**;
3. There is a **robust implementation plan**;
4. Adequate resources are provided so the **implementation** is well-supported;
5. Information is gathered regularly to **examine the strategy** and to **reflect on and inform next steps**.

This guidance released today is designed to promote and foster robust collaboration and effective decision-making for better Title II, Part A investments. The full guidance and examples of best practices can be found [here](#).

###

Appendix XVI



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
Minutes
November 14, 2016 Meeting**

The 8th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 1:03 p.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross (MSDE), Emily Dow (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community College), Justin Heid (Maryland State Education Association), Deborah Kraft (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland),

MSDE Staff to include: Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), and Derek Simmons (Attorney General's Office).

Absentees: Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Mariette English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Kimberly Pratesi (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Laura Weeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals)

Ms. Spross welcomed everyone to the 8th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016. She noted that everyone should have received the materials of interest and the draft interim report. The priority for this meeting is for the workgroup to think about where they want to go from here and what they want to see the committees accomplish.

Ms. Spross asked the workgroup members at the table to introduce themselves because some of the members were substituting for other workgroup members. She asked the workgroup to review the October 4, 2016 minutes. The minutes could not be voted on because they did not have a quorum. The minutes will be posted in a draft format on the website and will be voted on at the next meeting in January.

Ms. Spross asked the workgroup to think about where they want to go from here and what they want to see the committees accomplish. She stated that the group needs to refocus and look at the broad goals. In terms of retention, it should be something measurable.

Ms. Nancy Shapiro stated that it would be good to get stakeholder buy-in. The sooner the workgroup can vet the language, the better.

Ms. Spross informed the group that both MHEC and MSDE collaborated on the shared responsibility of teacher preparation programs. She indicated that she will send out the language as soon as its release is permitted.

Mr. Jack Smith stated that the Administration will look at all the Bills across the state and will decide what Bills they are going to approve.

Ms. Shapiro asked about what is happening with CAEP? She suggested that the CAEP committee members should be distributed to the other four committees.

Ms. Spross stated that Committee 5 is gone. There were recommendations to make a Committee 5 on incentives for teachers. Ms. Spross asked the workgroup if they think that they should add a

Committee 5 on Incentives for Recruitment and Retention. Quality Teacher Incentive Act – National Board Certified Teacher Stipend discussion. Ms. Spross stated that other four committees touched on the subject of incentives for teachers.

Committee 2: What does Maryland think is right for accreditation to be conformed to?

- Looking at IPC and SPAs but didn't have any recommendations.
- Clear guidance?

Ms. Spross asked the workgroup if they should add a Committee 5 on Incentives for Recruitment and Retention. Quality Teacher Incentive Act - NBCT discussion

Ms. Shapiro stated that “we need to redesign and reframe what has happened in the past. We need to devote some time as a collaborative body together to decide what we think the new standards should be. What should all teachers know and be able to do?” (Regardless of whether or not the applicants come out of a teacher preparation program.)

Mr. Jack Smith asked Ms. Spross, “what is it that we are expected to deliver? What does the General Assembly expect us to deliver? Let's work back from that to figure out what we need to do in the next 10 months. The General Assembly works best with specific things to do. Picture what it will look like in June 2018 and work back from that - how do we make it happen?”

- Revisions and ideas for implementing the Act and what we should do with that
- Recruit, retain, and promote teachers at all levels
- Interweave principals with NBCT
- NBCT interwoven into leadership
- Look at how teacher certification and occur and how to make it more valuable by linking to high needs schools
- Incorporate induction best practices
- Recommendations to existing state laws
 - Measurement and management
 - Reward for high quality work
- Evaluate AACPS stipend for effectiveness (in 2019)

Mr. Smith asked, what needs to happen in regulation this year to make it happen?

Ms. Spross stated that we need to look at the routes to certification. We need to look at the conditional certification route and make it more user-friendly, especially in high-needs areas.

Mr. Smith suggested to the workgroup cleaning this up and creating a foundation for all the money projects. This could be a foundation for the changes we want in the content of the legislation.

Ms. Spross stated that the group needs to challenge the Induction Community to put some uniformity behind this work. Ms. Spross stated that all of the teacher certification test should be reviewed to see if they are aligned with other states and to determine if they are still what Maryland wants? Some of the test may or may not be the best. Are there other ways to measure the readiness of a teacher - other than certification?

Mr. Smith stated that the group needed to look at areas of work to determine where in each foundational area change needs to happen. Then create a process map:

- Certification
- Program Approval

Ms. Emily Dow stated that we need to state the why. What problem or barrier are we solving? This way people will understand why X is a problem and why X is a recommendation.

FOUNDATION:

- Certification
- Teacher Preparation
- Incentives
- Induction
 - 1st year teachers
 - Out of state teachers

Ms. Shapiro stated that if we look at the teachers who are retained, do we know where they came from? Is there research about what the pool of teachers that we want look like and where they came from?

Ms. Dow inquired about exit data - can we make this a one-year requirement to do a more thorough exit interview? Current survey does not ask WHY they leave.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the workgroup could propose a residency model. Especially for those individuals who are coming to Maryland from a 4-year program or from out of state. Residency experience is a true medical residence. You become part of the community/school you are working in. You get a mentor.

Ms. Spross stated that there are 3 areas of interest that need to be researched and discussed further.

1. General access to the profession
2. Innovation (current state of affairs: NBCT, AACPS, incentives, etc.)
3. A whole new way of thinking about it (residency model)

Ms. Spross asked the group, "How do you see accomplishing this?" Should there be 2-3 committees or just the main group?"

Ms. Shapiro stated that MSDE could get started on sorting through a collaborative website with MHEC for people to make recommendations and suggestions.

Mr. Smith stated that the committee should lay the foundation. It should be split it into two groups and structured in a way that makes it easier to do the desirable thing. Mr. Smith also stated that the workgroup should draft something and take it back to the other 72 members.

- Short term innovations (NBCT and access)
- Long term desirable state that we want to get to (residency model)

Ms. Spross stated that the individuals at the table are the driving force and should take the information back to their stakeholders.

Ms. Kraft asked what the workgroup members can or cannot say to their stakeholders.

Mr. Derek Simonsen from the Attorney General's Office informed the workgroup that is not a problem with the quorum of the group discussing the information with their stakeholders. He recommended if there is an email sent out to the stakeholders, do not respond to all.

Ms. Spross told the group that she encourages them to go back and inform their stakeholders of the process, so that we can get feedback. She asked for recommendations of names of people to come and speak to the workgroup.

Ms. Spross told the workgroup that she wanted to make it clear and simple to those who are coming to Maryland to teach. You have X - then you do Y. We are not trying to lower standards - just make it clear and simple so that navigating the process is not a barrier to getting people to come teach in Maryland.

Ms. Shapiro told the group that this reminds her of the math pathway work they are doing. The pathway is equally rigorous, but not everybody has to do it the same way. The rigor is there but not everybody comes in at the same level. Our community college partners give us the opportunity to get the word out for recruitment and retention strategies.

Innovation and Access

- Do we need to be looking at or changing online PD course work?
- Is the rigor something we need to be looking at as well?

Ms. Shapiro implied that having a residency requirement could actually help with the pipeline. With the “for-profit” businesses involved collaboratively with MSDE and the schools to help monitor the quality of the people who are coming in; this is a challenge worth looking at.

Mr. Smith stated that we need to use a recursive drafting and reviewing process.

Mr. Justin Heid (MSEA) stated that this way we can get as many voices in the process as possible to get buy-in.

STATUS UPDATE: The interim report has gone to Annapolis.

Mr. Smith stated that the group needs to think about getting budgetary needs to LEAs as quickly as possible.

Ms. Kraft stated that we should look at Friday, January 20, 2017 for extended meeting time....with a white board so that the group can edit collaboratively.

Ms. Spross thanked everyone for their participation and wanted to know if they were comfortable with the foundation.

Meeting Adjourned

Meeting adjourned 2:45 p.m.

Appendix XVII



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
Materials of Interest
November 14, 2016 Meeting**

Chapter 740 (SB 493) Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016

http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2016rs/chapters_noln/ch_740_sb0493e.pdf

Statute that requires the State Department of Education to establish a workgroup, the participants, sets forth the elements to be reported on and the dates (November 1, 2016, November 1, 2017, and December 1, 2021) by which the interim and final reports must be submitted to the governor.

Materials of Interest

“Maryland Teacher Staffing Report 2016-2018”, Maryland State Department of Education September 2016

<http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DEE/ProgramApproval/MarylandTeacherStaffingReport20162018.pdf>

This report, just released at the end of October 2016, provides information on the number of teacher candidates produced through traditional and nontraditional teacher preparation programs. In addition the actual and anticipated hiring needs of the 24 local schools systems are included. This information addresses both the supply of new Maryland teachers and the demand that the local school systems expect in hiring.

“Education commission not just about money, but how it is spent, and what it achieves” Maryland Reporter.com November 1, 2016

<http://marylandreporter.com/2016/10/31/education-commission-not-just-about-money-but-how-its-spent-and-what-it-achieves/>

This article highlights the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education; commonly referred to as the Kirwan Commission. Included in the article is a link a PowerPoint used by Marc Tucker, National Center on Education and the Economy at the most recent meeting. The PowerPoint is entitled “What will it take for Maryland to compete with the best education systems in the world.”

“October Issue Brief: America’s Teacher Pipeline”, Core Education, October 28, 2016

<http://us5.campaign-archive1.com/?u=a4ae2b1b129b9f8a29d50b80f&id=512ea8208f>

This issue brief contains, 6 links to various articles pertaining to the Teacher Pipeline. Titles include *Educator Pipeline at Risk*, *Teacher Supply, Demand and Shortages in the U.S.*, *The condition of Future Educators*, *the Changing Landscape of the Teacher Workforce*, *Exploring the Teacher Shortage Dilemma*, and *Districts Facing Teacher Shortages Look for Lifelines*.

**“Final U.S. Teacher-Prep Regs Allow Flexibility on Student-Outcome Measures”,
Education Week, October 12, 2016**

http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2016/10/today_the_education_department.html?cmp=eml-enl-eu-news1-RM

This article provides a summary of the new requirements aimed at holding teacher training programs accountable for the performance of their graduates. Under the new regulations states will be required each year to rate all of its traditional, alternative, and distance preparation programs as either effective, at-risk, or low performing. Those that are identified as low performing will have to receive additional support. Annual ratings will be based on multiple measures; however, states will have the flexibility to use other measures deemed relevant to student outcomes. In an effort to help recruit diverse candidates into the teaching profession, students will be held to a high bar by program end not as a condition of admission..

“Education Department Releases Final teacher Preparation Regulations” U.S. Department of Education, October 12, 2016

http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/education-department-releases-final-teacher-preparation-regulations?utm_content=&utm_medium=email&utm_name=&utm_source=govdelivery&utm_term=

USDOE press release indicating the publication of new regulations governing teacher preparation programs. These focus on promoting stronger outcomes for all programs for both traditional and alternative preparation programs.

Key provisions of the regulations provide transparency around the effectiveness of all preparation programs (traditional, alternative routes, and distance) by requiring states to report annually—at the program level—on the following measures:

- Placement and retention rates of graduates in their first three years of teaching, including placement and retention in high-need schools;
- Feedback from graduates and their employers on the effectiveness of program preparation;
- Student learning outcomes measured by novice teachers' student growth, teacher evaluation results, and/or another state-determined measure that is relevant to students' outcomes, including academic performance, and meaningfully differentiates amongst teachers; and
- Other program characteristics, including assurances that the program has specialized accreditation or graduates candidates with content and pedagogical knowledge, and quality clinical preparation, who have met rigorous exit requirements.”

“Obama administration released long-delayed regulations for teacher-preparation programs”, The Washington Post, October 12, 2016

https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/obama-administration-releases-long-delayed-regulations-for-teacher-preparation-programs/2016/10/12/14049e10-8fee-11e6-9c52-0b10449e33c4_story.html

Provides and overview regarding the regulations published by the US Department of Education governing programs that prepared new K-12 teachers. These regulations require each State to issue annual ratings for teacher-preparation program. The regulations faced delays related to the issues surrounding the role standardized test scores play in gauging the effectiveness of a new teacher. The regulations allow states to decide how to measure student learning and how much that should count in an overall rating. It is important to note that these regulations apply to both traditional and alternative preparation programs. Ratings must be introduced as a pilot in the 2017-2018 year.

“Department of Education 34CFR Parts 612 and 686”, October 12, 2016

<http://www2.ed.gov/documents/teaching/teacher-prep-final-regs.pdf>

Newly established federal regulations to implement the requirements for the teacher preparation program accountability system under title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965. These amendments will result in the collection and dissemination of more meaningful data on teacher preparation program Quality. In addition the regulations governing the TEACH grant program have been amended.

“The teaching profession needs and overhaul”, Baltimore Sun, October 9, 2016

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bs-ed-teacher-shortage-20161009-story.html>

In this Op Ed piece, Dr. Nancy Grasmick provides commentary on the national teacher shortage.

“Debunking the myth of the ‘teacher pay gap’ again”, AEI, October 6, 2016

http://www.aei.org/publication/debunking-the-myth-of-the-teacher-pay-gap-again/?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=biggsteachermyth

This article by AEI provides an overview of the recent report by Economic Policy Institute (EPI) regarding their position that teacher are underpaid. AEI criticizes the report for not recognizing the work that has been done on teacher compensation since its last report in 2008.

“ESSA: How Should States and Districts Use their Teacher-Quality Money?” Education Week Blog, September 27, 2016

http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2016/09/how_should_states_use_their_teh.tml

This blog provides snapshot guidance regarding how states and districts may want to use the title II money under ESSA for teacher support, preparation, and training.

Appendix XVIII



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
January 20, 2017 Meeting**

The 10th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 9:30 a.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross (MSDE), Emily Dow, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland), Deborah Kraft (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association),

MSDE Staff: Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Karen Dates-Dunmore (MSDE), Tanisha Brown (MSDE)

Absentees: Marietta English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Laura Wheeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals)

Administration

Ms. Sarah Spross called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

Ms. Spross noted that today is a work day. At the last meeting we discussed identifying the issues, aligning our findings and recommendations to the issue. All identified issues must address the components of the Bill. Our goal today is to identify the framework/parameters for the committees to move forward with.

Secondly, the Instructional Performance Criteria (IPC) has been broken down into a working document highlighting a Column for Areas of Change/Innovation. The goal is for the workgroup members to identify the four standards today. The charge to the committee will be to identify the element, indicator, and evidence for each standard. The workgroup encourages the committee to be bold and innovative with their recommendations.

Dr. Shapiro asked for an update on CAEP and State Legislation update.

Ms. Spross noted the legislation has not dropped due to questions surrounding funding. We anticipate seeing it released soon.

Ms. Spross provided an update on the ESSA listening tours. To date MSDE has conducted meetings in Dorchester County, Washington County, Baltimore City and, and Prince George's

County. The last event will be held next week in Calvert County. Our group has facilitated the discussion regarding two areas of the consolidated state application; supporting excellent educators and equity. MSDE has over 500 respondents to the online survey and the listening tours have been well attended. Most respondents have been educators.

Comments have included: When teachers talk about teacher preparation we hear that the internship experience is not related to what it is really like to be a teacher. Ms. Spross told a story from a woman in Western Maryland that was about a teacher who was not prepared to teach people who did not look like her, sound like her, or grow up like her. This is something that needs to be looked at.

In Prince George's we heard about needing apprenticeships. We need to look at these issues. Is it a residence model, and is it about seeing different schools, doing coursework at night? We did not hear back as much about certification but the one thing we have heard from the survey is that the respondents do not think the tests are relative to what they are teaching. There are discrepancies about the testing issues. Is Maryland too hard or too soft? There is also disparity around being able to add a certification area by test. There are also responses to micro credentialing, but the focus is on the tests.

Professional Development was a big topic. The biggest thing is that we do not differentiate the professional development. Everyone has to do this class or that, but not always relevant. They want autonomy to choose professional development plans. They also want to see stronger mentorship models across the state. There needs to be a stronger pool of mentors with uniform standards. Professional Development should be from locals, IHE, or the State. It should be paid for by the State and all tie back to certification.

Fewer responses focused on equity but the State should mandate that those most qualified should teach in high needs schools. Could this be on a rotation? This has issues around being told what to do. The biggest take away is that we are not preparing our teachers in teacher prep or professional development for cultural competency. We need to pay attention to this.

Ms. Dow noted what stood out to her that we have not discussed are substitute teachers and what skills they should have.

Ms. Spross noted they also talked about the idea of growing your own. Those coming in do not know what Maryland norms are and we need to have supports in place for these people. Maryland needs to grow our own from our communities. There is some strong misunderstanding. They do not understand the State does provide Professional Development. One group talked about how Montgomery County does professional development and one participant asked about sister cities for support. They also talked about social media and technology to support professional development.

Dr. Shapiro asked if we can address these things and can we make changes. One of the approaches the University is addressing uses system-ness. If there is a good idea at UMES and Coppin is not doing it, we want to talk to the people at Coppin. We can help to make that connect. One of the potential drivers for MSDE should be systems.

Dr. Shapiro comments regarding the internship and that it is not enough. There have been recommendations around the internship. We know 100 days is not enough. We need to get behind the idea of a residency model. We are talking in IHEs that there should be multiple measures to qualify teachers and we should identify what they are. Next she addressed baseline measures. Professional Development in IHEs is not the same for all. We are reworking our advising systems and a meta-major. In Professional Development, can we create a meta area? For the equity topic, incentives are better than mandates to be in the challenging districts. Is it about money or about more time for mentorships? The schools should be structured differently. She continued with technology and social media. Our generation is feeling less competent and our organizations need to hire those who are competent. We need to think about who we hire into our organizations so we are more responsive.

Ms. Shurn noted disparity between young, and more seasoned, educators...don't need to push back on seasoned teachers, just increase collaboration. She proposed the idea of considering a 5-year track? Students do not feel ready.

Dr. Shapiro said there is not enough time in the program. Five years would be great, but it costs more. Ms. Shurn discussed the alternative pathways and how are those people being prepared. In secondary, you focus on content and not pedagogy. Elementary is the opposite. College and Career Readiness ask us to focus on this. Teachers need an in-depth knowledge. Do we need to shift from generalist in elementary to more specific?

Ms. Spross noted we have six months to make strong bold recommendations to overhaul what we need to do in Maryland. We can't be afraid to make recommendations regardless of money or if others will agree. Our recommendations should be based on what this group feels would be best for Maryland today.

Ms. Spross introduced the document that shows the recommendations that are in the report. They are not all measurable or deliverable. We need to bucket them into some big pieces like the residency model. This is a reformat of what we have.

Recommendations:

Ms. Spross noted we were missing the "what is the issue?" We learned it started with critical shortage and our certification regulations are a barrier. The law speaks about certification. How can we move forward and is certification something to fix?

Ms. Shurn agreed we should. There are areas in which you can get certified without taking coursework in an area where you have not taken any classes. This is of concern. Ms. Spross noted the requirements for transcript review is outdated. Ms. Shurn also noted you can test in. Ms. Spross reminded that these need to be aligned with what is right for Maryland. Dr. Shapiro spoke about the use of SPAs. Ms. Spross asked if we want to align to National Standards or what we are asking teachers to do in Maryland.

Dr. Shapiro noted everyone should be able to teach to Maryland College and Career Readiness.

Dr. Smith talked about the threshold of knowledge you need to have based on who you are teaching, something similar to Debra Ball at Michigan, with group work that leads to learning. Pedagogy is broader than this. Can the teacher apply what they know, not just knowing learning theory? If we do not go back to results in student performance we have issues that not everyone can respond to kids as a way to pull them back in, especially with cultural differences. We get hung up on tests and internship and we need to reach a threshold of competency in all the areas prior to or during initial teacher experience.

Dr. Kraft asked how can we capture this threshold?

Dr. Smith stated we can do a better job than we are doing now and it cannot be a binary system. We need to look at professional judgement and do quality control.

Ms. Spross noted we have five routes to certification. Maryland Approved Programs, Approved out of state, approved out of state administrative, approved out of state experienced professional, transcript analysis), and Maryland Resident Teacher Program. Are we limiting who we bring into the State? There is also the recommendation that National Board be considered a route.

Dr. Smith said he could support National Board in combination with something else. There is a level of evidence in National Board related to the threshold. National Board does not necessarily say you will get good student outcomes.

Dr. Shapiro said we should think of teachers as the highest level of profession like law and medical. Can we learn from how they qualify to come into the profession?

Ms. Blumenthal noted the experience does not necessarily produce teachers who have good student outcomes.

Dr. Kraft pointed out the issue is that the recommendations are going to greater limit certification.

Ms. Spross asked if there are other states that have different options for becoming certified to teach in there state. Also are there different models as opposed to a single tier system. Do we want to explore a different tiered system and not require a Masters, still requiring professional development? Georgia has a two- tiered system focused on outcome. We never differentiate high quality.

Dr. Smith asked what the flaws in our pathways are. Or where are the flaws where we have been ridiculous?

Ms. Shurn expressed frustration with pathways to certification for herself.

Ms. Spross agreed that MSDE sees flaws in the process all the time. We need to break down barriers. Transcript analysis was designed for those who did not go through a traditional route. We do need to think about minimum threshold.

Dr. Smith asked if you need courses AND Praxis.

Ms. Meadows commented on transcript analysis and the subjectivity of it. It is a complicated process with the certification specialist and educator.

Ms. Spross noted the test vs. the courses and we will have people who feel very strongly about this issue.

Dr. Smith offered that we need to change the conversation. One thing does not make you a teacher.

Ms. Spross noted a certification only means you have met the requirements to teach.

Dr. Shapiro commented on the threshold, can we make sure even brilliant people who are great with content but terrible with students are not in the classroom, there should be a do no harm threshold.

Dr. Smith noted that not all people should be teaching and counseling them out is a success.

Ms. Kraft said they should be counseled out in teacher education and currently we do not have a system of knowing if they would be good. We need an apprenticeship. Even the best may not make it. They need more support from everyone in teacher education.

Ms. Spross confirmed that as a workgroup we want to change the language around what is a certification, look at a minimum for do no harm, and we need to look at how to assess that. We need to look at other states to see what can learn from them. The group agreed that not all teachers need to go to Advanced Professional Certificate.

Ms. Shurn stressed the need for teacher leadership standards.

Ms. Spross reminded the group that PSTEB and the SBOE will need to review and approve regulatory language changes. Members asked are we answering the problem of not enough teachers and removing the barrier to staying in the profession.

Ms. Shurn noted there may be specialty programs where no Masters exist.

Dr. Smith pointed out the subset of the domain of teachers. If you are good at teaching students you may or may not be good at teaching adults. If you are not good at teaching any students you will not have the credibility to teach teachers.

Dr. Shapiro noted that not requiring the Masters has huge impact on higher education. Micro credentialing is possibly a new pathway in partnership skills. Schools see higher education as a resource.

Ms. Spross said the other barrier is the basic skills test. There are a significant group of educators who have difficulty with the math in CTE and work based study. This is a huge issue with CTE.

Ms. Meadows commented that currently you can renew a conditional certificate two times and someone does not need to submit their basic skills test at first and they can still teach for two years without the test and if they do not pass the test they are done.

Dr. Kraft has talked with faculty who said many students do not enter the profession because of the tests.

Dr. Shapiro noted that we should not lower the bar so low we do not have a way of ensuring we have qualified people teaching. There may be a way to make exceptions. If do not want to lower it to the point we get people we do not want.

Ms. Shurn reminded the group there was a time we took composite scores. She said we need to rethink the bands we are providing certification in.

Dr. Smith offered we should think differently about this. Think of it as processes, we could think about a different kind of certificate. You can teach literacy but maybe not math. But everyone needs to read and write at a threshold.

Ms. Spross reminded everyone there are multiple ways to do basic skills.

Ms. Meadows talked about the Praxis II and how it fits in with content.

Dr. Shapiro spoke about how people understand math and what the basic math includes. Tests should be modified if we ask students to go beyond Algebra I.

Ms. Spross moved the conversation into the need for incentives for our teachers to teach in low performing schools and we need ways to do that. Loan forgiveness only at the Federal level.

Dr. Smith talked about Pinsky's unfunded law from two or three years ago that is related to scholarship or loan repayment. This might come out of the Kirwan Commission.

Dr. Shapiro thinks we should think about school structure to reduce burnout. Working conditions need to provide support for teachers.

Dr. Kraft said the schools that pay the most are not necessarily where people teach.

Ms. Shurn thinks there should be support for National Board Certification and those that are not.

Ms. Spross noted the State does pay for 2/3 of National Board, but not all locals will pay for it.

Ms. Shurn talked about loan repayment and housing as well.

Ms. Spross noted MSDE looked at all 50 states to see what incentives they had in place.

Ms. Dow brought up the idea of a medical model for placing first year teachers, on a semi random match like a medical residency.

Dr. Smith noted it would need to include a large incentive for people to participate in this idea.

Ms. Shurn asked how students that do not have experience will know what they know.

Dr. Smith stated we need to change the internship model or apprentice.

Dr. Kraft asked if students are getting enough experience in other experiences.

Ms. Spross and Ms. Dow talked about staying in a district but maybe changing schools but having a specific mentor.

Ms. Shurn noted there are some issues with no fault leaving and performance.

Dr. Kraft said this might be able to start as a pilot.

Dr. Smith noted there is a difference between can't and don't want to.

Ms. Spross shifted the discussion to the about the internship and how does it align to real life classroom experiences. Teachers often do not get hired into school communities that reflect their internship placement.

Ms. Shurn asked if there is a definition of professional development. What is it and what is it not? We need to consider standards to plan what is appropriate. Schools need to know the difference between professional development and a meeting. The shift needs to be towards learning.

Ms. Spross noted we are hearing from teachers they need more supports.

Dr. Kraft noted new teachers want a safe environment to talk about things they need help on.

Ms. Spross asked if it is innovative and do we want to recommend a residency. Is there a system-ness of professional development in the State? This will lend itself most to the retention piece.

Dr. Kraft asked if someone needs to do this for three years.

Dr. Smith noted we need to create a sense of belonging with new teachers but we also need to build professionalism, depth of knowledge, skills and understanding.

Ms. Shurn noted teachers ask for non-instructional support. How do we create instructional and non-instructional communities?

Dr. Smith said what children learn needs to be the outcome.

Ms. Blumenthal said teachers should have ownership of their own professional development and this might not happen if a Masters is not required.

Dr. Shapiro noted there is a movement in IHEs that are college success courses, like an orientation course in the beginning.

Dr. Smith noted nothing is binary and we need to aim for the threshold level.

Ms. Spross said we should look at the renewal and we could rebrand it. Three buckets, reworking certification, incentives for working in high need schools, system-ness of professional development and induction, and the next bucket, how do we design teacher education and how we prepare teachers? Retention will be with mentoring.

Ms. Dow noted that there are leadership issues with retention. Not all leadership is principals. Ms. Shurn asked when the last time the leadership requirements were reviewed was and it was in the last few years.

The workgroup agreed that on the 31st we want to drive the conversation for the committees.

Ms. Spross introduced Ms. Dunkle and the changes to the Instructional Performance Criteria. This is not a time for debate, but instead a time to review what Ms. Dunkle has done. She has broken down the components of the IPC. The group needs to agree if they want to keep, toss, change, or innovate the components.

Ms. Dow asked if these standards for IHE and for alt. prep. Ms. Dunkle confirmed that they are.

Ms. Spross noted if CAEP wants to be an accrediting body in the State of Maryland they must meet these standards.

Ms. Kraft noted IPC is currently different from CAEP.

Ms. Spross continued that the workgroup needs to confirm each component.

Ms. Spross introduced Component 1: Strong Academic Background. She asked the group if they agree and they all agreed.

Dr. Shapiro wanted to know what strong academic background in elementary education is.

Ms. Dunkle explained there is literacy and soon to be math workgroups to look at the elementary requirements and we will be looking at the entire elementary program. Ms. Dunkle confirmed changes will be brought back to the workgroup. There are issues around elementary math and the core math class.

Ms. Spross noted different committees will need to keep in mind what other committees are doing. Component 2: Extensive Internship. Ms. Spross reminded the group that we all agree there should be an extensive internship.

Ms. Dunkle noted the research on the preparation of the initial teacher, says it should be extensive. There is room for, a call for, and innovation for change. One hundred days is an arbitrary number. The ESSA groups pointed out we do not know who we are talking about when we say first year teachers. We cannot ensure a diverse experience. The model needs innovation to meet the needs of student interns. Can we decided to keep idea of extensive internship we will be good.

Dr. Kraft noted we need to be careful around the language; it is about the spirit of internship.

Ms. Spross said we need to give the committee who will be working on this guidance. We need rebranding. We need to look at the 100 days.

Ms. Dunkle noted we have never taken anything away and the committees can look at this document and make the recommendations they want to make and the workgroup will then reconsider the recommendations.

Dr. Shapiro suggested changes to Component I and how it is structured and how we define the element of the component.

Ms. Dunkle suggested we consider adding more and keep in mind accountability.

Ms. Spross noted we should not be doing the work of the committees. Ms. Dunkle reminded the group this is the IPC and we should give the committees the opportunity to make the recommendations.

Ms. Shurn clarified that some of the elements are better as indicators. Considering the timeframe do we shift things around for the time to be more meaningful?

Dr. Shapiro wants the biggest box possible with multiple indicators.

Ms. Spross asked if we are allowing broader group to make decisions and recommendations. If we structure the elements you are telling them what they have to work within. Someone on the committee might feel differently from the workgroup. We need to reshape the committees and there could be a workgroup member that is part of the committees.

Ms. Dunkle suggested you can put everything in the column of indicator and let the committee what rises to that level.

Ms. Spross suggested workgroup members integrate into the committee work. Do we need to identify different people to serve on the committees? Ms. Spross and the group agreed the four components are good. The elements should be moved into indicators.

Ms. Dunkle gave some feedback on the requirement for evidence where possible. She asked the group to encourage the workgroup to ask their constituents to think out of the box about

technology and innovation. How creative can they be and this should be brought to the table. This is an opportunity to see big change.

Ms. Spross noted the innovated program Drs. Smith and Shapiro talked about could fit into multiple places in the components.

Dr. Shapiro said we should not hold ourselves back based on finances and we should include the idea of career lattices in professional development.

Ms. Shurn offered the idea that mentors should be its own component. There should be collaboration between the locals and the IHEs with the help of the State.

Ms. Spross asked the group to consider new workgroups with certification, incentives, professional development, mentoring, and the IPC. We will need to know the new committee members. There also needs to be a new structure to committee work that lets the workgroup to debrief and update. There can be professional development for teachers and professional development for leadership.

The January 31, 2017 meeting is at the Arbutus Library.

Meeting adjourned 12:30

Appendix XIX

**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
January 31, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

The 11th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 1:04 p.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross (MSDE), Emily Dow (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community College), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Deborah Kraft (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland), Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals)

MSDE Staff: Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Tanisha Brown (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE); Karen Dates-Dunmore (MSDE), Linda Murel (MSDE), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE), Jeanne Marie Holly (MSDE), Cecilia Rowe (MSDE), and Derek Simonsen, Esq. (Attorney General's Office)

Absentees: Mariette English (Baltimore Teacher's Union), Kimberly Pratesi (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Laura Weeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals)

Introduction:

Ms. Spross welcomed everyone to the 11th meeting of the workgroup of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016. She stated that she was impressed with the turnout for the meeting and that this was a very important meeting. Ms. Spross let the workgroup know that the meeting is scheduled until 4 p.m. She informed the committee members to use this time to work on their new assignments. She explained that the three-hour meeting that was held on January 20, 2017 with the workgroup was used to look at some of the things that the workgroup/committees have talked about and to refocus/retool the committees. Out of the January 20 meeting, five new committees were created: Committee 1 – Certification Restructuring; Committee 2 – Quality Teacher Incentives; Committee 3 – Expansion of Professional Development & Induction; Committee 4 – Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria; Committee 5 - Mentoring.

Approval of December Minutes

Ms. Sarah Spross entertained a motion to approve December minutes.

MOTION: Nancy Shapiro/Linda Gronberg-Quinn

To approve the December minutes.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Approval of January Minutes

Ms. Sarah Spross entertained a motion to approve January minutes.

MOTION: Rowena Shurm/Tess Blumenthal

To approve the January minutes.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Ms. Spross gave a brief update on the ESSA feedback. Ms. Spross stated that there have been five ESSA Listening Tours, all in the month of January. The tours were well attended by teachers, parents, advocates and other professionals. An online survey has been created to get feedback from the attendees. Ms. Spross noted that so far, there have been 2,097 responses. Ms. Spross shared with the group feedback from the ESSA tours from Word Clouds.

Ms. Spross gave further instructions to each of the committees. The committees were given 2 ½ hours to discuss and outline their specific topics. She stated that the workgroup has to have the report finished by August. She asked the committee members if they could come up with one priority, what would it be? Ms. Spross requested that each committee come up with the top 3 recommendations, but would love to see 5 recommendations in priority order.

Dr. Nancy Shapiro stated that the new teachers are not fully prepared to do what they are taught to do. Dr. Shapiro noted that even though at the January 20th meeting the workgroup validated the five categories that needed to be done, something like the induction category was not done because it touches all of the five committees. Dr. Shapiro stated that there will be overlap with all five of the committees because one thing is continued to the other.

Ms. Spross reiterated that work will cross over into the different committees. She noted that it is critically important for there to be continued discussion. Ms. Spross reiterated to the group the importance and requirements of the Open Meeting Act. While no committee work can be completed outside of the meetings; it is essential to give and get feedback to the organizations that you represent. Each committee contains two MSDE representatives (1 employee and 1 note taker). Ms. Spross asked if there were any questions. She received no response.

Ms. Spross instructed the workgroup and the other attendees to break up into the five committees. She instructed the committee members that they were allotted 2 hours to discuss and outline the top priorities for each topic.

Committee Break-out Session – 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

See attached draft minutes from each committee

3

Ms. Spross called the workgroup back to order at 3:30 p.m. She asked the workgroup members if they wanted to do a brief report out or collect the notes from each committee.

Dr. Jack Smith stated that doing a report out would not be necessary. He shared that Ms. Dunkle did a very good job with Committee IV (Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria). Ms. Rowena Shurn inquired about the timeframe in which each workgroup member will receive copies of each committee's notes. Ms. Spross indicated that she would disseminate the draft minutes within two weeks (February 14, 2017).

Ms. Spross stated that the next meeting will be held on February 21st at the Arbutus Library from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. The workgroup will review and talk about the notes received for each committee. This will allow the workgroup to see where they need to go with each committee.

Ms. Spross thanked everyone for their participation.

Meeting Adjourned

Meeting adjourned 2:45 p.m.

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016

Workgroup

January 31, 2017 Meeting

Committee #1- Certification Restructuring

Committee Members Present: Mary Tillar, PSSAM; Darren Hornbeck, MSEA; Margaret Trader; MICUA; Karen Robertson, USM; Kelly Meadows, MSDE; and Jeanne-Marie Holly, MSDE

Committee Members Absent: Audra Butler, MADTECC and Carrie Conley, MAESP

MSDE Staff: Tanisha L. Brown

Attorney General's Office: Derek Simmons, Esq., Assistant Attorney General

Alternates Present: N/A

Approval of Minutes:

Not applicable

Discussion:

Mr. Hornbeck started the discussion by asking if teachers are adequately prepared to enter the classroom? New teachers have always wondered what IHEs can do to help them be more prepared. He shared the following points:

- Teachers often cite lack of sufficient preparation in: classroom management, reading and special education
- Difficulty including extra coursework, because of limited time in course schedules (IHEs limited to 128 credit hours for a program) and extending time in school creates financial issue
- Creating a five year degree is not beneficial – teachers only earn \$40k or less entering the classroom.

Dr. Robertson shared that many new teachers are placed in most difficult classes because no one else wants them. Resultantly, many new teachers leave because they are in over their heads. The group agreed that seasoned teachers should have most difficult classes and asked what the LEAs are doing to ensure new teachers are placed where they can be most successful?

Mr. Hornbeck suggested we are losing teachers at both ends of the continuum (i.e. fewer are entering and fewer are remaining). The group discussed several points, including:

- Well-trained teachers still don't always make it to year 3.
- Teacher autonomy and ability to be treated as professionals are the 2 biggest issues with retention, per National Survey.

Ms. Meadows offered to facilitate that committee discussion and shared the agenda items with all. The objective of today's meeting is to narrow the focus and identify the committee's top 3 priorities moving forward. The group decided to spend time talking about each item presented and decide which items aren't pertinent to certification and which items were critical.

Ms. Meadows shared an overview of the current routes to certification in Maryland and available certificates. The group discussed the route of transcript analysis. Ms. Trader shared that transcript analysis can be liberating for individuals with content degrees who only need pedagogy (i.e. it extends the continuum).

Ms. Meadows shared that we often hear teachers saying they don't feel like professionals because they aren't treated like professionals. Mr. Hornbeck shared that teachers consistently share in surveys that they do not feel valued as professionals because they do not have the autonomy to do their jobs.

Ms. Tiller suggests the teacher continuum should be enhanced not eliminated.

Mr. Hornbeck emphasized the importance of ensuring a minimum qualification threshold for teachers, regardless of shortage issues. The group posed the questions:

- If applicant cannot pass basic skills, should they be able to enter the profession?
- What are the minimum requirements for certification, including:
 - Coursework
 - Classroom management
 - Special needs
 - Reading
 - Content
 - Pedagogy
 - Basic skills
 - Tests/assessments/portfolio
 - Experience (classroom)
 - Internship/clinical experiences
 - Cultural diversity

Would an adjunct certificate be useful? If so, should it have the following limitations?

- Valid for a limited period
- Renewable
- Not available for individuals currently pursuing certification

Mr. Hornbeck suggested adjunct certificates could be useful, but that these instructors should not be permitted to teach students with special needs. The group asked the following questions with regard to an adjunct certificate:

- What should be minimum requirements for Adjunct teaching certificate?
- Should it be modeled after Resident Teacher Certificate (RTC)?
- Should it be available in all subject areas or just specialty cert areas?

The committee agreed that the National Board route to certification is welcomed and referred to this route as "a no brainer".

Materials of Interest Requests for next meeting:**Next Steps:**

- Discuss the possibility of an adjunct certification and elements for inclusion in a draft regulation
- Define the must haves and basic requirements for initial certification, renewals and endorsements, including:
 - Classroom management
 - Special needs
 - Reading
 - Content
 - Pedagogy
- Discuss the conditional certificate and possible regulatory language changes
- Explore the concept of micro-credentialing
- Draft regulatory language elements to be included for National Board Certification to be included in the initial route option continuum

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016

Workgroup

January 31, 2017 Meeting

Committee #2- Quality Teacher Incentives

Committee Members Present: Justin Heid, MSEA; Fran Kroll, MADTECC; Tess Blumenthal, MAESP; Alexandra Cambra, MSDE; Jeanne Marie Holly, MSDE

Committee Members Absent: Monique Sloan, MAESP; Tanya Williams, MICUA; Tony Navaro, PSSAM; and Althea Pennerman

Workgroup Members Present: Deborah Kraft, MICUA

MSDE Staff: Ruth Downs

Alternates Present: None

Approval of Minutes:

Not applicable

Discussion:

Ms. Alex Cambra reiterated the instructions provided by Ms. Spross and the workgroup. She provided the packet prepared for the committee called "Committee II: Quality Teacher Incentives" and reviewed its contents.

Ms. Fran Kroll stated that loan forgiveness program is something that should be offered to teachers.

Ms. Kroll stated that we need to recruit more people into the field of teaching. Enrollment is down about 10% at the 2 year colleges. Students who attend community college need to work and go to school at the same time.

Mr. Justin Heid stated that the incentives need to be tied to the recruitment process.

Ms. Kroll stated that a lot of students don't have money to go to college full-time and 4-year colleges are waiting for students. Ms. Kroll stated that we need to sell ourselves bit better. Ms. Rowena Shurn rotated through the committees and offered some comments to this committee. She talked about reshaping internships. She asked if we could provide funding for paid internships or provide a stipend. Ms. Shurn asked if institutes of higher education (IHEs) partner with the local education agencies (LEAs) so that the student is able to continue to work while studying.

Ms. Deborah Kraft stated that internships cannot be paid because it would cost too much money. Universities cannot afford to pay the students. Ms. Kraft stated that Superintendent Dance met with all the Deans and Directors to let them know what Baltimore County needed and what they can offer.

Mr. Heid stated that there are two categories: Recruitment and Retention. He stated that at one time, Frederick County Public Schools offered a stipend to teachers if they stayed for 3 years.

Ms. Kraft stated that for recruitment, we should offer the Teacher Academy and Loan Forgiveness as incentives.

Mr. Heid informed the committee that "Loan Forgiveness" is based off of what your yearly salary is.

Ms. Kroll stated that she felt that the "Loan Forgiveness" should be a program that offers a no pay back payment plan and should be for all teachers. We should also offer tuition reimbursement.

Ms. Cambra stated that "Priority School" is the new name for comprehensive needs school.

Ms. Kroll stated that we should add affordable housing along with the loan forgiveness for recruitment for all and not just in geographic shortage areas.

Mr. Heid stated that housing should be more defined, because a lot of teachers are traveling to other counties for lower rent.

Ms. Cambra shared feedback provided to the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) during the five Listening Tours conducted across the state in the month of January. She shared that a lot of teachers on the Eastern Shore stated that when they move to a district for a job, especially on the Eastern Shore, their spouses or significant other cannot find employment.

Ms. Kroll made a recommendation of offering a monthly payment towards housing, or in their salary, add \$10,000 more as taxable income because housing is important. Many teachers complain about not being able to afford to live where they work.

Ms. Kraft stated that many teachers live at home because they cannot afford to live on their own.

Ms. Kroll stated that items 3, 5 and 6 of the proposed recommendations provided by the workgroup to the committees should be combined. When recruiting for highly qualified students into teaching careers, we should offer statewide loan forgiveness, a housing stipend, scholarships and early college/teacher academies. The school system should also offer loan forgiveness for those teachers who are getting their masters when they negotiate their contract. Out-of-state recruitment should offer loan forgiveness too. There should be loan forgiveness for all undergrads and MAT students for any major. Ms. Kroll also felt that retention should be retro-active, but noted it is much more expensive.

Mr. Heid told the committee to be careful that they are not creating two tiers. The packages should be equal.

Mr. Heid stated that the first year teacher mentoring program should be school based. He stated that there is a lot of discussion about National Board Certified Teachers (NBCT) incentives for teachers with a lot of experience. Maybe we need to change how NBCT is seen. There should be Maryland based professional development that will continue to help teachers grow in their profession.

Ms. Kroll stated that appropriate professional development/mentoring would help teachers to be promoted and possibly keep them in the profession. She asked the question, what we could do for a residency to help build a bridge from college to classroom.

Ms. Kraft stated that the 5th year should be more than an internship. Maybe a residency model – 100 days.

Ms. Tess Blumenthal stated that it could be a paid internship. We should offer teachers an extra personal day or two. She stated that low performing schools are not the essence for teacher incentives. For first year teachers, there should be some kind of residency or extra support during their first 2-years of teaching.

Mr. Heid stated that it should be a co-teaching model.

Ms. Kraft stated that all schools need professional development.

Ms. Kroll stated that there should be intensive mentoring for new teachers in priority schools.

Top 2 Categories

Retention

Career Lattice

State-wide Loan Forgiveness

Mentoring Programs

Residency/Mentoring (look at working w/teacher academy various state-wide models at Maryland Higher Education Commission)

Recruitment

Mentoring Program

State-wide Loan Forgiveness

Housing

Materials of Interest Requests for next meeting:

Pull incentive findings from survey for ESSA

- Developing Teacher Leaders Survey Results (attached)
- Incentives for Retention Survey Results (attached)

Next Steps: Next Committee meeting is on February 21st.

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016

Workgroup

January 31, 2017 Meeting

Committee #3- Professional Development for Teachers and Administrators

Committee Members Present: Kathy Angeletti (USM); Henoah Hailu (MSEA), Yi Huang (USM), Heather Lageman (PSSAM), Laura Liccion (MSDE); Yi Huang, (USM)

Committee Members Absent: Deanna Stock (MADTECC); Phyllis Lloyd (MAESP), Judy Jenkins (MICUA);

MSDE Staff: Karen Dates Dunmore (MSDE)

Alternates Present: Dewayne Morgan (P-20 Director, USM)

Approval of Minutes:

Not applicable

Discussion:

- There needs to be a clear template re expectations that should be consistent state-wide
- Definition of “career ladders” – certain pathways that are highly focused and personalized—multiple pathways. Not everyone has to become an administrator—master teachers who provide mentor role
- Lack of support—PD is what is holding them back. Growing movement for past 3-4 years. Need structure and support.
- Key factor—alternative options to learning – rethink what matters most to teachers
- Credentialing is being re-thought—more customizable
- Research and evidenced based
- Engage teachers with other teachers
- Look at different ways to acquire knowledge – do not focus on seat time and counting hours – performance based
- Re-visit inhibiting structures
- Cultural proficiency training in first year
- Pathways change and grow
- Interest in salary scales being tied to credentialing
- Focus on PD to be personalized, tied to the teacher
- Focus on teacher needs to be effective in the classroom
- Availability of both seat time and other options for certification
- Bring in LEA’s so that we are not in competition with them—what is important to them
- How do we start “new”?
- Parts of teacher induction are not being followed by all jurisdictions—no one there to “mind the store”

- Shift the mind-set in schools
- School-university partnership – what does it mean? Focus on what has been required – year long PD experience – hard to go beyond the requirements. A lot contingent upon reception of faculty and principals. Looking to create a different kind of dynamic—true partnership re how learning is designed. Tap into the power of many voices to really look at what works
- Resources are biggest deterrent. Are funds being used in the best place possible?
- Schools and universities need to really look together
- Micro credentialing
- Collective resources with higher ed
- Induction – coaching is more important
- Quality of cooperating teachers is random. Role of selecting mentors is critical
- Release time for mentors – jurisdictions cannot afford the release time
- Higher ed partnerships – use as teacher mentors
- Changing the ability to become a mentor—it should not be as easy
- Change master teacher role – shared role as part of university partnership. Look at different configurations that promote shared responsibility. Hybrid roles
- Do we know all of the PD available in the state and how much is over lapping, are all needs addressed, all areas covered—need to inventory. Send out a survey. What is the cost of running the programs—then bring people together to prioritize, eliminate overlap. Better way to tap into what the teachers need. (MSDE professional development office – CPD database – not all LEA’s—have a starting point. What offered that is not thru CPD—does not come thru MSDE. IHE’s also have offerings. LEA’s have offerings – need to be able to access. Where are the voids where we can partner with IHE’s—more course offerings)
- Department chairs – another resource because they already are trained as coaches.
- More of an on line credentialing process at state level – cross boundaries
- Micro-credentials – skills, application, classroom, research, reading courses
- LEA’s would benefit from micro-credentialing
- Directory of current offerings—how to start compiling info?
- Coppin – looking at cultural competency as first set of micro-credentialing
- IHE’s could look at instruction; if able, to look at inventory of what is available
- Make clear to districts that there is a customizable option – let LEA’s know that we can offer blueprints to follow (we are not trying to take over)
- Cost is a deterrent – incentives to keep the costs of good quality PD down – obstacles to current set up
- Time constraints if one commits to taking advanced classes – teachers do not have time
- Several principals have started the university model – opportunities within the school – menu options based upon one’s needs – credits for leading learning as well participating
- Need to take evaluative role out of mentorship.

Recommendation – combine 1 & 3 – RECOMMENDATION 1

Create statewide professional development pathways with career-wide learning opportunities for educators across the state.

Recommendation – combine 2 & 5 – RECOMMENDATION 2

Establish a school-university partnership process for building PD programs that link but are not limited to certification requirements for renewing.

- A. Establish shared responsibilities for induction and professional development programs that may include components such as mentoring and coaching, etc.
- B. Programs should incorporate a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National DPDS, Learning Forward Standards for Professional Learning, etc.

Materials of Interest Requests for next meeting:

- Digital Promise - micro credentialing (Heather)
https://bloomboard.com/microcredential/provider/ac2f23c8-274d-449d-ac3f-6ad29e399737#designing_and_facilitating_high_quality_professional_learning
- New Teacher Center – Santa Cruz – have research to share and assessments in place—rank re effectiveness of programs. Show direct impact of resources. P-20 partnership model. Look at states with the highest rankings, like Kentucky. (Heather)
<https://newteachercenter.org/resources/>
- Induction models (Laura/Dan)
- Local educator unions also providing PD – get their info (NCEA—one example) (Laura or HOLD until further conversation)
- PD language from ESSA—look at PD vs PL. (Heather)
ESSA: <https://learningforward.org/who-we-are/professional-learning-definition>
LF: <http://mediaportal.education.ky.gov/educator-effectiveness/2013/05/professional-development-vs-professional-learning/>
- Resource –Beyond PD-- Ben Jensen – report on career ladders – (Heather)
<http://ncee.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/BeyondPDDec2016.pdf>

Next Steps:

For further discussion at the next meeting:

- Research LEA's and see what they are doing in PD—determine which LEA's to focus upon
- Are there different staffing models that we can explore?
- Private industry looking at micro credentials – should IHE's develop?
- What are the PD plans for each teacher—how can a blueprint be developed for LEA's?
- Look at structures to see where there are areas and obstacles that need to be re-visited
- How to make recertification relevant—making more PD count toward re-certification—should any six credits be acceptable?
- Can reps from The New Teacher Center attend one of our meetings?

**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup
January 31, 2017 Meeting
Committee #4 - Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria**

Committee Members Present: Chadia Abras (MICUA), Stacie Burch (MADTECC), Robin L. McNair (MSEA), Laurie Mullen (USM), Eugene Schaffer (USM), Jack Smith (PSSAM), and Michelle Dunkle (MSDE).

Committee Members Absent: Lisa Booth (MAESP)

Workgroup Members Present: Nancy Shapiro (USM); Emily Dow (MHEC); and Rowena Shurn (MSEA)

Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) Staff: Linda Murel

Alternates Present: None

Convene: 1:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes:

Not Applicable

Discussion:

Handouts that were distributed: Committee IV: Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria (Recruitment and Induction) a draft and discussion document Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC) of the Redesign of Teacher Education.

Ms. Michelle Dunkle asked members to introduce themselves. She stated that our charge is to look at the Institutional Performance Criteria and make revisions. Ms. Dunkle echoed Ms. Sarah Spross that Committee IV's name was changed to "Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria."

Ms. Dunkle said that there will be state program approval and asked everyone to look at the chart noting that the committee would note areas of change and innovation. Laurie Mullen suggested that Michelle needed to make sure that everyone understood the chart and what is being requested at this time.

Dr. Nancy Shapiro said it was good to keep everything as aligned as possible with Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Ms. Dunkle suggested that the language of the bill did not intend for two sets of reports, as long as there is alignment with elements of teacher preparation that we want in our state program approval process.

Ms. Dunkle shared that:

- If the institution chooses to continue with CAEP there will be a process to ensure that state priorities are met
- It is not anyone's intent to make the process harder, but simple as possible

- The Work Group already committed to the four components of the existing IPC with 1, 3 and 5 probably not too much in controversy
- The Internship is where the distinction is with the elements forming the basis for program approval.

Ms. Robin McNair agreed with the importance of the internship and the need for background knowledge before they go into the field. She explained that the internship experience is different from what happens when teachers are then hired. Ms. McNair was an advocate for ensuring that coursework prior to internship prepares adequately for the field experience.

Ms. Dunkle noted that there was a manual developed from the Race to the Top project titled *Preparing Educators for High Poverty/Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Schools: A Manual for Teacher Educators, Teachers and Principals* that can be found on the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) website and hard copies were available. A consortium of eleven universities collaborated to provide this manual as a tool for preparation.

Ms. Dunkle shared that on the Institutional Performance Criteria discussion document items that were in the Elements column were moved over to the Indicator column. The feeling of the Work Group was that the committee should be free to decide which of the items rise to the level of a supporting element and which should remain as Indicators of having met the requirements of the Element. After a lively discussion, Dr. Smith suggested that Component I: Strong Academic Background might better be referred to as Strong Instructional Preparation so that pedagogy and instruction on cultural sensitivity, etc., would be considered a part of the instruction. Dr. Laurie Mullen stated that Component I defined as Strong Academic Background in comparison to Component III Performance Assessment may have more weight, but the only thing in regulations are reading courses.

Ms. Spross, in making her rounds, said that we will do what is good for Maryland.

Ms. Dunkle has three things that she wanted the Committee to focus on:

- What would you need going into an internship to support regional professional development centers? We cannot provide funding.
- What structure could we build that would not rely on additional external funding, or should this be one of those places where the committee requests funding?
- There a number of Professional Development Schools in very challenging schools, but are those experiences organized to the best advantage to the candidate and the schools?

Dr. Chadia Abras stated that she likes the idea of regional professional development centers.

Dr. Eugene Schaffer said some of the questions are:

- How does professional development work?
- How can I work with you as a county?
- The school system and university create and build standards.
- How do you address children coming from high poverty areas?
- All teachers can evidence that they can teach all children.

Ms. Dunkle said that the PDS model created in 1995 may not be what we need now.

Dr. Smith asked, at the minimum what do we want for the state?

- Provide multiple internship experiences
- Provide for lower critical poverty mass in schools possibly paired with...
- Higher critical poverty mass in school
- Candidates to understand the Social Emotional needs of our students
- Ensure strong instructional preparation
- Make teachers aware of the experiences some children have every day
- Teach prospective teachers to build relationships with others

Dr. Shapiro asked Dr. Smith if he would work with those schools, he said "Yes."

Comments and Questions:

- How can you measure that a teacher has the right disposition?
- There should be strong content knowledge across the board and there are still issues.
- A specific course addressing cultural competency could be in place that teachers must take.
- How do we address the challenge of diverse classrooms?
- Look at what is possible in a school system
- You can look at poverty, not necessarily based on English Learners, and look at what is actually doable
- What kind of accountability and responsibility is there for school superintendents?
- We hope CAEP moves us in the direction
- State Board involvement is needed
- How does it work with Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs (MAAPPs)
 - Ms. Dunkle said it is totally on the local school system with MAAPPs, a different type of program. We need to know if we are doing a better job of recruiting teachers through the Maryland Approved Programs and MAAPPs.

We must have in a teacher education program:

1. Socio-Emotional coursework for teachers and children
2. Assure internships reflect diversity - should be coursework (this will add cost) modules – competency based-experience
3. More required fields – cannot do all in the same place

4. 100 days over two semesters (What should and could change?)
5. What is it I can give to people that is similar to their very first year?
6. How one begins and closes their school years (Dr. Smith said take out the word "teacher" and use "firefighter" instead when thinking of the requisite skills)
7. Experience has to be one where candidates are assessed and provided with feedback
8. Look at function of teacher, be able to produce student learning
9. Observe before teaching
10. Clinical component – high leverage and high impact practices (Towson University practices with a colleague)
11. Does everybody have to do the same thing?
12. Can there be a state model with umbrella requirements
13. Response to CAEP training
14. Critical Practice of Understanding
15. Theoretical instruction (continued in internship and employment)
16. Refinement and preparation for the continuation of learning throughout not only the induction years but throughout the career
17. Is data literacy non-negotiable?

Materials of Interest Requests for next meeting:

Next Steps:

Go over IPC Areas of Change/Innovation comments at next meeting.

Note: Not all conversation was ascribed to the speaker by name; however, everyone participated throughout the meeting and many of the bulleted points came from those not recognized by name.

Adjourn 3:45 p.m.

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
January 31, 2017 Meeting
Committee #5- Mentoring

Committee Members Present: Gail Bennett, PSSAM; Justin McConnaughey, MAESP; Debra Poese, MADTECC; Cecilia Roe, MSDE; Jasmine Stewart, MSEA; and Stacy Williams, MICUA.

Committee Members Absent: N/A

MSDE Staff: Linda Bongiovano

Alternates Present: N/A

Approval of Minutes: Not Applicable

Discussion:

The committee reviewed, discussed, and revised the proposed recommendations. Below are the committee's recommendations.

1. Ensure reduced workloads to mentors, as well as new teachers.
2. Establish IHE's and LEA partnerships to develop induction programs with innovative evidence based strategies.
3. Develop on line resource centers to build mentor and teacher capacity.

Rationale

Upon reviewing the workgroup's recommendations, the committee made the following observations:

1. The first sentence of proposed workgroup recommendation #5 served as the umbrella for recommendations # 1 and #7. Recommendations #1 and #7 would be part of the "how" #5 could be carried out.
2. The minimum requirements in COMAR 13A.07.01.06 are sufficient to eliminate proposed recommendation #4.
3. The proposed recommendation # 6 did not apply. Providing effective differentiated guidance is part of the mentor role.
4. Recommendations #2 and #3 apply to all teachers, not just mentors and new teachers. The committee feels that these recommendations would be more appropriate to consider with the professional development recommendations, not mentoring.

Additional Discussion Topics

Mentors

There is no standardization of employment requirements for individuals for serving as mentors. Consider developing a certification mentor endorsement area. Terminology varies, examples include consulting teacher, mentor, and instructional coach. The mentor assignment varies from the mentor being a full-time teacher, as well as a mentor, to mentors whose job assignment is

solely mentoring teachers. Some mentor programs with full time mentors require mentors to rotate between school years assigned as mentor and as classroom teacher. The mentor may also have a negative connotation for more experienced teachers; if a teacher is assigned a mentor, it could be viewed as punitive. The categories of mentoring across the state's districts include; first year teachers, new hires to a local school system, teacher changing to a new grade or subject assignment, and teachers needing remediation. There is a pedagogy aspect as well as a content aspect to mentoring.

Innovation/Hub/Technology

Innovation center should be moved to the Professional Development committee because it would benefit all teachers, not just new teachers. It could also be an activity under the collaboration of between the state/district and IHE. Technology is an efficient, cost effective way to disseminate customized information to a large population. Technology allows for differentiated mentoring models. The mentor and the teacher can view content together. New information can be updated regularly. A Facebook type format was one suggestion as it is easily accessible. IHE participation could be integrated into to the technology allowing the IHE to keep in touch with what is going on in the school system.

One way to change mentoring

While much discussion can be placed on creating the ideal program, it is more productive to consider the reality of what can be offered. Clarify what you want. More time for the length of mentoring program; more time for the teacher to spend with the mentor; and more time for the mentor to acquire mentoring knowledge.

Materials of Interest Requests for next meeting: Not Applicable

Next Steps:

Appendix XX



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
Materials of Interest
January 31, 2016 Meeting**

Chapter 740 (SB 493) Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016

http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2016rs/chapters_noln/ch_740_sb0493e.pdf

Statute that requires the State Department of Education to establish a workgroup, the participants, sets forth the elements to be reported on and the dates (November 1, 2016, November 1, 2017, and December 1, 2021) by which the interim and final reports must be submitted to the governor.

Materials of Interest

“Our Say: Schools need to confront turnover problem”, Capital Gazette, January 17, 2017

http://www.capitalgazette.com/opinion/our_say/ph-ac-ce-our-say-0115-20170115-story.html

This article specifically looks at teacher turnover in Anne Arundel County Public Schools. It addresses that schools with the lowest test scores, poorest students, and highest discipline rates often have the highest turnover; which is often attributed to the placement of the newest most inexperienced teachers in these environments.

**“Maryland works to retain qualified teachers”, Capital News Service
December 12, 2016**

http://www.times-news.com/news/local_news/md-works-to-retain-qualified-teachers/article_9daacf12-6baf-5c52-b99a-91219dfe3234.html

This report, discusses Maryland’s attrition rate sighting the Learning Institutes September report. The Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 is cited highlighting the pilot program and the National Board Certification incentives.

“Within Our Grasp: Achieving Higher Admissions Standards in Teacher Prep”, National Council on Teacher Quality, November 2016

<http://www.nctq.org/dmsStage.do?id=649915&dmsVersionId=649328>

This report reviews the past five-year efforts to raise the admission standards at the state level. While it does not contain information on Maryland, it provides perspective on the perceived consequences of raising admission standards

“Teachers’ union wins hurt education”, Frederick News Post, November 26, 2016

http://www.fredericknewspost.com/opinion/columns/teachers-union-wins-hurt-education/article_66598ff6-3d7e-571f-97dd-78aa88ec1986.html

This article discusses how Maryland’s teacher unions continue to oppose effective policies that have worked in other states. Points made include; but are not limited to, the inability to hire high-quality teachers because they are not certified, teachers in high-demand subjects cannot be paid higher salaries; and most contracts do not require teachers to attend needed professional development.

“TELL Maryland; Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning” 2015 Reports

https://tellmaryland.org/results/report/320/119538#MD15_Conduct

The TELL Maryland Partners want to ensure that all Maryland educators have the supportive environment necessary to help students achieve at the highest levels. The TELL Maryland Survey is a perceptual survey that allows every educator to TELL Maryland if they have positive teaching and learning conditions that research has shown to be important to student achievement and teacher retention. The 2015 Tell Maryland survey was administered February 23-April 6, 2015 and the results can be found at the above link.

“ Seven Lessons Learned from Implementing Micro –credentials”, Friday Institute for Educational Innovation

<http://www.fi.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/microcredentials.pdf>

Provides an overview of Micro-credentials and how they provide opportunities for educators to engage in rigorous, self-paced, job-embedded professional learning.

Appendix XXI



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
February 21, 2017 Meeting**

The 12th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 1:00 p.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross (MSDE), Jack Smith (Principals Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland), Deborah Kraft (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Karen Dates-Dunmore (MSDE), Tanisha Brown (MSDE), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE), Linda Murel (MSDE)

Absentees: Emily Dow, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Mariette English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Laura Weeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals)

Ms. Sarah Spross called the meeting to order at 1:00pm

Ms. Spross welcomed those attending the TIRA workgroup. The meeting is a full meeting of workgroup and committees and she thanks all for their attendance and participation.

The workgroup members introduced themselves.

Public Comment: Mr. Charles Hagan, Principal, Harford Technical High School, and President of the Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals and a member of the Professional Standards Teacher Education Board (PSTEB).

Mr. Hagan noted that he was at the meeting to be voice for certification standards. There is a unique problem for those hired at Technical schools. Welders are welding because of their expertise. We need these experts. The certification for these folks is for two years. Their last education was high school. In the first two years they need to learn everything the school system does, take college classes and pass Praxis I. Technical principals are losing great people because we are making this too hard. Mr. Hagan noted he was to ask for an additional two years to get Praxis I. This is not about lowering standards. "I have two instructors I may lose in May. A suggestion would be teachers take classes and pass part of Praxis or have more time to get Praxis done. For many teacher it takes 4, 5, 6 times. This is a real problem for Technical principals. Currently there is only one applicant for mechanic or welder."

Dr. Shapiro asked what part of Praxis is the biggest challenge for the technical teachers. Ms. Meadows said, although anecdotal, it is not just one part, but all are issues. Dr. Shapiro asked if there are there any models around the country for technical teacher where there is a certified teacher of record and a specialist for the skill in the classroom. Ms. Spross said she would look into it. Ms. Shurm clarified that it would be a co taught classroom. Ms. Spross noted it would be like special education, both teachers all day. Dr. Shapiro noted, when we were talking about STEM issues we were talking about using community college professors to have a special certification to teach in public schools. They have a degree but have not gone through the certification process.

Ms. Spross stated there are certification requirements that are perceived or not perceived as barriers to certification. Professional and Technical Education (PTE) requirements are currently going through revisions. There were some specialized tech issues out of Baltimore City. Some avenues require within two years of conditional certification, or PTE, or Section 27, you still need to meet 24 credit hours, and you still need the rest of the requirements. This is a limiting component. We have heard of individuals coming in with high set of skills in all counties. This is an ongoing two year problem. As we have talked before in the 2015 session there was Senate Bill 635 out of Washington County asking for a county certification. We must look at conditional certification. Is it fair for someone with 15 years welding experience to have to take classes, Praxis, and learn the rules of the school house? Do you utilize a conditionally certified teacher only when you cannot find someone else? Alternative is to shut down the class and not offer it. Or, have long term substitutes or someone teaching out of their certification area. Committee I is absolutely looking at the Conditional certification and adjunct teacher certification option in order to bring in highly skilled people. We have also reviewed a letter from the Harford delegation in support of Mr. Hagan's comments. This is also being discussed at Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board (PSTEB).

Dr. Smith noted that whatever comes of the recommendation, it should be a strong statement that this needs to be changed. If you have expertise to weld, that is most important. We need to change the requirements and remove the barriers.

Ms. Spross said that we want a strong statement and draft of regulations. PSTEB and the State Board work collaboratively. It will be powerful to have committee and workgroup input.

Dr. Smith noted it should be in career areas.

Approval of minutes:

All minutes for both workgroup and committees are still in draft form.

Dr. Shapiro asked for revisions to the minutes from the January 31 workgroup meeting. In the minutes, on the 2nd page, 3rd paragraph, strike the line regarding the statement that begins with “the new teachers...”

Darren Hornbeck noted that in the minutes from Committee I, we must revise the referenced sentence to include “unless they have proper certification”. This is for adjunct certification.

Ms. Linda Gronberg-Quinn made the motion to approve the minutes and Dr. Deborah Kraft seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with the requested revisions.

Ms. Spross stated that the workgroup would look at what the committees recommend and provide a request for comments.

Ms. Spross offered some overarching thoughts. She commended the committees on the work they did with thought behind the recommendations. Two to five recommendations per group were generated with overlap of use of micro credentialing. There is a large learning curve with micro credentialing. Ms. Lagerman in Committee III and Dr. Yi were available to talk about these pieces for professional development and renewal of certification. Committee II talked about state wide incentives. They recommend they look at the Quality Teacher Incentive Act in place, weigh the pros and cons, and consider how can it be reshaped. There are only 24 priority schools in Maryland. How can we get the most talented teachers to the lowest performing schools? Also, how do we get the best and brightest to go to the farthest reaches of counties? Mentoring has a solid plan and the work that came out of the committee is well thought out.

Dr. Shapiro mentioned one of the things we need to do is incorporate research based conclusions. We should be using findings from research and be explicit. We have some good systems in Maryland and we need to know which are working and which are not and we want to keep those that are working. We should think through what is working and what we want to keep; and consider what evidence we have that these systems are working.

Ms. Spross agreed that we need to base our recommendations in research. Professional Development for example, what would it take to have a state wide network. What are other states doing for incentives? We need actionable items.

Announcements

Next meeting, March 29, 2017. 1-3pm. Workgroup only

Updates, HB 715 are scheduled for March 7, 2017 at 1pm. Ms. Spross will let the group know who is testifying.

HB 152 has seen heavy amendments to the work, specifically the funding behind the projects. There is a pilot program with the RFP ready to go, but the bill eliminates or makes the funding optional in the future. This is a change for Quality Teacher Incentive Act: there *shall* be money has changed to *may*. Dr. Smith noted there can be lobbying. Ms. Shapiro advocated for people to take note of these changes.

**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup**

February 21, 2017 Meeting

Committee #1- Certification Restructuring

Committee Members Present: Darren Hornbeck, MSEA; Karen Robertson, USM; Kelly Meadows, MSDE; Jessica Cuches, PSSAM; Nomsa Geleta, USM; Audra Butler, MADTEC

Committee Members Absent: Margret Trader, MICUA, Carrie Conley, MAESP;

MSDE Staff: Tanisha L. Brown

Attorney General's Office: Derek Simmons, Esq., Assistant Attorney General

Guests: Charles Hagan, Principal, Harford County Public Schools

Alternates Present: N/A

Discussion

Ms. Spross began the meeting asking if any changes were necessary for the minutes from the January 31, 2017 meeting. Mr. Hornbeck requested that his comment on adjuncts be updated to read: "adjuncts should not be permitted to teach students with special needs unless they have had proper training."

Ms. Meadows began the committee discussion by handing out a letter from the MD House of Delegates regarding Professional Technical Education (PTE) certification requirements. The group began discussing their experiences with PTE teacher shortages and how it relates to certification deadlines and requirements.

- Ms. Cuches indicated they are having similar issues as Mr. Hagen in Anne Arundel County (public comment presenter).
- Ms. Cuches asks what is the purpose of the basic skills test? What are they supposed to demonstrate?
 - Dr. Robertson suggests it is supposed to indicate individuals have the basic skills to enter the classroom.
 - Ms. Cuches indicates there are good teachers who have not passed the Praxis I Core or equivalent, as well as not-so-good teachers that have passed.
- Dr. Robertson asked if PTE teachers were always hired as Conditional teachers. Ms. Meadows shares the four routes to PTE certification and reminds group members that they all include pedagogy requirements.
- Mr. Hornbeck asks Ms. Cuches if she thought an extra year to meet certification requirements would *really* rectify retention concerns with PTE teachers; Ms. Cuches indicates it would not necessarily rectify the problem in her opinion.

- Ms. Meadows reminds the group that it can also be difficult for PTE teachers to find needed courses
 - Ms. Butler shares, community colleges have more flexibility with course offering, and also notes that her IHE (Anne Arundel Community College) has a Praxis prep course. Ms. Butler suggests that community colleges may be able to offer the PTE pedagogy courses.

Mr. Hornbeck asks how MD's cut scores compared to other states? Ms. Meadows indicated the chart disseminated at the previous meeting listed the cut scores established by ETS as well as Maryland's scores. Maryland's passing scores are within a few points of the recommended scores for each test with the exception of physical education. Currently, we do not have every state's cut scores. Ms. Meadows would need to request them from ETS. Ms. Spross indicated MD teachers, on average, are outperforming other educators in the nation.

Dr. Geleta asked why B.A. holders are required to take the basic skills test, given that a B.A. indicates you have generally met a certain level of proficiency in reading, writing and math?

Ms. Meadows notes that at one point, experience was taken in lieu of basic skills for PTE teachers, but she is not sure why this stopped and other options are not in place for initially certified PTE teachers?

- Dr. Robertson recommends using 2 years successful teaching as an alternative to testing for PTE teachers, or extending the deadline for requirements to three years.
 - Ms. Cuches suggests that if the deadline for completion of requirements for the conditional is to be extended it should be extended to at least 4 years, otherwise it will not fix the problem. Ms. Meadows asked if an extension to 4 years would solve the issue if the person couldn't pass the tests. Ms. Cuches stated that it would not.

Ms. Butler indicated that they sometimes advise students to take ACT prep and take the ACT exam for the basic skills requirement.

Mr. Hornbeck questioned the validity of the test and noted some people are not good test takers. He recommended asking for a waiver to the test and offering another option to replace the test. Ms. Meadows reminds him that by regulation tests cannot be waived and that although the waiver regulation could be changed, it is more productive to change the actual regulations so as not to require a waiver.

Dr. Geleta recommends again that individuals with a B.A. should not be required to take the basic skills test. Dr. Shapiro agrees, but notes it does not address testing requirements for non-B.A. PTE teachers who come in with an AA degree or high school diploma may still have difficulty.

Mr. Hornbeck asks, if someone has the skills (implied through a B.A.), why can't they pass the Praxis I Core? Dr. Geleta shared that when one has not actively practiced skills, such as algebra, they may lose them and then do not perform well on an assessment. Dr. Shapiro suggests offering and accepting competency based credits so certain candidates can avoid taking unnecessary classes (unnecessary because they have mastered these things through work or other avenues).

Ms. Butler recommends requiring a portfolio in lieu of the basic skills exam, but also mentions: "Who will review the portfolio?" Ms. Meadows asks, what about fee payers? Who would review for them?

It was suggested that PTE teachers without a B.A. present course credits in lieu of the basic skills exam. Everyone agreed this could be a reasonable alternative. Ms. Cuches mentioned it could potentially address the PTE teacher issue.

Mr. Hagen recommended a hybrid course covering reading, writing and math to replace the basic skills test, perhaps offered at the community college level.

Ms. Meadows and Ms. Gronberg-Quinn mentioned it was best to focus on classes that currently exist (there are no known hybrid reading, writing and math classes).

Ms. Meadows asks if offering a composite score for the Praxis Core would help?

It was mentioned that a composite score exists with SAT and GRE so it is understandable to offer a comprehensive score for the Core.

Mr. Hagen notes that PTE teachers can *do* math, as it relates to their career, but often have difficulty with it from a math textbook.

The group questioned if requiring reading and math coursework could be used in lieu of meeting basic skills exam requirement, since reading coursework will encompass writing as well.

Ms. Meadows asked if we go to a four year extension, would there be a renewal of the conditional, and if so, what would individuals need to bring? Everyone agreed that there would be no renewal if the conditional certificate was to be a 4 year certificate.

- Ms. Cuches suggested PTE teachers complete a competency based demonstration, evaluated by the local education agency (LEA).
- Ms. Butler suggested creating a course where candidates build a portfolio.
- Ms. Meadows reminded everyone that they must think from the state wide perspective (include fee payers), rather than the local perspective. Having requirements in place that involve review of a portfolio is not feasible for fee payers.

Dr. Robertson suggests maybe there should be easier entrance requirements and harder exit requirements into the field?

Ms. Meadows asked if the committee was comfortable with the pedagogy requirements for PTE teachers. The committee felt they were sufficient for minimum requirements.

Ms. Meadows asked if the 50% rule for coursework that applies to transcript analysis is still necessary.

- Dr. Geleta noted that because of online courses, the landscape of education has changed, leading to many people selecting courses from a variety of institutions, as they feel appropriate for their schedule or timeline.
- Dr. Robertson felt that it is important that 50% is taken at the same school so that it is taken as a program. Ms. Meadows reminded the group that this requirement is for those coming into certification via the credit count route.
- Ms. Butler mentions the rule can be a barrier because community colleges often work together to offer courses and will send students to the schools they know are running the course at a given time.

The committee would like to discuss the following alternatives to basic skills and the conditional certificate in more depth:

- Using math and reading coursework (college level credit bearing) in lieu of basic skills;
- Not requiring the basic skills if one has a Bachelor's Degree;
- Using a composite score for the Core
- Allowing a local school system superintendent to approve an "equivalent" measure for basic skills (e.g., evaluation, portfolio); and
- Length of conditional certificate.

Materials of Interest requests for next meeting:

- Heather Lageman was not able to speak to the group today. The group would like to hear from her regarding micro credentialing at the next meeting.
- Chart of states' ETS cut scores.

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016

Workgroup

February 21, 2017 Meeting

Committee #2- Quality Teacher Incentives

Committee Members Present: Justin Heid, MSEA; Fran Kroll, MADTECC; Tess Blumenthal, MAESP; Tanya Williams, MICUA; Althea Pennerman, USM; Tony Navarro, PSSAM; Jessica Bancroft, MSDE

Committee Members Absent: Monique Sloan, MAESP; Alexandra Cambra, MSDE

MSDE Staff: Ruth Downs, Jeanne-Marie Holly

Alternates Present: None

Guests: Benee Edwards, Grants Management Manager – MHEC
Donna Thomas, Director of Student Financial Assistance - MHEC

Approval of Minutes:

Approved by workgroup

Discussion:

Ms. Sarah Spross spoke with Committee II reiterating what their goal is for the review of Quality Teacher Incentives.

Dr. Fran Kroll stated that teachers struggle with the not being able to afford to live on their own. They usually live at home with their parents. We need to find a model to look at.

Ms. Spross stated that the committee needs to look at what is available. The research is really mixed when it comes to financial support. Ms. Spross told the committee that there are not a lot of ideas in regards to housing incentives. She told them to pick what they think makes the most sense and to really think about three models to look at.

Ms. Jessica Bancroft informed the committee that National Board Certified Teachers receive double the amount of the stipend when they teach in one of the priority schools.

Mr. Justin Heid asked Ms. Spross if Senate Bill 493 – Ed Article 6-306 would affect all teachers in schools.

Ms. Spross informed Mr. Heid that it will affect those teachers who do not work in a comprehensive needs or non-comprehensive needs schools. Teachers who work in comprehensive needs schools receive \$2,000 and those in non-comprehensive needs schools receive \$1,000.

Ms. Bancroft asked everyone to go around the table and introduce themselves.

Ms. Donna Thomas from MHEC did an overview on the Workforce Shortage Student Assistant Grant Program. The Workforce Shortage Student Assistance Grant (WSSAG) program is for students who plan on working in specific career/occupational programs upon graduation. Eligible fields include: child care, human services, **teaching**, nursing, physical and occupational therapy, social work, and public service.

All current high school seniors, full-time and part-time, degree seeking undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in an eligible accredited Maryland postsecondary institution may apply for the grant. The requirements are that the student must be a MD resident and plan to attend a two-year or four-year Maryland college or university as a full-time or part-time degree seeking undergraduate student, and/or full-time or part-time degree seeking graduate student. The award amounts are set at the statutory minimum and are based on the type of institution and the student's enrollment status. The service obligation for teachers is that the recipient must work in an approved teacher education program leading to certification in a critical shortage field.

Mr. Heid stated that counties can supplement the grant as well, based off of each county's funding.

Ms. Thomas stated that MHEC offers scholarships too. She stated that less than 100 applicants have applied for the scholarship. There needs to be an increase in awareness of the program. The main requirement of the program is for the applicant to teach in Maryland and complete the service obligation.

Ms. Jeanne-Marie Holly spoke about the loan repayment program that is offered. The maximum amount annually is \$10,000 and the minimal amount is \$3,000. These amounts are based on the loan amount.

Ms. Bancroft asked the committee to look at and revisit the Staffing Report. There are 24 priority schools. Also look at the geographical locations of the schools.

Ms. Thomas stated that MHEC is in the process of reactivating its "Work Shortage Council".

Dr. Kroll was worried that there would not be enough money to award the teachers.

Mr. Heid talked about loan forgiveness. He felt that those individuals who graduated from a Maryland school should be entitled to this, as well as an individual coming to Maryland from out of state.

Ms. Benez Edwards from MHEC shared the model of the nursing support program with the committee. She stated that this program is a state grant program funded through health services cost review commission.

Dr. Kroll stated that the school system in DC supplements some of their teacher salaries. The state needs to offer a loan forgiveness program for teachers that is different than what is already written.

Ms. Bancroft stated that the Teach Grant program makes you repay the loan after 10 years if you have not completed the degree within 4 years.

Dr. Kroll stated that no 2 year colleges are using grants and some 4 year colleges are opting out of using grants. She stated that the state needs to come up recommendations and some funding. MHEC could offer the funding.

Dr. Thomas stated that the Workflow Shortage Award is up to \$4,000 annually.

Ms. Bancroft asked the committee to look at the chart provided to them of incentives from different states. She stated that we need to encourage the applicant to think about where they want to be employed. The incentives should be sustainable.

Ms. Edwards stated that the loan forgiveness plan should be that the state and the teacher alternate payment years.

Mr. Heid stated that some teachers do not have loan forgiveness because their tuition was paid for by their family, so what other incentives can we offer those individuals? What about the teacher who has been in the system for a while? We also have to make sure that we get applicants who are committed to teaching. Mr. Heid stated that we need to look at the other states that offer funding from the lottery.

Ms. Bancroft stated that we need to look at the parameters of loan repayment to see if there is some expansion to the program and write in requirements specific to evaluation. She stated that we need to establish what a reasonable amount of time is to offer loan forgiveness. Maybe offer a tax credit for housing?

Recommendations

Loan Forgiveness and Repayment:

1. Request MHEC information on loan repayment and loan forgiveness.
2. Request MHEC review their current literature and update, as appropriate, to ensure the list of critical shortage areas are up to date and accurate.
 - a. MHEC does have the current Maryland Teacher Staffing Report. It is possible that additional areas of shortage could be added, allowing access to financial assistance for more educators.
3. Request MHEC consider a loan forgiveness program specifically for teachers, instead of having teachers be part of a bigger program. Make educators a specific priority for financial assistance. There are a limited number of awards.
 - a. Currently the Janet L. Hoffman Loan Repayment Assistance Program (LRAP) is for lawyers, nurses, licensed clinical counselors, physical and occupational therapists, social workers, speech pathologists, and teachers.
 - b. Consider increasing the amount awarded, currently you must have over \$75,001 in debt and can awarded a max of \$30,000. If your debt is \$40,001-\$75,001 you can be awarded \$18,000. If your debt is \$15,001-\$40,000 you can be awarded \$9,000. These are distributed over a 3 year period.
 - c. Increase the allowed gross annual salary of \$60,000 or combined married \$130,000 for eligibility.
4. Expand the Nancy Grasmick Teacher Award.
5. Federal Loan Forgiveness - <https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/repay-loans/forgiveness-cancellation/teacher#teacher-loan-forgiveness>.

<https://www.tcli.ed.gov/CBSWebApp/servlet/TCLIServlet>

Compensation:

Not all compensation should focus on loan repayment or loan forgiveness. There will be teachers who do not qualify for it or for whom loan repayment is not needed.

1. Research housing assistance programs. There are models in other states such as California.
 - a. Program is called California Teacher Home Loan & Assistance Program.
 - b. HUD has a program called Good Teacher Next Door:
https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/housing/sfh/reo/goodn/gnndabot.
 - c. There is a Baltimore Housing/Home buying Incentive for teachers:
http://www.baltimorehousing.org/vtov_incentives.
2. Consider signing bonuses for teachers who will work in priority schools.
3. Consider a bonus after 5 years (possibly 3 - need more discussion); teachers who continue in a priority school.
 - a. This could be complicated, not just for funding, but also for addressing the teachers who have already been in the school for the 3 or 5 years.
4. Create a scholarship specifically for teacher shortage areas and priority schools that is in addition to currently available financial assistance.

Questions to consider in future discussions:

1. Differentiated pay for those working in priority schools
2. Differentiated case load for priority schools
3. How can we better inform Maryland educators and student interns of the resources available to them for financial support? Both local and federal. Whose responsibility is this? MSDE, MHEC, LSS, IHEs? All?

Materials of Interest:

None

Next Steps:

1. Consider and discuss details of proposed incentives.
2. Address current questions.
3. Continue to explore what other states are currently offering for incentives (ex., California and housing)
4. Consider incentives that are not just grounded in a monetary outcome.

Next meeting will held on March 29 for the workgroup only.

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup

February 21, 2017 Meeting

Committee #3 – Professional Development for Teachers and Administrators

Committee Members Present: Kathy Angelis (UMD), Yi Huang (USM), Heather Lageman (PSSAM), Dan Capozzi (MSDE)

Committee Members Absent: Henoah Hailu (MSEA), Deanna Stock (MADTECC), Phyllis Lloyd (MAESP), Judy Jenkins (MICUA)

MSDE Staff: Karen Dates Dunmore (MSDE)

Others Present: Dewayne Morgan (USM)

Guest: Liam Goldrick (New Teacher Center)

Approval of Minutes:

Not applicable.

Discussion:

Guest – Liam Goldrick – New Teachers Center

Question #1: What are other states and countries doing re policy?

Question #2: How does MD compare to other states?

Overview of Questions:

- On paper, Maryland's state requirements look pretty good.
- It has deep and detailed policy on how mentors are selected and put to work.
- There are strong requirements for local programs to evaluate and self-assess and focus on retention.

TELL Survey 2015:

- ¼ of teachers statewide say they aren't getting a mentor
- 30% are saying they don't get dedicated time to work with mentors or be observed
 - No mentors
 - No instructional support
 - Opportunities for observations
 - Intentional work on instructional practices
- We could look at each district and compile an overview - Liam can look into having their team do this.
- Who is responsible for those who fall through the cracks?
- What is the role of the state in supporting this happening?
- How can the state position itself as the sister of support to the districts and make some changes?
 - State as support provider—state position as improver of programmatic design
 - Focus on programmatic improvements at the local level
 - Holding districts accountable—who is responsible?

- There are some states that oversee this work with a heavier hand - are there elements of policy regulations or state activities they could engage in to hold districts accountable?
- Who are these new teachers who are saying they are not getting support?
 - Are they dispersed throughout the state?
- Are they teachers with provisional licenses--If dispersed everywhere and lost in the process, a different problem—look through various counties (NTC will see if they can compile info for us).
- *Question* – what about partnerships between institutes of higher education (IHEs) and local school systems (LSS) in terms of induction in other states?
 - Tend to be more of a focus on perseverance until teachers become teachers of record
 - Policy does not really move work toward induction
 - Partnerships are difficult to do with a single institutions – come in with a myriad of teacher prep
 - Larger districts try to do things themselves to try to meet needs of various teachers
 - Anne Arundel County (AACO) – trying to share faculty – splits time between AACo school and teacher in classroom who serves as a mentor
 - Can we look at different models like a residency model that brings people together in different roles?
 - Policy vs. practice
 - How do you make sure the neediest groups are getting served---create a center – consortium approach
 - Iowa -- \$150 million – statewide teacher coaching program that includes teacher mentoring and induction – work across district lines
- *Question* – Can we look at shared staffing requirements?
 - UMD is looking at having K12 teachers come to teach on campus for 3 year rotations
 - How do you bring people together into each other's' worlds?

Federal Schools and Staffing Data - Cross mapped with State Policy

- NTC compared this
- Presence of state policy requirements helps move induction work forward to a degree
- Does having a mentor increase achievement?

13 Grants with 3 Districts (Broward County, FL -- Brantwood AEA Iowa -- Chicago)

- After 2 years of induction support, students of teachers exhibited 3-5 months greater reading achievement

What are the key components of a good induction program?

- (1) a multi-year course of support – lasting impact on retention
- (2) quality of the mentor - selection, foundational training and continuous support (take the role seriously and continually refresh—not volunteers or those wanting a stipend)
- (3) tracking time is huge - some state policies qualify a minimum amount of time (observation, reviewing student work, coaching)—it can be a struggle to meet the hourly requirement
- (4) Look at state's role -- state's push onus to the locals rather than requiring state to actually do something – if locals report back regarding low retention, what does that state then do? What can the state do realistically by law or by deed? Can the state target systems that have been identified as really needing support? Explicit things should be expected of the state – program

audits or site visits, set aside state funding for evaluation of induction activities. MD is actually very typical of states that refer responsibility to LSS's – issue of capacity and finding ways to do this. Are there other systems of accountability that could be brought into the process?

2011 Richard Ingersoll—research re key characteristics

http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1127&context=gse_pubs

- Looking at expansion of monitoring role in MD – difficult when not in law to just have best practices. LSS's are also limited budget-wise with that they can do.
- LSS's can be protective of local induction programs.
- DE, IA, HI, CT – only four states that have dedicated state funding for multi-year induction – CT has a portfolio approach – centralized training : IA – state resources directed toward mentor stipends: HI – state policy structure with some centralization—complex areas.
- KY – has a statewide program – teacher intern program – very prescriptive – high rates of mentor involvement – one year program. Good feedback from teachers and mentors.

What is the biggest shift that needs to take place?

- Taking implementation of induction programs seriously
- Allow for differentiation locally –
 - Helps to communicate a vision regarding what induction is about
 - Core elements of a strong program
 - Used as a tool for programmatic improvement or oversight
 - Use standards to allow for granting of state dollars – drive awarding of funds
 - Multi-year course
 - Focus on time and track in a way that is simple
 - Do not lose the intent by making so bureaucratic —mentoring relationship can lose out
- Program standards approach – can enable differentiation at the local level

Keys for Success

- Take program design implications seriously
- Good set of Program Induction Standards
 - Helps to communicate a vision for what induction is fundamentally about
 - Lays out the core elements
 - Can be used as a tool to drive programmatic improvement and oversight
 - Program Continuum

How do we do this without taking the heart and soul out of it? We can't make this a compliance exercise.

Funding

- (1) Dedicated appropriation funding
 - Take the appropriation and spread it by per pupil allocation
- (2) RFP - Texas uses this model - funding with no affirmative state requirement

Title I & Title II

- ESSA has not changed much in terms of induction – it has expanded grants to include both teachers and administrators
- It has injected evidentiary based definitions on the state level - but not at the LEA level.

Priority Schools (low performing)

- How have teachers been empowered to help figure out what needs to be done – gives them a stake in what is happening – make them want to stay
- Build capacity at the school – shift focus – induction programs to really be based in the school—feel less like something being put upon the school – different staffing models
- A lot of the change is cultural
- Change the way people interact – do not look upon it as a “program”

Recommendation regarding statewide network – need to really look into doing (Carnegie Foundation, NEA and NTA doing something similar)

- MD Induction Center – could be legislated
- How to ensure equitable access? Center could be a vehicle

How do we shift the focus to the local schools?

How do we empower the induction programs in the schools?

How do we change hearts and minds over time?

Create Regional Education Centers

Equitable access to support – can do if multiple universities would be part of a shared system supporting the schools in their areas

Friday Institute – hub for professional learning – in NC – Institute for Educational Innovation – NC State University -- William & Ida Friday – College of Education

Proposed recommendations for further discussion:

- (1) Create a state-wide professional development pathways with career-wide learning opportunities for educators.

Leverage state, LEA, Union and higher educational expertise and resources to increase quality, transparency and portability of professional learning.

Leverage new knowledge, promising practices, and advanced technologies to increase access and success.

Leverage regional partnerships, resources, and delivery structures to ensure equitable access across the state.

- 2) Establish school-university partnerships in development and delivering professional development programs that link but are not limited to certification regulations for renewal.

Establish shared responsibilities and resources for induction and professional development programs that meet LEA and school priorities and address individualized needs for teachers

Establish professional development programs that incorporate evidence-based practices with context, content and pedagogical currency, such as cultural proficiency and technology integration, to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and Learning Forward Standards for Professional Learning.

Resources:

Maryland's ESSA Webpage: <http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Pages/DAPI/ESSA/index.aspx>

PDF of Plan:

<http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DAPI/ESEA/MarylandConsolidatedStatePlanDRAFT1.pdf>

NC State University - The Friday Institute

<http://www.fi.ncsu.edu/about-us/>

Virginia Regional Centers for Teaching Excellence <http://www.vccs.edu/careers/office-of-professional-development/regional-centers-for-teaching-excellence/>

Consortium Approach to Teacher Induction:

https://newteachercenter.org/wp-content/uploads/consortium-approach_induction-brief.pdf

Next Steps:

At the end of the Meeting Dr. Nancy Shapiro shared an email with recommendations for Committee 3 the email containing the recommendations is attached and will be shared with the committee at its April meeting for discussion.

Parvathi Narayan

From: Nancy Shapiro
Sent: Saturday, February 18, 2017 8:33 AM
To: Parvathi Narayan
Subject: FW: Draft Recommendation for Committee III

Please print 5 copies of this for me for the TIRA meeting

From: "Huang, Yi-Ping" <yhuang@coppin.edu>
Date: Saturday, February 11, 2017 at 4:10 PM
To: Nancy Shapiro <nshapiro@usmd.edu>, Kathy Angeletti <kangel@deans.umd.edu>
Cc: "Huang, Yi-Ping" <yhuang@coppin.edu>
Subject: Draft Recommendation for Committee III

Greetings Nancy,

Kathy and I had a great conversation yesterday. Below is our recommendation for Committee III: Expansion of Professional Development and Induction. Please let us know if we can provide any additional information. Thanks and have a great weekend.

Proposed Recommendations for Committee III: Expansion of Professional Development and Induction

- 1. Create state-wide professional development pathways with career-wide learning opportunities for educators.**
 - a. Leverage state, LEA, Union and higher educational expertise and resources to increase quality, transparency, and portability of professional learning.
 - b. Leverage new knowledge, promising practices, and advanced technologies to increase access and success.
 - c. Leverage regional partnerships, resources, and delivery structures to ensure equitable access across the state.

- 2. Establish school-university partnerships in developing and delivering professional development programs that link but are not limited to certification regulations for renewal.**
 - a. Establish shared responsibilities and resources for induction and professional development programs that meet LEA and school priorities and address individualized needs for teachers.
 - b. Establish professional development programs that incorporate evidence-based practices with context, content and pedagogical currency, such as cultural proficiency and technology integration, to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement.
 - c. Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and Learning Forward Standards for Professional Learning.

With Warm Regards,
Yi

Yi Huang, Ph.D.
Associate Dean and Associate Professor
College of Arts & Sciences, and Education
Coppin State University

Confidentiality Notice: This message may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that you are not authorized to read, print, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If this message has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender by replying to this transmission.

-----Original Message-----
From: Nancy Shapiro [mailto:nshapiro@usmd.edu]

Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2017 4:29 PM
To: Huang, Yi-Ping
Cc: Eugene Schaffer; Kathy Angeletti; Laurie Mullen; Donna Wiseman; Nomsa Geleta; Jonathan Singer; Karen Robertson
Subject: Re: USM testimony for HB 715

Yi,
Thank you for such a quick response--it means a lot to me to have your "approval!"
Nancy

On 2/5/17, 4:28 PM, "Huang, Yi-Ping" <yhuang@coppin.edu> wrote:

>Greetings Nancy,
>
>Excellent testimony! I am in full support, Nancy. Thanks.
>
>Yi
>
>Sent from my iPhone
>
>> On Feb 5, 2017, at 3:46 PM, Nancy Shapiro <nshapiro@usmd.edu> wrote:
>>
>> Folks,
>> I drafted some language for the USM testimony for HB 715. I need to get this to Andy by Monday or Tuesday, the bill goes for second reading on Wednesday.
>> Please take a look and let me know if it makes sense, if it is too rah rah, or if we need more specifics.
>> My biggest goal was (1) to make sure it is clear that our institutions will have a choice, and that (2) MSDE and MHEC are seen as equal partners in determining the standards for national accreditation.
>> With your edits and suggestions, I'll send to all the ed deans and also to MICUA and MHEC for review before we submit.
>>
>> Unless we are asked, I do not intend to have us at the table with MSDE, but rather just submit written testimony from USM.
>> (All institutions can submit testimony if you want.)
>>
>> Thanks
>> Nancy
>>
>> <hb0715F.pdf>
>> <USM Testimony in support of HB 715.docx>
>

**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup
February 21, 2017 Meeting
Committee #4 - Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria**

Committee Members Present: Chadia Abras (MICUA), Lisa Booth, MAESP), Stacie Burch (MADTECC), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE), Deborah Kraft, (Stevenson University), Jack Smith (PSSAM), and Donna Wiseman (UMD).

Committee Members Absent: Lisa Booth (MAESP), Robin L. McNair (MSEA), Laurie Mullen (USM)

Workgroup Members Present: Nancy Shapiro (USM) and Rowena Shurn (MSEA)

Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) Staff: Linda Murel

Alternates Present: Jon Singer (UMBC)

Convene: 1:37 p.m.

Approval of Minutes:

January 31, 2017 minutes approved.

Discussion:

Four Handouts were distributed: January 31, 2017 Minutes, Draft #2 of the Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC) of the *Redesign of Teacher Education*, the Work Chart for State Program Approval Team Preparation and "Preparing Educators for High Poverty/Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Schools: A Manual for Teacher Educators, Teachers and Principals. Ms. Dunkle reminded the committee that the manual could be found on Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) website.

Ms. Dunkle asked members to introduce themselves. She noted that Component I title was changed from Strong Academic Background to Strong Instructional Preparation. She clarified that the manual she distributed today was developed from the Race to the Top project originally intended to be included in the IPC structure. She stated that the manual is very good, but that its inclusion in the IPC has been forestalled in anticipation of IPC revisions.

Ms. Dunkle said that Component #2 was the most difficult. She asked the committee which one of the components did they want to approach first and that she would like to get something accomplished today that would result in a product.

Dr. Nancy Shapiro questioned the IPC working chart being placed on Google Drive. Ms. Dunkle explained that legal counsel advised her that the chart could not be posted on Google Drive because it was a violation of the Open Meetings Act.

Dr. Shapiro referenced strong retention data when candidates are hired from PDS. Ms. Dunkle clarified the data by stating that interns in one study were trained in one institute of higher education (IHE) and hired into the Professional Development School (PDS) in which they were trained. This is different than PDS training - promoting retention in any school into which a candidate is hired. That is not to be negative, she said, because the retention is very strong, over 80% after five or more years. She said that Prince George's County Public Schools, College Park, and Bowie State University had strong retention data as well, when that data was being tracked. Dr. Shapiro said that if we know that students who go to PDS present better advantages both in training and retention, we do not want to get away from the parts of the model that work.

Dr. Donna Wiseman said sometimes you do not have space available in an existing PDS. Ms. Dunkle mentioned that there are exceptions where we cannot require PDS (e.g., at the Maryland Institute College of Art where there are exceptions to the rules). You have to look at the rules around the PDS.

Ms. Debbie Kraft said it is hard to do what is best for the majority of your students. One size fits all is not always best for a specific student. Ms. Dunkle asked do we change it or throw it out? Dr. Jon Singer suggested that PDS might be geared toward early field experiences at the beginning of the program as opposed to at the end.

Ms. Dunkle said perhaps each IHE should submit how they implement the standards or rules, whatever they may end up being. Dr. Kraft said we are talking about multiple experiences.

Dr. Wiseman suggested that there may not be enough certified teachers in an established PDS. There may be different levels (4) to look at and said that we seem to have abandoned the original plan which required all PDS to engage in the following areas:

- Collaboration
- Teacher Preparation
- Research
- Curriculum

Dr. Wiseman continued that perhaps we should consider the identification of a true PDS as only that school that is able to offer all services, that schools that can only offer one or two would not be considered less valuable a partner, but simply able to offer a particular service. The analogy was made that at certain hospitals, one can receive quality care for a heart attack, but only at a facility at a different level could one receive a heart transplant.

Ms. Dunkle and Dr. Shapiro both expressed that they like the idea of different levels.

Dr. Chadia Abras said we should think of the criteria. Dr. Kraft asked how did the 100 days come about and could it more flexible? Ms. Dunkle explained that the actual number was

adopted in a somewhat arbitrary way, although research certainly continues to support extended clinical experiences.

Ms. Dunkle suggested that the following could be possible:

- Let each IHE present to the state how they are meeting standards as defined by this group rather than MSDE developing prescriptive evidential markers to be used by all
- Measure candidate effectiveness across the board rather than through the proxies used in the recent past to determine intern performance

Dr. Jack Smith suggested that a set of threshold activities might be developed where, in a quasi-medical model such as was suggested above, interns could acquire certain experiences from different partnered schools without all schools having to offer all that a PDS would offer. He mentioned things such as observing and participating in opening and closing school activities, what resources are available in a school and how to find them, etc.

Comments and Suggestions:

- (Ms. Rowena Shurn) - How do we know we are getting the same quality if each IHE has a different structure?
- (Dr. Chadia Abras)
 - Experience gives quality not the structure
 - Outcome should not be a moving target
 - How do you control internship?
 - What qualities should an intern have?
 - Another layer to look at is to bring them in, teach them, keep them in the loop, and pay them enough (note: referencing mentor teachers)
 - What replaces the 100 days?
- (Dr. Jack Smith)
 - Preparation, structure and quality of environment
- (Dr. Debbie Kraft)
 - Not everybody is at the top, they are meeting the minimum
 - Make a checklist and look at the end results
- (Ms. Lisa Booth)
 - Best teachers may not be willing to be mentors, but have negative attitudes or no time for mentorship
 - What about their skills and what are we doing in the 100 days?
 - Align with Charlotte Danielson or other accepted philosophies
 - Students have demonstrated that they can and do have high level practices
- (Dr. Donna Wiseman)

- Not all good teachers are great mentors
- (Dr. Jon Singer)
 - In South Carolina PDS could bank IHE-partner courses to be offered to their mentor teachers for their use when needed as incentive
- (Ms. Michelle Dunkle)
 - It is necessary at the beginning of the development of PDS to set some proxy measurements of quality
 - Originally designed to be of assistance to the school
 - Cohort model was put in place to affect the school and for support for members of the cohort under one roof
 - Could there be a regional training model and how can interns and schools benefit from a regional approach?

Ms. Booth said teachers should be equally comfortable in both types of settings – poverty or not. Dr. Shapiro mentioned that there are direct resources for the issue. Ms. Dunkle noted that through all five regional Listening Tour meetings, participants said the same thing: that most new teachers cannot deal with the classrooms they have been assigned to.

Dr. Smith stated that for internships we could set up a series of experiences with tier parts (e.g., early experiences and extended experiences). Set up the experiences and learning you want them to have. You want them to have flexibility. Should anyone who wants to be a first year teacher, part of the internship should be how to set up a classroom. Course experience is helpful exposure.

Dr. Shapiro thought merging systems so they are all one partnership in layers is a good idea.

Ms. Dunkle asked who is going to pay for what and we need to think about the resources that we already have. What are the threshold markers and where do they go? We should engage in flexibility and need a framework for State program approval. Do we want series of practica?

Dr. Wiseman said identify the levels of partners and how much experience. Also, what are we going to do about classroom management? Dr. Kraft noted that we should think about the outcomes and that some students might be ready for a higher level and not require all experiences.

Ms. Stacie Burch stated that virtual experience and training is nice. Dr. Wiseman said instructors can setup situations that students have to react to, for instance if they can calm a classroom down and how they deal with different settings. We should think about how we can use technology in the internships.

Dr. Singer wanted to know if MSDE would approve multiple interns with one mentor.

Ms. Dunkle replied, yes.

Ms. Booth said students would get a double dose and come out better.

Dr. Abras stated that schools are better equipped to know what they need. Ms. Dunkle said that is the primary reason why we wanted to create PDS. Dr. Abras thought it would be beneficial to have a series of training events and to follow guidelines and that the teachers should be certified. Ms. Dunkle said training is required for mentors and we have to have a standard to meet. Dr. Abras noted that we are held responsible to meet the requirements and that the state has the requirements that should be met.

Ms. Dunkle pointed out that we need to be thoughtful about what we want to see (e.g., in establishing the standards for the first year teacher).

Ms. Booth said everyone needs to have the ability to walk into school and be prepared. Ms. Dunkle said that partnership schools with three levels of performance at the school is a good concept to consider. Ms. Booth said criteria for partnership schools require schools with diverse populations to be defined. Ms. Dunkle said the State and CAEP need to figure out racial markers. Ms. Shurn stated that we are not limited to ability, race, and ethnicity - there is a big umbrella for diversity to look at.

Ms. Dunkle suggested we do have to deal with diversity, general framework, but need flexibility to design a program.

Ms. Burch asked if we can recommend that the term PDS be taken away. Ms. Dunkle stated that there is nothing wrong with the PDS Standards, just remove some proxies and get the framework together. Dr. Singer noted that the title PDS grants you certain resources. Ms. Dunkle said we want to consider keeping what is good but modifying for current needs.

Materials of Interest Requests for next meeting:

Next Steps:

Workgroup Session scheduled on March 29, 2017.

Adjourn 3:45 p.m.

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
February 21, 2017 Meeting
Committee #5- Mentoring

Committee Members Present: Justin McConnaughey, MAESP; Debra Poese, MADTECC; Cecilia Roe, MSDE; Jasmine Stewart, MSEA; and Stacy Williams, MICUA, Sarah Mallory, UMD; Diane Workman, PSSAM

Committee Members Absent: N/A

MSDE Staff: Laura Liccione, MSDE

Alternates Present: N/A

Approval of Minutes: Not Applicable

Discussion:

The committee reviewed and discussed the recommendations from the last meeting on January 31, 2017. The committee recommended revisions as follows:

1. Recommendation #1 from January 31 meeting:

Ensure reduced workloads to mentors, as well as new teachers

Recommendation #1 revised to: *Provide appropriate time for mentors to support non-tenured teachers based upon individual teacher needs.*

• Discussion:

- ✓ The original goal of this recommendation by the committee was to provide more time for mentors and mentees to work together.
- ✓ Revise recommendation to state “ensure more time” instead of “ensure reduced workloads”
- ✓ MSDE DCAA staff has partnered with New Teacher Center through RTTT funding since 2011 to train new mentors across the state. To continue to provide this training, MSDE DCAA staff is being trained by New Teacher Center and, in turn, they train new mentors across the local education agencies (LEAs). The goal is to train every new mentor and supplement LEA trainings.

• Follow-up; Further Discussion

- ✓ Sarah Spross stated that the Workgroup may want us to define or drill-down to “appropriate time.” The committee feels that drilling down to define “appropriate time” would be difficult because it would depend upon the needs of the teacher. Not all teachers, whether tenured or untenured, require the same amount of support. The amount of support/time should be personalized to the needs of the teacher.
- ✓ Consider: What can we do state-wide...how can the state support LEAs through more dedicated funding? What does the research say about the amount of time a new teacher (first year) needs (so it leads to retention)? Try to find if we invest x time [and money] into first year teacher, what is the y rate of return with respect to retention?

• Research needed:

- ✓ value of mentor to new teachers
- ✓ rate of return on retention of teachers with mentors
- ✓ student achievement with new teachers who have mentors as opposed to those without

- ✓ appropriate amount of time for mentor to spend with new teacher
- ✓ appropriate amount of time for mentor to spend with new teacher in order to increase retention- various models- percentage of time to teachers over time (LEA existing models include: some released, some stipends, some mixed models like department chairs)
- ✓ New teacher professional development plan requirements in COMAR

2. Recommendation #2 from January 31 meeting:

Establish institutes of higher education (IHE) and LEA partnerships to develop induction programs with innovative evidence-based strategies.

- **Recommendation #2 revised to: *Establish IHE's and LEA partnerships to develop and implement mentorship training programs which embed innovative evidence-based strategies as part of a comprehensive induction program.***

- ✓ Considerations: Number, Time, Measures, Self-Efficacy, Evaluation/Success Measures, Partnerships
- ✓ COMAR recommendation for ratio of mentors to mentees at 1:15 - seems appropriate to committee (Refer 13a.07.01 section .06)

- Research needed:

- ✓ How much time is adequate to develop an effective teacher (how long to mentor)?
- ✓ What tools exist to evaluate mentor/mentee such as self-efficacy before, during and after?

3. Recommendation #3 from January 31 meeting: *Develop on line resource centers to build mentor and teacher capacity.*

- **Recommendation #3 revised to: *Develop online repository of resources to strengthen mentor best practices.***

Resources may include:

- videos
- mentor and mentee tools
- webinars
- protocols
- self-reflection guides/surveys
- training modules

- Discussion:

ESSA feedback says teachers want easy access to online resources instead of traveling to off-site locations.

Research needed:

- ✓ What are other LEAs doing successfully with a resource repository?

4. **New recommendation #4 added: *Match mentees with mentors who have similar experiences serving specific student populations, such as students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and socio-economic backgrounds.***

- Rationale:

- ✓ Match mentors who have had teaching experiences with special student groups with non-tenured teachers in similar teaching positions to provide them with strategies, tools and experiences relevant to their current student population. These student populations require additional time and expertise to offer differentiated instruction that new teachers often do not possess at induction.
- ✓ Feedback from LEA Induction Coordinators and ESSA feedback indicate that there is great need to train new teachers for dealing with diverse student populations and needs.

- Discussion:
 - ✓ Should recommendation #1 be rewritten to include this recommendation or should this be a separate recommendation?
 - ✓ A budgetary limitation as many LEAs have mentors teaching a full course load and mentoring with a stipend. Code of Maryland (COMAR) - does not require mentors have reduced workloads, but recommends reduced workload. This especially pertains to elementary schools.
 - ✓ How to use the 20% model across the state—reduce new teacher work load to allow more time for induction activities.
- Research/Possible solutions:
 - ✓ Study the model of CT- Consulting Teacher program- where districts have approximately 1:15 consultant: new teachers and/or identified teachers. These mentors are more like advocates, non-evaluative, released positions. CT used for other teacher capacities besides new teachers, such as career changers.
 - ✓ Increase class sizes so that additional planning time is spent with mentor and new teachers.
 - ✓ Study- other models; confer with other committees that are researching this.

Next Steps:

- ✓ Gather research to bring to next committee meeting or send research to Cecilia Roe cecilia.roe@maryland.gov
- ✓ Work group meeting only 3/29/17 from 1-3pm at Arbutus Public Library. No committee groups
- ✓ Work group and committees meeting- 4/26/17

