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• To begin, the proposal 405 pages of regulatory language

• Comments on the proposed information collection requirements (burden and cost) to the Office of Management and Budget due January 2, 2015.

• Comments on the proposed regulations due February 2, 2015 (60 day comment period)

• The Department of Education needs to hear your comments!!

• Link to proposed regs and related material: Teacher Preparation Issues
Background

• 2012 negotiated rulemaking failed to reach consensus, no further action by the Department until 2014

• Department published proposed rules to the Federal Register on December 3, 2014.

• Currently Title II of Higher Education Act has no regulations

• These regulations connect Title II and TEACH grants

• Regulatory hook for the Department: What is a “high quality teacher preparation program” for TEACH grant participation?
Background Data from the Department

• Total of 25,000 individual teacher preparation programs in the United States
  
  o 22,312 programs are at 1500 institutions of higher education
  o 2,688 programs are at 1300 entities other than institutions of higher education

• The average institution of higher education offers 15 teacher prep programs
Overview:

Title II Reporting and TEACH Grant Nexus

- Every state must rate every teacher prep program in the state every year on a 1-4 scale
- Only those in the top two ratings will be eligible for TEACH grants

Ingredients for rating:
- Student learning outcomes (or teacher evaluations)*
- Employment and retention with focus on high need schools**
- Survey results of graduates and employers
- Professional accreditation or program approval with certain components
  - * must be satisfactory to be in top two categories
  - ** “significant part” employment outcomes in high need schools
Performance Assessment Levels

• The regulations mandate Performance Assessment Levels for all teacher preparation programs in the state.

• States must use at least these four levels:
  – Low-Performing
  – At-Risk
  – Effective
  – Exceptional

• Based on 4 ingredients including “in significant part, employment outcomes for high-need schools and student learning outcomes.”
Ingredient #1: Student Learning Outcomes

• “data, for each teacher preparation program in a state, on the aggregate learning outcomes of students taught by new teachers that are calculated by the state using one or both of the following:”

  – student growth, including VAM

  – teacher evaluation measures, which are based in large part on student growth, which could include VAM or testing
“Student Learning Outcomes: Student Growth”

• “change in student achievement in tested grades and subjects and the change in student achievement in non-tested grades and subjects for an individual student between two points in time”
  – Could be “value-added modeling”
  – “Student achievement in tested grades and subjects” = ESEA required assessments
“Student Learning Outcomes: Student Growth” continued

- “Student achievement in non-tested grades and subjects” = “determined by measures of student learning and performance, such as student results on pre-tests and end-of-course tests, objective performance based assessments, student learning objectives, student performance on English Language proficiency assessments and other measures of student achievement, that are rigorous and comparable across schools and consistent with State requirements.”

- Definitions nearly identical to ESEA waivers
“Student Learning Outcomes: Teacher Evaluation Measure”

• “the percentage of new teachers, by grade span and subject level, rated at each performance level under an LEA teacher evaluation system consistent with statewide parameters that differentiates teachers on an annual basis using at least three performance levels and multiple valid measures determining the performance levels.”

• “Multiple valid measures... include data on student growth for all students as a significant factor as well as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards and other measures of professional practice.”
Ingredient #2: Employment Outcomes

• Two components: Placement and Retention
• “Teacher Placement Rate” = percentage of *new teachers and recent graduates* who have been hired in a full-time teaching position for the grade level, span and subject area in which the teachers were prepared
  – Does not have to include graduates who go to other states, private schools, positions that don’t require certification or those who have enrolled in graduate school or joined military
Employment Outcomes:
Teacher Retention Rate

• Three options:
  1) % of new teachers hired in full time teaching positions who have served for at least 3 consecutive school years within 5 years of being granted certification that allows them to teach as teacher of record
  2) % of new teachers hired in full time teaching positions and reached a level of tenure or equivalent measure of retention within 5 years of being granted a level or certification that allows them to be teacher of record
  3) 100% minus % of new teachers hired in full time positions and whose employment was not continued by their employer for reasons other than budgetary constraints within five years of being teacher of record
Placement and Retention in High Need Schools

• Both calculated separately in relation to high need schools

• High Need School = meets one or both definitions:
  – Highest quartile of schools in LEA with % of students from low income families based on one or a composite of: % students in poverty; % eligible for free and reduced lunch; % receiving Social Security subsidies; % eligible for Medicaid.
  – Elementary school where 60% or more are eligible for free or reduced price lunch or others school where 45% or more are eligible for free or reduced price lunch.
  – Must be “significant part” of indicators
Different Employment Metrics for Alternative Routes

- States may calculate placement and retention rates differently for alt. routes vs. traditional programs when there are differences in the program that affect employment outcomes, such as employment requirement for entry into program.

- Varied assessments must result in “equivalent levels of accountability and reporting”

- Examples:
  - Same standard applied differently or apply same standard uniformly
  - Weight employment outcomes differently
Ingredient #3: Survey Outcomes

• Results of surveys of new teachers and their employers

• Designed to capture *perceptions* of whether new teachers possess the skills needed to succeed in the classroom

• May develop surveys and/or employment and retention rates in conjunction with CAEP
Ingredient #4: CAEP Accreditation or State Program Approval

• Accreditation by CAEP, NCATE, TEAC
• State Program Approval with these measures:
  – Produces teacher candidates with content and pedagogical knowledge
  – Quality clinical preparation (include multiple clinical or field experiences that serve diverse, rural or under represented populations, including ELL and SWD assessed with performance based protocol)
  – Rigorous entry and exit qualifications (entrance on multiple measures and exit based on performance assessment)
  – States may choose additional measures
  – (applied equally to alt routes and traditional programs)
State Processes to Build and Implement the Rating System
State Consultation with Stakeholders

• State must consult with at a minimum:
  – Leaders and faculty of traditional and alt. route programs; students of teacher prep programs; superintendents, school board members; elem and sec school leaders and instructional staff; elem and sec. school students and their parents; IHEs that serve high proportions of low-income or minority students or ELLs; advocates for ELLs and students with disabilities and officials of state’s standards board or other standards body.

• Must consult about:
  – Procedures for assessing and reporting the performance of each teacher preparation program
  – Weighting of four indicators to achieve rating
  – Method of aggregation of programs
  – State level rewards or consequences for performance levels
  – Opportunities for programs to appeal their rating
Aggregation of Data

• Must report on programs that produce 25 or more *new teachers* per year

• States may create a threshold lower than 25

• Must try to reach threshold by
  – aggregating programs operated by the same entity
    e.g. 2 different special ed programs
  – or aggregating over multiple years, up to 4
  – or a combination of the two
Low Performing and At Risk Programs

- States must identify both at risk and low performing programs, as with the current system
- Regulations mandate the use of at least the 4 indicators previously discussed to rate the programs
- When calculating rating for a program must include, “in significant part”, student learning outcomes
- No program can be “exceptional” or “effective” unless student learning outcomes for a program are “satisfactory”
Technical Assistance (TA) for Low Performers

• State must provide TA to low performers
• May include:
  1. Providing programs with the information on the indicators used to determine rating
  2. Assist programs in addressing the rigor or entry and exit criteria
  3. Help program identify areas of curriculum or clinical experience that correlate with gaps in graduates’ preparation
  4. Identify potential research and other resources to assist program improvement
  5. Share best practices from exemplary programs
Consequences for Low Performing Programs

• Loss of state approval and/or funding
• Loss of access to federal financial aid (Title IV)
• Provision of transitional services (remedial services, career counseling, locating another program) to students enrolled in the program for no more than 150% of the length of the program
• Estimated that 50 programs will lose state approval because of low performance
TEACH Grants

• Scholarships for teacher candidates up to $4000 per year for undergraduates and $4000 per year for two years for graduate students

• Must have 3.25 GPA and/or be in top 25% of standardized admissions test

• Service obligation of 4 out of 8 years in high need school and high need field

• Grant becomes loan to be repaid if service obligation is not completed.
TEACH Grants

• $100 million program
• Of the 22,312 teacher prep programs at IHEs, 16,721 have participated in the TEACH grant program
• About 800 IHEs and 34,000 students participate
• Almost half of TEACH disbursements to students in private not-for-profit IHEs
• Fewer than 100 institutions enroll the majority of participants
• Estimated that 3% to 8% of programs will lose TEACH eligibility with new rating system
“TEACH Grant Eligible Program” as defined by the proposed regulations

• “high quality teacher prep program” = rated as effective or exceptional for 2 out of 3 years

• “TEACH Grant-eligible STEM program” = physical, life, or computer sciences; technology; engineering or mathematics” over the most recent three years for which data are available have not been identified by the Secretary as having fewer than 60% of its TEACH recipients complete at least one year of teaching that fulfills the service obligation within 3 years of program completion.

• Secretary publishes annual list of TEACH grant eligible STEM programs identified by CIP codes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>States design establish, and troubleshoot data systems necessary for the mandated performance rating systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last reporting for the State Report Cards under the current system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Pilot reporting for State Report Cards still identifying low performing or at risk programs based on current system requirements but can include the performance ratings based on the new mandated reporting requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>State Report Cards must include the new mandated rating system for performance assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2020</td>
<td>Programs could be ineligible to participate in the TEACH Grant program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Impact of Regulation: Office of Management and Budget

• Economically Significant Regulation- threshold of $100 million more or adversely affect a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs etc... or raise novel legal or policy issues

• Department of Ed must verify that benefits justify the costs and the path chosen maximizes the benefits

• The Office of Management and Budget is required to also respond with an assessment of the costs and burdens, and wants to hear from YOU – deadline January 2, 2014
Cost and Benefits: The U.S. Department of Education Cost and Rationale

• 42.1 million over 10 years – total cost of reg

• Benefits according to the Department of Education:
  – Prospective students in choosing programs
  – Employers in recruiting and hiring
  – States in making funding decisions
  – Teacher prep programs in improving

*Department of Education states the current Title II data created “a market failure due to imperfect information”*
Cost to Institutions of Higher Education: According to the Department of Education

- No additional data collected as a result of this regulation; all current data under Title II will continue to be collected
- 4 hours per institution (entity) to adjust from aggregated to disaggregated program data
- Annual total cost for ALL IHEs to meet Institutional Report Card requirements = $3.7 million annually

AACTE does not concur with the estimates
Overall Burden: Perspectives

**U.S. Department of Education:** Total aggregate burden = 1.3 million hours nationwide for section creating the new rating system and the associated data collection; increase of 507,000 hours

**American Institutes of Research:** estimated this would require 2-3 state employees full time for the first two years.
Comments on Data Collection by the Office of Management and Budget—Due Jan. 2

- OMB is required to respond to the Department concerning the collection of information contained in these proposed regulations between 30 and 60 days after publication of this document in the Federal Register.

- Therefore, to ensure that OMB gives your comments full consideration, it is important that OMB receives your comments by January 2, 2015. This does not affect the deadline for your comments to us on the proposed regulations.
If you want to comment on the proposed information collection requirements, please send your comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for U.S. Department of Education. Send these comments by email to OIRA_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov or by fax to (202) 395-6974. You may also send a copy of these comments to the Department contact named in the ADDRESSES section of this preamble. Show citation box.

We have prepared an Information Collection Request (ICR) for OMB collection 1840-0744. In preparing your comments you may want to review the ICR, which is available at www.reginfo.gov and for which the comment period will run concurrently with the comment period of the NPRM. To review the ICR on www.reginfo.gov, click on Information Collection Review.
Submitting Comments on the Proposed Regulations by Feb. 2, 2015

- Submit your comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. We will not accept comments by fax or by email. To ensure that we do not receive duplicate copies, please submit your comments only one time. In addition, please include the Docket ID at the top of your comments.

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** Go to [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) to submit your comments electronically. Information on using Regulations.gov, including instructions for accessing agency documents, submitting comments, and viewing the docket, is available on the site under “Are you new to the site?”

- **Postal Mail, Commercial Delivery, or Hand Delivery:** If you mail or deliver your comments about these proposed regulations, address them to Sophia McArdle, U.S. Department of Education, 1990 K Street NW., Room 8017, Washington, DC 20006.
The Good News

• The acknowledgement of the importance of effective teacher preparation has never been greater

• There is much reform underway to celebrate

• The attention to these regulations provides the field with an opportunity to reframe and restate our perspective on the appropriate federal role in teacher education, which AACTE has worked to express in key bills in the House and Senate
Concerns with the Proposed Regulations: The Devil Is in the Details

• Federal overreach into state affairs
• Unfunded mandate on the states
• Applying a failed NCLB test-based accountability system to higher education
• Lack of state capacity and state data systems
• Potential production of low quality data
• Harm high need schools and high need fields
• Likely to privilege alternate providers
• Unworkable
• Distract from the real work of reform
• Jeopardize student financial aid for high need students
• Over 20 new definitions, not all aligned with definitions found in the law
Next Steps

• Read the proposed teacher preparation program regulations carefully
• Share broadly with your colleagues/networks/constituents/stakeholders
• Discuss potential impact broadly
• Analyze impact on your program/state
• Confer with your local/state stakeholders – legislators/governors/Presidents and provosts
• Utilize AACTE resources
• Submit comments by Jan. 2 and/or by Feb. 2
AACTE Member Resources

• Dedicated email for questions: regs@aacte.org
• Dedicated webpage, which includes AACTE press statements and media presence, & resources
• Summary of regulations document on webpage
• Concerns document 12/16-17
• Webinars posted on website 12/17
• Template letter for AACTE members to use to build out comments to submit 12/23-25
Speak UP!

• Let’s generate 100,000 comments!
• VOLUME COUNTS

IMPORTANT TO NOTE
Each person MUST submit his or her own comment letter – if you pull 25 letters together into 1 pdf and submit it via the Federal Register, then the document submitted counts as 1 comment.

BE SURE TO IMMEDIATELY SEND YOUR COMMENTS TO YOUR U.S. SENATORS & U.S. REPRESENTATIVE WITH A SHORT NOTE OF EXPLANATION – THEY NEED TO HEAR FROM YOU TOO

This is a critical opportunity to shape the profession’s destiny!