IMPROVING TEACHER PREPARATION: BUILDING ON INNOVATION
TEACHER QUALITY IS THE MOST IMPORTANT IN-SCHOOL FACTOR AFFECTING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND SUCCESS
GREAT TEACHERS MATTER
STUDENTS LEARN MORE FROM EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Teachers in the top 20 percent of performance generate five to six more months of student learning each year than low-performing teachers.
According to a Tennessee study, the difference in student achievement gains between being assigned a “less effective” teacher and being assigned a “more effective” teacher is roughly the equivalent of a student moving from the 50th percentile to about the 69th percentile in mathematics, and from the 50th percentile to about the 63rd percentile in reading.
Elementary and middle school students who are taught by a more effective teacher for just one year attend college at higher rates by age 20.
UNEQUAL ACCESS TO GREAT TEACHING
LOW-INCOME STUDENTS HAVE LESS ACCESS TO EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Percentage of the most effective teachers in high- and low-poverty elementary and middle schools

- Highest-Poverty Schools
- Lowest-Poverty Schools
WHAT WE KNOW:

THE QUALITY OF TEACHER PREPARATION HAS A GREAT IMPACT ON TEACHERS AND STUDENTS
In one study, the impact of the top vs. bottom teacher prep programs exceeded the impact of poverty or learning disabilities on student learning.
OUR STUDENTS ARE LOSING GROUND EDUCATIONALLY COMPARED TO OTHER NATIONS
“The United States... has lost its once-large lead in producing college graduates, and education remains the most successful jobs strategy in a globalized, technology-heavy economy.”

— The New York Times
WHERE WE NEED TO GO:

THE NEED FOR IMPROVED TEACHER PREPARATION
A COLLECTIVE EFFORT
NATIONAL EDUCATION LEADERS SEEK A WAY FORWARD

Arthur Levine, President, Woodrow Wilson Foundation

62%

Education School Alumni Agree

“schools of education do not prepare their graduates to cope with classroom reality”
A COLLECTIVE EFFORT
NATIONAL EDUCATION LEADERS SEEK A WAY FORWARD

American Federation of Teachers

“…new teachers give their training programs poor marks in the areas they describe as most important.”

82% Of teachers believe that better coordination between teacher preparation programs and school districts would improve teacher preparedness

77% Of teachers believe that aligning curricula with field experiences would improve teacher preparedness
NEW STANDARDS
BASELINE CRITERIA FOR INSTITUTIONS SEEKING CAEP ACCREDITATION

- An average student GPA of 3.0 or higher
- An average student score on a college entrance exam (SAT, ACT, GRE) that ranks in the top 50% by 2016-17 and the top 33% by 2020
WHERE WE NEED TO GO:

MORE AND BETTER-TRAINED TEACHERS

ESPECIALLY IN HIGH-NEED SCHOOLS AND FIELDS
THE NEED FOR TALENTED TEACHERS
WHERE WE ARE AND WHERE WE’RE GOING

Teachers Trained in 2011-12

Teachers Potentially Needed Annually by 2020

= 10,000 teachers
High-poverty schools experience substantial rates of turnover each year:
- In 2012-13, an estimated 148,000 teachers in high-poverty schools either changed schools or left teaching altogether

Principals are roughly 10 percentage points more likely to report serious difficulties filling math and science vacancies than English vacancies

Research suggests that we have more than enough qualified teachers in reading and language arts, but not enough qualified math and science teachers to compensate for teacher turnover
CHALLENGES OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION

TURNOVER AND SHORTAGES

Teacher Turnover by School Poverty Level: 2012-13

- 75% or more: 12.2% Moved to Another School, 9.8% Left Teaching Altogether
- 50%-74%: 8.6% Moved to Another School, 7.1% Left Teaching Altogether
- 35%-49%: 7.0% Moved to Another School, 7.5% Left Teaching Altogether
- 0%-34%: 5.9% Moved to Another School, 6.9% Left Teaching Altogether

Percent of Students who Receive Free or Reduced Lunch at School

Percent of Teachers
THE CHALLENGE:

STATE REPORTING AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS ARE WEAK
Historically, state accountability systems have been based on high licensure exam pass rates and program inputs—not student outcomes.

In 2011, just 12 states identified low-performing or at-risk teacher preparation programs.

Over the last twelve years of available data, 34 states have never identified a teacher preparation program as low-performing or at-risk.
THE STATE OF TEACHER PREPARATION

WEAK STATE ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAMS

State Identification of Teacher Preparation Programs

- Programs NOT identified as low-performing
- Programs identified as low-performing

2,100 institutions

38 programs
THE ROAD AHEAD:

NEW REGULATIONS WILL BUILD ON MOMENTUM IN IMPROVING TEACHER TRAINING
# Proposed Regulations

## Key Provisions and How They Compare to CAEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>NPRM</th>
<th>CAEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student outcomes:</strong> Academic gains among K-12 students as demonstrated through measures of student growth, performance on state or local teacher evaluation measures that include data on student growth, or both, during their first three teaching years</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment outcomes:</strong> Job placement and retention, including in high-need schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer satisfaction:</strong> Surveys of program graduates and their principals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program review and accreditation</strong> based on content/pedagogical knowledge, high quality clinical practice, and rigorous entry/exit requirements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple performance levels</strong> resulting from review and accreditation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility</strong> to states and providers in developing multiple measures of performance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike current reporting requirements, which focus almost exclusively on inputs, the proposed regulations set forth meaningful outcome indicators for reporting on teacher preparation programs.

States would have enormous flexibility for determining the specific measures used and evaluating program performance.

Provide key information on the performance of all teacher preparation programs.

Create a new feedback loop among programs and prospective teachers, employers, and the public.

Empower programs with better information to facilitate continuous improvement.
PROPOSED REGULATIONS

KEY FEATURES

- Performance reporting at the program, rather than institutional, level
- States would use a minimum of four performance levels for programs: exceptional, effective, at-risk or low-performing.
- Significant flexibility for states, including in setting performance thresholds and additional performance categories or indicators
- Requiring states to engage and consult with a broad range of stakeholders, including teacher preparation programs as well as school leaders and teachers
- Requiring states to report on rewards or consequences associated with each performance level and provide technical assistance to low-performing programs
- Refocusing TEACH Grant eligibility on programs identified as effective or higher
- Ensuring STEM programs can be eligible for TEACH Grant
BETTER REPORTING SYSTEMS

STATES LINKING STUDENT LEARNING AND TEACHER PREP PROGRAMS

RTT/Flex and other states that currently are linking (or plan to link) student growth and teacher evaluation to teacher prep (SLDS)

RTT/Flex states that currently are linking (or plan to link) student growth and teacher evaluation

States using student achievement data to hold teacher preparation accountable (NCTQ)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2015</td>
<td>Final regulations published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad. Year 2015-2016</td>
<td>States consult and design systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2016-2017</td>
<td>States and providers begin data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2017</td>
<td>Providers report AY 2016-17 data to states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Pilot year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• States submit first/pilot reports with data on new indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify low-performing/at-risk programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Option to identify effective/exceptional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>States submit first report with full ratings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Official” reports with data on new indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Required to identify 4+ performance categories for all programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>States submit second reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>