Report to the 2011 Oregon Legislature
House Bill 3619

December 1, 2010

Submitted by:
HB 3619 Task Force on Education Career Preparation and Development

HOUSE BILL 3619: REPORT TO THE 2011 OREGON LEGISLATURE

December 1, 2010

Executive Summary 1

HB 3619 4

SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION 7

SECTION 2.0 – TEACHER PREPARATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 12
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Teacher Preparation in Oregon
- 2.3 What Does It Take to Become a Teacher?
- 2.4 Clinical Preparation Stage
- 2.5 Shared Responsibility Equals Stronger Partnerships
- 2.6 Illustrations of Current Preservice Clinical Preparation
- 2.7 Professional Development for Educators
- 2.8 Key Recommendations

SECTION 3.0 – ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 22
- 3.1 Significance of Administrator Preparation and Professional Development
- 3.2 Administrator Preparation in Oregon
- 3.3 Current Administrator Professional Development Practices
- 3.4 Federal Policy Context
- 3.5 Recommendations

SECTION 4.0 – LICENSURE, PROGRAM ACCREDITATION, AND TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS 28
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Selected Strengths of Current Oregon Educator Licensure and Accreditation Requirements
- 4.3 Selected Weaknesses of Current Oregon Educator Licensure and Accreditation Requirements
- 4.4 Recommendations
- 4.5 Conclusion

SECTION 5.0 – USING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA TO EVALUATE EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS 34
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Distinct Steps in Assessing, Analyzing, and Applying Student Achievement Data
- 5.3 National, State, International, and Oregon Developments in Student Achievement Data Use
- 5.4 Conclusion
- 5.5 Recommendations

SECTION 6.0 – SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS 43

APPENDICES 46
Appendix A: Oregon Approved Teacher Education Institutions
Appendix B-1: Snapshot of Teacher Preparation Program [WOU – Undergraduate]
Appendix B-2: Snapshot of Teacher Preparation Program [UP – Graduate]

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND TERMS 49

REFERENCES 22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

House Bill 3619 called for the creation of the Task Force on Education Career Preparation and Development, whose purpose was to "develop a proposal for a seamless system of professional development that begins with career preparation and continues through employment as an education professional." Emphasis was placed on building "stronger connections between teacher education institutions and employers of education professionals." Ultimately, the Legislature seeks to strengthen teaching and learning in Oregon schools by improving preparation and professional development for all educators. Legislators emphasized that this is the single most important thing that we can do to improve student achievement.

The Task Force met eight times from spring 2010 through November 30. Members of the Task Force were appointed as directed by the Chancellor of the Oregon University System, the State Superintendent, and the Director of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

The recommendations of the Task Force are based on three principles. First, we need a seamless system of recruitment, preparation, induction-year support, and ongoing professional development for all professional educators. The current system is fragmented, with recruitment and preparation mainly the responsibility of institutions of higher education and professional development the responsibility of school districts. Different cultures and funding systems tend to keep universities and PK-12 schools in their silos. The recommendations herein are designed to break down the silos and to foster collaboration, efficiency, and effectiveness through partnerships that support stronger clinical preparation models, to elevate the role of school personnel who are partners with educator-preparation programs, and to increase the amount of time that university faculty can engage with school partners on efforts to improve student success.

Second, the foundation for the professional preparation and professional development system we put in place must be built on high standards. To this end, we have recommendations related to how Oregon will address national standards for licensure, accreditation, and curriculum. Standards in each of these areas reflect a growing consensus in the profession based on new research regarding teaching and learning.

Third, we must develop assessment systems that help us improve programs for educators and for PK-12 students and that address accountability expectations of policy leaders and the community. We need, for example, a statewide data system that enables teacher preparation programs to track their graduates to determine where they are placed, how long they stay in the teaching profession in Oregon, how well prepared they feel they were for their work, and how well their employers feel they were prepared. We need a system that uses multiple forms of data such as placement rates, surveys, and student performance that will help educators determine how well they are doing and how they can improve student learning. A major

emphasis must be on gathering reliable data that enable us to track how well we are addressing the needs of students from all backgrounds.

Not all of the Task Force recommendations require funding, and many will lead to greater efficiency as well as effectiveness. Following are the major recommendations of the Task Force that require support of the legislature. Recommendations not requiring legislative action are not included in this Executive Summary but may be found in the full report.

Teacher Preparation and Professional Development

Recommendations	Comments, costs, and next steps
Create an Educator Preparation Improvement Fund in order to advance university and district partnerships that respond to: (1) changes in Oregon PK-12 education; (2) collaboration around delivery models and clinical partnerships that provide effective professional preparation; (3) Oregon's educator workforce needs, including recruiting individuals into high-need areas and individuals from diverse backgrounds; (4) dissemination of research and best practices that address the needs of Oregon's schools; (5) focused collaboration around initiatives that support student success and post-secondary achievement; and (6) efforts to meet national accreditation requirements	$500,000 annual budget to ODE in partnership with TSPC to distribute through an RFP process
Develop an annual event that focuses on best practices emanating from shared responsibility for clinical-preparation models across the continuum of professional development, focusing on what is known about teacher recruitment, preparation, persistence, and success in impacting PK-12 student learning	$10,000 (recover costs through conference admission)

Administrator Preparation and Professional Development

Recommendations	Comments, costs, and next steps
Create a comprehensive leadership development system to support all Oregon students, with a focus on Oregon's highest-need students. This initiative will provide research, technical assistance to enhance evidence-based practices, and strengthen diversity and human capital capacity for the improvement of instructional and organizational leadership in schools.	Total cost: $5,000,000 annual to ODE in partnership with TSPC Will seek private sector funding match of $2.5 million annual

Licensure

Recommendations	Comments, Costs and next steps
Fully fund the mentor teacher program	$10 million annual
Encourage teachers to participate in National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification	$2 million annual state funding to TSPC to support preparation for teachers pursuing NBPTS certification and to provide bonus money for successful applicants
Incorporate national accreditation standards and InTASC standards into Division 17 and develop rubrics for those standards	Limited costs to TSPC. Implementation costs for teacher-preparation institutions

Data Use in Analysis of Teacher Preparation

Recommendations	Comments, Costs and next steps
Develop a database for use in the analysis of teacher-preparation program effectiveness, including information on 1) placement of all newly hired educators, 2) longevity of educator placements, 3) the nature of placements, including teaching assignments relative to licensure and certification and district demographics, and 4) educator and employer satisfaction with educator preparation	$90,000 annual budget for research and staffing
Conduct an in-depth study of the use of student achievement data in the analysis of teacher preparation programs so as to determine how best to evaluate educator effectiveness and contribute to the analysis and development of such programs	$250,000 annual budget for research and staffing; validation of results
Concurrent with the development of the database, develop systems for regular access to data and for training in its use for educators, including those in higher education, and particularly in educator-preparation programs	Cost to be estimated once scope of database known

75th OREGON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY—2010 Special Session

House Bill 3619

Sponsored by Representative KOMP (Presession filed.)

SUMMARY

The following summary is not prepared by the sponsors of the measure and is not a part of the body thereof subject to consideration by the Legislative Assembly. It is an editor's brief statement of the essential features of the measure **as introduced.**

Establishes Task Force on Education Career Preparation and Development for purpose of improving effectiveness of school teachers, administrators and counselors by building stronger connections between education career preparation institutions and employers of education professionals.

Sunsets task force on date of convening of next regular biennial legislative session.

Declares emergency, effective on passage.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

Relating to professional development of education professionals; and declaring an emergency.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. (1) As used in this section:

(a) "Education career preparation institution" means a higher education institution that provides education or training to a person to:

(A) Become an education professional; or

(B) Gain skills, update skills or otherwise improve techniques in being an education professional.

(b) "Education professional" means a school teacher, administrator or counselor.

(2) The Task Force on Education Career Preparation and Development is established for the purpose of improving the effectiveness of education professionals by building stronger connections between education career preparation institutions and employers of education professionals.

(3) The task force consists of 18 members appointed by the Chancellor of the Oregon University System. The task force must include members from public and private education

NOTE: Matter in **boldfaced** type in an amended section is new; matter [*italic and bracketed*] is existing law to be omitted.

New sections are in **boldfaced** type.

LC 177

HB 3619

career preparation institutions, school districts, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, the Oregon University System, organizations representing teachers, nonprofit organizations related to the improvement of education and advocacy for children, and an association of businesses focused on the long-term social and economic well-being of this state.
(4) The task force shall:
(a) Identify the strengths in and the needs for the practices and procedures used in the preparation, recruitment and retention of education professionals; (b) Identify any gaps in the practices and procedures used in the preparation, recruitment and retention of education professionals that may exist between education career preparation institutions and employers of education professionals; and (c) Develop a proposal for a system that improves the effectiveness of education professionals by building stronger connections between education career preparation institutions and employers of education professionals.
(5) The proposed system developed by the task force, as described in subsection (4)(c) of this section, must strive to create a seamless system for preparing, recruiting and retaining:
(a) Highly effective teachers for every public kindergarten through grade 12 classroom;
(b) Highly effective administrators for every public school; and
(c) Highly effective counselors to sufficiently serve every student in public schools.
(6) Elements of the proposed system created as provided by subsection (5) of this section must include, at a minimum:
(a) Methods for the collection, reporting and use of student performance data in a manner that enables education career preparation institutions to analyze their program effectiveness;
(b) An examination of the benefits of fully funding legislation related to the development of teachers, including:
(A) The Oregon Teacher Corps, as described in ORS 329.757 to 329.780; and
(B) The Minority Teacher Act of 1991, as described in ORS 342.433 to 342.449 and 351.077;
(c) The adoption of professional development standards that take into consideration standards proposed by national organizations while retaining flexibility for the individual needs of this state;
(d) An examination of methods and incentives to increase the involvement of faculty at education career preparation institutions in the environments where the education professionals will be working;
(e) The determination of the costs and the benefits of funding:
(A) Paid time for faculty at education career preparation institutions to go to the places where education professionals work and to be involved in the professional development of the education professionals; and
(B) A greater number of substitute teachers for the purpose of reducing the workload of first-year teachers and providing additional time to teachers who participate in teacher

preparation;
(f) The consideration of a program in which an education career preparation institution may apply for funds to assist the institution in responding to the needs of a school district, as described in a request for proposals made by the school district; and
(g) A study of the equity of the current allocation of resources to professional development programs that have a clinical practice.
(7) A majority of the members of the task force constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.
(8) Official action by the task force requires the approval of a majority of the members of the task force.
(9) The task force shall elect one of its members to serve as chairperson.
(10) If there is a vacancy for any cause, the chancellor shall make an appointment to become immediately effective.
(11) The task force shall meet at times and places specified by the call of the chairperson or of a majority of the members of the task force.
(12) The task force may adopt rules necessary for the operation of the task force.
(13) The task force shall submit a report that describes the findings described in subsection (4)(a) and (b) of this section and the proposed system described in subsection (4)(c) of this section to the legislative interim committees related to education no later than December 2, 2010.
(14) The Oregon University System shall provide staff support to the task force.
(15) Members of the task force serve as volunteers on the task force and are not entitled to compensation or reimbursement for expenses.
(16) All agencies of state government, as defined in ORS 174.111, are directed to assist the task force in the performance of its duties and, to the extent permitted by laws relating to confidentiality, to furnish such information and advice as the members of the task force consider necessary to perform their duties.
(17) The task force may work in collaboration with other entities involved in the development of practices and procedures that improve the effectiveness of education professionals.
SECTION 2. Section 1 of this 2010 Act is repealed on the date of the convening of the next regular biennial legislative session.
SECTION 3. This 2010 Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this 2010 Act takes effect on its passage.

LC 177
HB 3619

SECTION 1.0: Introduction

House Bill 3619 called for the creation of the Task Force on Education Career Preparation and Development whose purpose was to "develop a proposal for a seamless system of professional development that begins with career preparation and continues through employment as an education professional." Emphasis was placed on building "stronger connections between teacher education institutions and employers of education professionals."

The Task Force met eight times from spring 2010 through November 30. Members of the Task Force were appointed as directed by the Chancellor of the Oregon University System, the State Superintendent, and the Director of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. A list of members follows:

Dr. Randy Hitz, Dean, Portland State University Graduate School of Education – Task Force Chair
Colin Cameron, Director of Professional Development, Confederation of School Administrators
Victoria Baines Chamberlain, Executive Director, Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
Dr. Kate Dickson, Vice-President Education Policy, Chalkboard Project
Dr. Scott Fletcher, Dean, Lewis and Clark College Graduate School of Education & Counseling
Dr. Thomas G. Greene, Dean, University of Portland Graduate School
C. Michelle Hooper, Director, Systems Management & Coordination, Oregon Department of Education
Dan Jamison, Superintendent, Sherwood School District 88J
Dr. Robert Larson, Director, Center for Classroom Teaching and Learning, Education Northwest
Marsha Benjamin Moyer, Salem-Keizer School District 24J Human Resources Department
Beverly Pratt, Education Specialist, Teacher Quality, Oregon Department of Education
Dr. Hilda Rosselli, Dean, Western Oregon University College of Education
Dr. Robert Turner, Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Academic Strategies, Oregon University System
Courtney Vanderstek, Assistant Executive Director, Oregon Education Association
Dr. Steven Wojcikiewicz, Assistant Professor of Education, Western Oregon University

Various members of the Task Force took responsibility for writing elements of this report. Though the Task Force as a group takes responsibility for the entire report and for all of the recommendations, we wish to acknowledge the primary writers for each part.

Introduction	Randy Hitz
New Teacher Preparation	Hilda Rosselli
Administrator Preparation	Robert Larson
Professional Development	Courtney Vanderstek and Colin Cameron
Teacher Effectiveness and Licensure	Thomas Greene and Victoria Chamberlain
Data Use	Steven Wojcikiewicz and Robert Turner

The Task Force also wishes to thank:

- Carol Harding for editing this report
- Mary Robinson for taking notes and providing other administrative support
- Education Northwest for hosting a "base camp" to facilitate communication
- Oregon Education Association for hosting most of the meetings at their Tigard office.

Most importantly, we wish to thank Representative Betty Komp for her vision in promoting HB 3619 and for her consistent and thoughtful contributions to the Task Force.

Context

Oregon, like other states and advanced nations, is attempting to educate all children and youth at historically high levels. Though one hundred years ago only ten percent of all U.S. citizens graduated from high school, and fifty years ago just over half of our population held high school diplomas, today over eighty percent of our people complete high school or its equivalent, and yet this is not nearly good enough. Complexities of modern society, workforce demands, and global competition require that all students graduate from high school ready to enter a complex workforce or to pursue higher education. A competitive and just nation must provide high quality education for all citizens.

The education environment has changed dramatically in recent years. More people across the world are being educated at higher levels and, while the U.S. led the world in the rate of college graduates in 1995, today we do not even rank in the top ten nations. By 2015 it is expected that China will graduate more people from college than the U.S. and the European Union combined (Schleicher, 2009).

Information is expanding rapidly, and it is estimated that the amount of technical information in the world doubles every two years. Over 3000 books are published every day. Through technological advances, students can now access much of this information from personal computers in schools, libraries, or their homes. No longer do students need to rely on obtaining information from teachers or textbooks. Technology has radically changed how we deliver, receive, and manage information, and it is changing the way people interact with one another to learn and to solve problems. Professions and businesses are changing their focus to become more customer-centered, and teams are becoming the key organizational structure to solve problems and meet the needs of customers and clients.

The single factor which may be most significant to the preparation and professional development of educators is the dramatic advance in the knowledge base regarding how people learn. In 2000 the National Academy of Sciences published a book summarizing the best science that informs what is known about human learning (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). In October 2010 the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) published major reports on human development and learning and how the science of development and learning must inform the preparation of educators (Pianta, Hitz, & West, 2010; Snyder & Lit, 2010). We know that people learn best when they

- have a deep foundation of factual knowledge and experiences,

- engage in activities that build on their existing knowledge,
- engage in problem-solving,
- organize knowledge in ways that facilitate retrieval and application, and
- have clear learning goals and monitor their progress.

We cannot merely reform our current education system; we must transform education in Oregon and America to meet the demands of the 21st century. This document focuses on one major (and we think the most important) aspect of that transformation, the preparation and professional development of educators.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) calls for a complete rethinking of the purposes, processes, and places for education—and for a focus on transforming rather than reforming the current system (Hill, Jeffrey, McWalters, Paliokas, Seagren, & Stumbo, 2010). They suggest that instructional practice

- be grounded in research evidence, including new brain research on how students learn;
- focus on personalizing learning for each student, to address unique and diverse learning styles and needs;
- incorporate and exploit new technologies to maximize and individualize learning;
- model 21st-century learning by allowing students to take charge of their own learning and do it in creative ways;
- include ongoing, embedded professional development for teachers and administrators around 21st-century content knowledge, skills, and pedagogical strategies.

Like the CCSSO report, HB 3619 wisely calls for Oregon to create a coherent educator development system that provides ongoing and continuous support through the career continuum.

Oregon and the nation have engaged in comprehensive school improvement for nearly two decades and the one most significant lesson we have learned is that any improvement in education depends primarily on the preparation and professional development of teachers and school leaders (Darling-Hammond, 2009a). Other sources point to the importance of school leaders. To meet the new challenges of today and to ensure that all students achieve at high levels, teachers need to be better prepared, and that requires a transformation in teacher preparation and professional development. Investing in the preparation of educators today will yield benefits to society for generations.

Other nations have also learned the lesson that well-prepared educators are the key to improving education, but they have made greater investments in the preparation and professional development of their educators. In her testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee on the Re-Authorization of No Child Left Behind on September 10, 2007, Linda Darling-Hammond explained to legislators why the United States failed to score as high as some other countries on specified tests of reading, mathematics, and scientific reasoning. In addition to her comments comparing school funding, types of assessment, and required curriculum, Dr. Hammond testified that,

> High-achieving nations intensively support a better-prepared teaching force – funding competitive salaries and high-quality teacher education, mentoring, and ongoing professional development for all teachers, at government expense. Countries which rarely experience teacher shortages (such as Finland, Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, Germany, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Taiwan, Singapore) have made substantial investments in teacher training and equitable teacher distribution in the last two decades. These include:
>
> > High-quality pre-service teacher education, completely free of charge to all candidates, including a year of practice teaching in a clinical school connected to the university,
> >
> > Mentoring for all beginners in their first year of teaching from expert teachers, coupled with other supports like a reduced teaching load and shared planning,
> >
> > Salaries which are competitive with other professions, such as engineering, and are equitable across schools (often with additional stipends for hard-to-staff locations),
> >
> > Ongoing professional learning embedded in 10 or more hours a week of planning and professional development time. (Darling-Hammond, 2009a, p. 47)

The essence of HB 3619 is to strengthen teaching and learning in Oregon schools by seeking recommendations for creating a more seamless system for educator preparation and professional development. The HB 3619 Task Force was charged to make recommendations to address the clinical components of preparation programs, including greater involvement of PK-12 schools, and it calls for greater involvement of universities in the induction of new teachers into the profession and in their ongoing professional development. This charge was particularly insightful as it anticipated a very significant report issued on November 16, 2010, by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (Zimpher & Jones, 2010) urging educator preparation programs and PK-12 schools to strengthen clinical experiences for aspiring educators. Because of this legislative insight and the work of the HB 3619 Task Force, Oregon was invited to participate with NCATE and a small group of other states to pilot new ways of improving clinical experiences.

Organization of the Report

This report includes five sections dealing with: teacher preparation and professional development, administrator preparation and professional development, state licensure practices, and data use in analysis of educator preparation. The final section lists the recommendations of the Task Force.

SECTION 2.1 – Introduction

Every so often an array of factors coalesces to create a dramatic sea change. Oregon is facing such an opportunity as state and federal policies, research on best practices, and good common sense focus attention on improving how future teachers and administrators are recruited, oriented, supported and welcomed into the education profession. As seen in the diagram below, some factors are exogenous and are already in motion. Others are endogenous and the result of thoughtful collaboration between various stakeholders in Oregon who over time have envisioned better ways to work together and create more cohesive, supportive systems that span the life of an educator.

Rosselli, H. 2010

This section explores current practices and proposes ways to maximize the current factors of change to create a strong and unified vision for preparation, retention, professional development and evaluation of Oregon's educator workforce.

SECTION 2.2 – Teacher Preparation in Oregon

Oregon has 20 institutions that prepare new teachers and administrators (see Appendix A). Each of the university programs must be approved by the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), submit annual reports documenting any program variations, and undergo an extensive program review every seven years.

Eight of the institutions are also accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The NCATE and TSPC accreditation processes both involve extensive self-study reports in which institutions provide data on their candidates' performance linked to standards, followed by a three-day visit by a team of educators that includes reviews of records, performance data, employer satisfaction survey results, and syllabi, as well as interviews with candidates, alumni, school partners, university officials, and faculty. The team's report includes a final recommendation that is then acted upon by the respective accrediting agency.

Coursework and clinical experiences in each of the Oregon teacher preparation programs are tied to TSPC's proficiencies for initial teacher licensure, state content standards, and content-specific teaching standards recommended by each discipline's professional association. NCATE has aligned its unit and program standards with the principles of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers. A revised set of these standards has recently been released for public comment (http://.ccsso.org/intasc). The revised InTASC standards are now intended to apply to all teachers and give specific attention to cultural competence, use of data to support learning, English language learners, technology, and the collaborative data-driven leadership roles that teachers are expected to assume in the schools of today as they focus on improving outcomes for students.

The usefulness of standards that span the continuum of teacher development can best be maximized if there is general agreement on what expertise should look like at the stages of pre-service, induction, early years, and master teacher. Neville, Sherman, and Cohen (2005) noted that "the education field continues to grapple with a lack of consensus over the characteristics of an effective teacher and continues to rely on varied state standards for licensure, which impacts efforts to ensure that all teachers meet an established level of competency" (p. 3). The lack of a common language in Oregon has created gaps in communication between vital partners involved in the recruitment, preparation, licensure, mentoring, retention and promotion of teachers in the state. It is time for a convergence around (a) one set of standards that differentiate between the stages of a teacher's development, (b) commonly agreed-upon performance indicators, and (c) alignment of measures used to assess and support teachers at each stage of the continuum. Efforts by TSPC and teacher-preparation programs to develop common language and evaluative tools for field experiences would be helpful to school districts who partner with multiple programs. Alignment of the measures used to evaluate teachers with the standards that are used to license teachers would help teacher-preparation programs better prepare candidates.

The alignment of InTASC standards with those designed for program accreditation (NCATE), professional development (National Staff Development Council - NSDC) and advanced credentialing (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards - NBPTS) can result in more common language and a unified way to reference the important skills and standards that teachers are expected to demonstrate, while also reducing unnecessary disconnects as educators progress through the various stages of their professional careers and coalescing around a common vision for learning, teaching, and leading. Now is the right time for Oregon to use these standards to develop articulated systems that view the profession on a continuum rather than as disparate components.

SECTION 2.3 – What does it take to become a teacher?

Unlike early pioneer days when teachers seldom had more formal education than beyond 10th grade, many teacher-preparation programs now enforce a complex and rigorous set of admission requirements that include passing a standardized general knowledge exam and a test on civil rights, successfully completing the equivalent of a major in one or more content areas, obtaining positive references that reflect an aptitude for working with children or youth, and passing a standardized content-knowledge exam in each area of specialization.

Specialized coursework in the content area is taught by faculty in the individual disciplines. Usually 60 undergraduate quarter hours (or the semester equivalent) is composed of general education courses and another 70 quarter hours in content areas, all taught outside the Colleges of Education. Once admitted to a school or college of education, future teachers study the art and science of teaching in coursework on campus that is frequently paired with clinical experiences in school classrooms. Candidates learn about child and adolescent development, school culture, professional ethics, cultural competency, discipline-specific teaching strategies and state content standards. They learn how to assess what their students already know, plan instruction tied to state standards, and engage students in using technology as a learning tool. They learn how to communicate and work effectively with all students and their families, particularly those who may speak another language, come from an impoverished environment, or have identified special learning needs. They demonstrate the ability to create effective classroom environments conducive for learning, to motivate and engage students in learning content, to assess what students have learned, and to use data to inform instructional planning and practices.

Pre-service candidates can also elect to enroll in a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program currently offered at the majority of institutions in Oregon. This degree option is particularly attractive to career changers. An MAT program accepts candidates with a bachelor's degree in a relevant content area and offers the coursework and field experiences required for initial licensure. These programs are held to the same TSPC standards and are also reviewed during any NCATE site visit conducted on a campus. (Appendix B contains sample program descriptions from two Oregon institutions.)

SECTION 2.4 – Clinical Preparation Stage

While enrolled in university classes within a school or college of education, prospective teachers spend significant time (200+ hours) observing and working in classrooms where they learn firsthand about the culture of schools, the nature of students, and the expectations of the profession. The literature is clear that this type of applied learning is critical and valued for developing teachers (Hart, 2009), and it is crucial that sites modeling best practices be used as training ground for new recruits to the profession (Darling-Hammond, 2009b). The clinical component culminates with at least 15 weeks during which the student teachers are in classrooms every day all day, applying what they have learned while being supervised by both a college faculty member and the host classroom teacher. Each student teacher is observed and rated on the ability to demonstrate proficiency on five major standards defined by the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

While in the schools, each student teacher completes two Teacher Work Samples (TWS), an authentic performance assessment originally created in Oregon and now copied by hundreds of institutions nationwide. The TWS demonstrates candidates' ability to pre-assess student learning, use data to plan and deliver instruction, post-assess, analyze learning gains, and reflect on their own effectiveness to impact student learning gains in a unit of instruction. Research conducted at the University of Portland examined three years of data that included over 3000 PK-12 students impacted by 400 Teacher Work Samples included in the study (Waggoner, Carroll, & Weitzel, 2010). The results showed that: a) student teachers make a positive impact on PK-12 student learning, b) the impact improves over the months they are in the classroom, and c) the impact is evident across the full spectrum of student ability levels and special instructional needs.

The time spent in school settings is a critical stage of development that orients each prospective teacher to the roles and expectations of the profession. The most effective clinical experiences rely on strong partnerships between university faculty and the classroom teachers who serve as mentors and who carry heavy responsibilities for modeling, coaching, and assessing student teachers' progress on a daily basis.

In November 2010, a Blue Ribbon Panel convened by NCATE released a report that re-emphasizes the importance of programs that are grounded in clinical practice, interwoven with academic content and professional courses (Zimpher & Jones, 2010). Creating a system built around programs centered on clinical practice also holds great promise for advancing shared responsibility for teacher preparation; supporting the development of complex teaching skills; and ensuring that all teachers will know how to work closely with colleagues, students, and community (p. ii). The panel calls for "sweeping changes in how we deliver, monitor, evaluate, oversee, and staff clinically based preparation to incubate a whole new form of teacher education" (p. 6). Already the report has resulted in the formation of NCATE Alliances in eight states, including Oregon, that have signed commitments from the Superintendent of Public Education, the Director of

Teacher Licensure and Standards, and the Chancellor of the higher education system, pledging to:

- Create and support collaborative partnerships among schools, districts, and a plurality of teacher preparation providers which will prepare teachers in a clinically based program.
- Expect multiple measures of performance assessments for teacher preparation candidates and providers working in clinically based venues.
- Establish stronger state policies and incentives to prepare teachers in clinically based settings.
- Develop a "scale-up" plan to expand from a limited number of clinical teacher preparation partnerships to a statewide system of clinical teacher preparation as a means for improving student learning – especially in high-needs schools.
- Share best practice models for clinically based teacher preparation with the Alliance and the education community at large.

In the current system, a cooperating teacher is typically provided no additional time for debriefing with the student teacher and university supervisor, no reduction in the teacher's caseload, and compensation of only a small stipend and/or a tuition voucher provided by the host institution. Opportunities for clinical-supervision training are often sporadic and lack standardization within and across institutions. Although there are commonalities across the different teacher-preparation programs, there are also variations in the types of evaluation forms and rating scales that mentor teachers are asked to use to provide feedback on the student teacher's performance.

Combined with the increased accountability for student learning that teachers have assumed, and the concern that students' scores may be negatively impacted by a novice teacher and ultimately reflect on a school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status,[1] it is not surprising that more and more teachers are reluctant to share their classrooms with student teachers. In both metropolitan and rural areas in Oregon, this is becoming a crisis of major proportion that calls for new ways of doing business.

SECTION 2.5 – Shared Responsibility Equals Stronger Partnerships

As is illustrated in this report, institutions in Oregon are committed to high standards and accountability for the preparation of teachers and administrators. But there is need for a shared responsibility model that more effectively engages school personnel working together with all of Oregon's teacher-preparation programs to develop our next generation of educators.

In order to improve the preparation of teachers, some institutions have adopted a teaching-hospital model by establishing clinical sites or Professional Development Schools (Levine, 2009;

[1] Adequate Yearly Progress is the minimum level of improvement that school districts and schools must achieve each year as determined under the No Child Left Behind Act. A full list of acronyms and terms can be found in the Glossary.

Zeichner, 2010) which embody best practices in clinical fieldwork and which operate much like clinical placements for residents in a teaching hospital. Under such a model, districts partner with teacher-preparation programs to establish clinical school sites dedicated to the preparation of new educators. Faculty in these sites are carefully selected and trained so that they are skilled in articulating their practice and coaching another adult towards higher levels of skills. Selected classes from the partner institutions may be offered on-site at the clinical schools so that teacher candidates can observe and practice instructional strategies in an environment where their learning is enhanced by the presence of practicing teachers.

The partnering schools often identify areas for school improvement and professional development that are furthered by frequent and sustained presence of faculty and student teachers from colleges/universities to improve practice and enhance student achievement. School personnel are often hired as clinical faculty to co-coordinate clinical experiences on-site, to teach classes, and to collaborate more closely with college faculty on program improvement efforts. Because university faculty either generate student credit hours at their institutions or are "bought out" for research or other activities, they are not easily freed up to work closely with schools on sustained partnerships without additional funding to replace courses they would normally be teaching. College faculty who spend considerable time at clinical sites often use this applied scholarship as part of their tenure and promotion process.

The clustering of student teachers at these clinical sites results in savings for colleges and universities, who have fewer placement sites and reduced travel costs for supervision; this results in a reallocation of resources to fund more faculty time in the schools, where they can collaborate with classroom teachers on strategies for improving student success and stay connected with school culture and challenges within the profession. Seed funding should be made available for each teacher preparation program in Oregon to establish at least one clinical site, similar to a teaching hospital, dedicated to the preparation of new teachers, faculty development, inquiry directed at the improvement of practice, and enhanced student achievement. Standards honed during the past twenty years from the Professional Development School models implemented in other states provide clear guidance as to effective shared governance, funding, and accountability practices needed to initiate and develop strong partnerships (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2001; Teitel, 2003) and can help ensure that school districts and universities jointly design and supervise strong clinical-practice collaborations (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2010).

SECTION 2.6 – Illustrations of Current Pre-service Clinical Preparation

A number of colleges and universities in Oregon are already seeking ways to develop sustained partnerships with school sites willing to engage in a greater role in preparing future educators, which include the following arrangements:

- Placement of multiple candidates with one cooperating teacher in a classroom;

- Co-teaching model where mentor and student teacher more equitably share classroom teaching responsibilities, thus supporting PK-12 students with two adult educators per classroom;
- Placement of student teachers in "clusters" in local schools in order to create learning teams both among the clusters of students and with the schools' cooperating teachers and university faculty –the focus of these teams is on student achievement as well as how best to prepare teachers and foster ongoing professional development for teachers and university faculty;
- Partnerships cultivated through long-term relationships with specific schools, which is recognized for success in reducing achievement gaps commonly predicted by race or socio-economic class, and where learning communities form to create positive structures for long-term, job-embedded learning for aspiring teachers;
- A year-long internship in one classroom that starts with the first day of teacher inservice and ends with the last day of the mentor's contract;
- Free on-site inservice consultations at schools where colleges have placed numerous student teachers;
- Communities of pre-service candidates who reflect together and collaboratively build understanding throughout the year in an ongoing practicum;
- Reflective inquiry assignments which ask students and their site supervisors to collaboratively inquire into an issue of practice; and
- Regular meetings of teacher-preparation faculty and staff from local school districts to discuss the progress of graduates hired as new teachers during their first and second years of teaching and which bring program faculty together with their graduates to explore ways of making the teacher-preparation programs more receptive to the changing needs of new teachers.

SECTION 2.7 – Professional Development for Educators

Teaching is a demanding and complex profession. Meeting the demands of the teaching profession requires tremendous will, ability, and preparation. It also requires continuous learning and support. Unfortunately, in difficult financial times, support for continuous learning is often one of the first budget areas cut. It is time to see this support as an investment in improving student achievement.

This report offers recommendations on improving and strengthening teacher preparation. It also recommends strengthening and expanding mentoring and induction opportunities for educators. Another key recommendation must be providing support for educators to continually acquire and apply effective teaching strategies to help all students achieve.

Once a teacher has become licensed, there are expectations that learning will continue through mentoring and professional development. The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) has defined professional development as coursework, experience, training, or renewal activity required by a state to maintain the validity of a license.

Oregon, like a number of other progressive states, has taken steps to provide mentoring for new teachers through the Oregon Mentoring Project. The Oregon Department of Education has partnered with the New Teacher Center (NTC) to provide a comprehensive two-year Mentor Academy Series. The Mentor Academy is a professional development series consisting of eight, three-day sessions. The Academy's sequenced curriculum supports the development of comprehensive mentoring knowledge and skills using the NTC Formative Assessment System. Each Academy has a specific focus and promotes the collection and analysis of field-based data, as well as provides structured time for collaborative planning with other mentors from around the state. Following is the content of the eight academies:

- Foundations in Mentoring and Formative Assessment
- Coaching and Observation Strategies
- Analysis of Student Work
- Planning and Designing Professional Development for New Teachers
- Coaching in Complex Situations
- Mentoring for Equity
- Extending Equity: Supporting Academic English Success
- Teachers of Teachers

School-based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are linked with professional development. The goal of this practice is continuous learning embedded in the workplace. PLCs provide collective focus on and responsibility for student learning. The collaborative effort, when implemented well, can provide an environment that fosters mutual cooperation, emotional support, personal growth and a synergy of efforts.

Two professional development practices that place an increased focus on cultural competency and meeting the needs of a diverse student population include SIOP: Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol and GLAD: Guided Language Acquisition Design. SIOP is a research-based and validated instructional model that has proven effective in addressing the academic needs of English learners throughout the United States. It consists of eight interrelated components: lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice/application, lesson delivery, and review/assessment. GLAD is an instructional model with clear, practical strategies that promote positive, effective interactions among students and between teachers and students. GLAD develops meta-cognitive use of high-level academic language and literacy. The strategies used in the model promote English language acquisition, academic achievement, and cross-cultural skills.

The Oregon Education Association also works with districts and local associations around the state to help prepare educators to work with diverse student populations. OEA's C.A.R.E. modules (Culture, Ability, Resilience and Effort) as well as diversity training provide ongoing learning opportunities for teachers. Based on research from the Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE) and the work of Belinda Williams, the CREDE five Standards for Effective Pedagogy include:

- Teachers and Students Producing Together – Facilitate learning through joint productive activity among teachers and students

- Developing Language and Literacy Across the Curriculum – Develop students' competence in the language and literacy of instruction throughout all instructional activities
- Making Lessons Meaningful – Connect curriculum to experience and skills of students' home and community
- Teaching Complex Thinking – Challenge students toward cognitive complexity
- Teaching through Conversation – Engage students through dialogue, especially instructional conversation.

All of the models require time for educators to learn, reflect and practice. Such investment in the educator workforce with professional development opportunities can contribute to improved student achievement.

Whereas in the past professional development was frequently relegated to a few large-group workshops or conferences, today opportunities for educators to network and collaborate on professional development opportunities are becoming more common as schools and districts seek ways to support lesson study, PLCs, and Data Teams. These options align with the National Staff Development Standards recommendations that professional development be comprehensive, sustained, and intensive, and focused on improving teachers' and principals' effectiveness in raising student achievement.

In the past, colleges and universities were seen as the primary providers of workshops, coursework, and advanced degrees or certificates; now, however, professional development offerings have expanded to include more commercial providers, and schools and districts have assumed more responsibility for providing in-house professional development that aligns with school or district improvement initiatives. Colleges and universities still provide coursework that enable teachers to add endorsements (e.g., Literacy and ESOL), authorization levels, Continuing Teacher Licensure options, and advanced degrees (including areas such as Educational Leadership, Literacy, and Special Education). Institutions accept tuition vouchers (earned by the districts through supervision of pre-service candidates) to reduce the cost of tuition for these offerings. A number of these programs are designed in partnership with school districts and offered on-site with faculty from both the university and the school district.

Neville et al. (2005) note that while there is a growing consensus regarding the characteristics of high-quality professional development, there is still a widespread need for standards that would enable educators to evaluate providers and offerings. In Oregon, SB 433 has resulted in the appointment of the Oregon Educator Professional Development Commission charged with providing technical assistance to local school districts to create professional development plans resulting in achievement of school improvement objectives. It is anticipated that the Commission will increase the accountability for professional development and provide more access to quality professional development offerings that show evidence of improving student outcomes.

SECTION 2.8 – Recommendations

Policymakers who care about improving outcomes for Oregon's PK-12 students are wise to demand a high level of accountability from those who prepare teachers, counselors, and administrators. But college and university faculty alone cannot prepare future educators. Oregonians would be wise to invest in educator preparation in ways that support the quality clinical experiences and supervision educators-in-training receive that can help them become effective practitioners in Oregon's schools and impact student success. It is time to acknowledge and enhance the field-based experiences that contribute to the preparation of Oregon's future educators. Oregon's policymakers can play a role in strengthening the preparation of educators in Oregon and ultimately impact student learning by adopting policies that support the following action steps:

- Adoption of one set of core teacher standards for Oregon based on InTASC that provide a common vision of an effective teacher in Oregon.
- Development of commonly agreed-upon performance indicators and rubrics that differentiate between the stages of a teacher's development, and alignment of measures with the adopted set of standards to guide the assessment and support of teachers at each stage of the continuum.
- Development of common language and evaluative tools used by teacher-preparation programs for field experiences that are understandable by the school districts who partner with multiple programs and that clearly align with the adopted set of standards.
- Alignment of measures used in districts with the adopted set of standards to evaluate teachers once they are employed.
- Encouragement for each teacher-preparation program to establish at least one clinical school site in partnership with a district.
- Support for continued partnerships between teacher-preparation programs and Oregon's New Teacher Mentor program to facilitate communication between those who prepare new teachers and administrators and those who mentor them in their beginning years.
- More judicious use of existing tuition vouchers and stipends to provide more consistent training statewide to prepare teachers to mentor both student teachers and newly employed teachers.
- Development of an annual event sponsored by ODE, TSPC, and Oregon's teacher-preparation programs that focuses on best practices emanating from strong clinical-preparation models and what is known about teacher recruitment, preparation, persistence, and success in impacting PK-12 student learning.
- Implementation of statewide standardized feedback surveys for new teachers and their employers within the first 18 months of employment.
- Support for the creation of a high-quality (valid and reliable) observational assessment of classroom teaching linked to teacher standards.
- Elevation of the status of classroom teachers who are selected and prepared for a leadership role that is analogous to that of physicians working in teaching hospitals.

- Establishment of an Educator Preparation Improvement Fund to promote improvement of the preparation of professional educators for Oregon public schools. This fund will provide resources to TSPC-approved programs to address their most pressing needs. Specifically, we propose that funds be available to help teacher-preparation programs to respond to:
    (1) changes in Oregon PK-12 education, including but not limited to high school diploma requirements and essential skills;
    (2) collaboration around delivery models and clinical partnerships that provide effective professional educator preparation;
    (3) Oregon's educator workforce needs, including recruiting from diverse populations, recruiting in high-need areas, and preparing educators to work in hard-to-staff schools;
    (4) dissemination of research and best practices that address the needs of Oregon's schools;
    (5) focused collaboration around initiatives that support student success and post-secondary achievement;
    (6) efforts to meet national accreditation requirements.

During the past decade the State of Oregon has collaborated across education agencies, school districts, higher education institutions, and non-profit organizations to enhance policy and practice to develop more effective school and district administrators. While we have made great progress, there is much to do. The HB 3619 Task Force requests Legislative assistance to codify and support a comprehensive leadership development system to sustain focus on Oregon's high-needs students.

SECTION 3.1 – Significance of Administrator Professional Development

Educational leadership development for principals and superintendents is essential to developing a high level of continuous improvement in Oregon schools. There is growing evidence that school leadership is a considerable factor in creating positive school outcomes and success, not the least of which is improved student achievement (Grissom & Loeb, 2009; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2003; Seashore Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010).

The Wallace Foundation, with Oregon and over twenty other states, has increased the visibility and importance of a changing role for school and district leaders. Oregon's contribution in this work has been implemented through the Oregon Leadership Network (see below). In the most comprehensive (including Oregon) study done to date, Learning from Leadership: Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning makes a strong case for the role that school and district leaders can play to positively influence student achievement (Seashore Louis, et al., 2010). This work and other research cited above is catalyzing the instructional leadership role of school administrators and moving the policy and practice agenda of leadership development to the center of school improvement and student success.

Oregon has scant state-level data pertaining to the frequency, quality, or effect of system professional development, and no data statewide for understanding of or coherence on district-level professional development for school and district administrators. Indicators and outcome measures relating to principal effectiveness are inadequate to assist practitioners and policy makers in supporting the development of effective school leaders. This proposal seeks to develop the key leverage point for school improvement – the role of school leaders in improving instructional practice and learning for each Oregon student.

SECTION 3.2 – Administrator Preparation in Oregon

Oregon has eight programs that prepare administrators for leadership roles in Oregon's school buildings and districts. Each of these programs has to be approved or accredited by TSPC by showing alignment with the TSPC's adopted standards. The programs must submit annual

reports documenting program operations, variations, and enrollment. Five of these institutions are also nationally accredited by NCATE.

New standards for administrative programs aligned with Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) were adopted by TSPC in 2005, and all administrator-preparation programs were reapproved under the new standards. These new standards also resulted in licensure modifications. The new standards not only align with national standards but reflect current best practice. Additionally, they reflect a stronger focus than the national standards on leadership ethics and cultural competency. Oregon issues an Initial Administrator License and a Continuing Administrator License.

Administrators are required to obtain an Initial Administrative License to practice. The Initial Administrative License (IAL) requires a master's degree, three years of educational experience on a license, and 18 semester or 27 quarter hours of university educational administrator leadership coursework based on the standards. That license may be renewed two times, and by the time of the second renewal, the candidate must have earned the Continuing Administrator License (CAL). All persons on an IAL must show significant progress (6 semester hours or 9 quarter hours) toward completion of the CAL licensure requirements upon each renewal. The standards underlying the Initial Administrator License are focused on administrative leadership primarily at the building level. A person holding an Initial Administrator License may practice school administration at all levels; however, if the person obtains a superintendent position, they must complete their CAL program within three years following their next licensure renewal.

The Continuing Administrator License is also an 18 semester- or 27 quarter-hour university program that is focused on the standards adopted for that license. In addition to the coursework, the CAL requires completion of the Commission's customized educational leadership examination and three years of half-time or more administrative experience on a license appropriate for the assignment. The CAL is focused on broader perspectives than building-level leadership, such as district leadership, policy development, budgets, and community engagement. In earning an IAL or CAL, candidates must complete a documented and supervised practicum (360 hours for the IAL and 216 hours for the CAL).

There are other administrative licenses. Prior to the development of the IAL and CAL, the Basic Administrative and Standard Administrative Licenses were issued. As needs have changed, other licenses and registrations have been developed: the Charter School Administrative Registration (renewable); Emergency Administrator (for very brief temporary measures); Exceptional Administrator (restricted to the applying district and for persons who have a master's degree and significant experience in administration from another field); and Restricted Transitional Administrator Licenses (restricted to the applying district, and only valid for three years, at which time the Initial Administrator License requirements must have been met). These licenses require no administrative coursework; however, the applicant must possess a master's degree to obtain one of these restricted administrative licenses. There are no similar criteria for the charter school administrative registration.

Other licenses include the Distinguished Administrator License for administrators who have obtained a doctorate degree in education administrative leadership; the Transitional Administrator License for persons who have been prepared as an administrator in another state, but have not either completed the coursework or experience sufficient to qualify for an Initial Administrator License in Oregon; and the Transitional Superintendent for applicants prepared in another state and who have more than five years' experience as a superintendent. Both the Transitional Administrator License and the Transitional Superintendent License are only valid for three years, at which time the administrator must qualify for either the Initial Administrator License or the Continuing Administrator License.

SECTION 3.3 – Current Administrator Professional Development Practices

Professional learning for school and district leaders occurs through a variety of approaches that include two statewide organizations, seven administrator-licensure programs and one statewide initiative. Key professional development opportunities are provided through the Confederation of School Administrators (COSA) (http://www.cosa.k12.or.us) and the Oregon School Board Association (OSBA) (http://www.osba.org/)

COSA represents members from more than 200 school districts and ESDs in the state, and has done so for decades. With an average annual membership of more than 2,200 school district administrators, it is the umbrella organization for a number of school administrator organizations. Annual attendance at workshops, trainings, institutes, and conferences is between three and four thousand participants. One- and two-year-long principal and superintendent Leadership Institutes are ongoing, with other trainings in the area of school law, finance, special education, mentoring, assessment, time management, and professional learning communities. Several partnerships with Oregon colleges and universities, ODE, districts, and Oregon Leadership Network benefit the members of COSA.

Founded in 1946, OSBA is governed by a member-elected board and serves PK-12 public school boards, public charter school boards, education service district boards, community college boards and the State Board of Education. Through legislative advocacy at state and federal levels, board leadership training, employee management assistance and policy, and legal and financial services, OSBA helps locally elected volunteers fulfill their complex public education roles by serving school board members and superintendents through an annual statewide conference and a variety of technical assistance formats on school and district policy.

Professional development at the pre-service and in-service levels also occurs through administrator-licensing programs (collectively organized as the Oregon Professors of Educational Administration – ORPEA). ORPEA members seek to continue their ten-year partnership through the co-development of online joint academic offerings for rural administrator licensure candidates. Specifically, ORPEA member institutions provide initial and continuing professional learning through state licensure requirements promulgated through TSPC. The following public and private institutions license and prepare school administrators in

Oregon: Concordia University, George Fox University, Lewis and Clark College, Portland State University, Southern Oregon University, University of Oregon, and University of Portland.

In addition, the Oregon Leadership Network (OLN) (http://oln.educationnorthwest.org/) has convened the above organizations and higher education partners during the past ten years to specifically address educational leadership and equity. Organized in 2000, OLN started as a demonstration project comprising seven school districts. Today, OLN boasts the membership of every major educational organization in the state and 21 member districts that educate nearly half of Oregon's student population and serves approximately half of the state's teachers and administrators. The OLN has operated from 2000-2010 under a grant to the Oregon Department of Education from the Wallace Foundation. The Network continues to operate today on behalf of the member organizations through Education Northwest. The mission of OLN is to strengthen educational leadership to increase equitable outcomes and improve student achievement and success, so that all students will meet or exceed state standards in reading and math. The vision of OLN is that there will be no performance gap between different ethnic or socioeconomic groups. Oregon is the only state in the nation that supports a comprehensive leadership development network with equity at its core.

The Chalkboard Project, an independent non-profit consortium of Oregon foundations working to strengthen education in Oregon, has also recently received a $13.2 million-dollar grant from the US Department of Education to locally design and implement career and compensation reforms for teachers and principals. Six school districts participate in Chalkboard's Creative Leadership Achieves Student Success (CLASS) Project, an initiative that provides school districts with a framework to integrate expanded career paths, effective performance evaluations, relevant professional development, and new compensation models.

SECTION 3.4 – Federal Policy Context

With the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001, the professional development of school and district administrators had no significant policy emphasis. However, this has changed. The Obama Administration has used the existing statutory language in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to give significant priority to the role of educational administrators. Specifically, the Administration has emphasized the role of the principal leadership and effectiveness. The following text articulates the administration's priorities in current funding streams as well as for the reauthorization of ESEA.

> **Effective Teachers and Leaders**
>
> Our proposal will continue and improve formula grants to states and school districts to improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders, and ensure that students in high-need schools are being taught by effective teachers in schools led by effective principals. To help meet these goals, states and districts may choose how to spend funds to meet local needs, as long as they are improving teacher and principal effectiveness and ensuring the equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals. To measure, develop, and improve the effectiveness of their teachers, leaders, and preparation

programs, states and districts will be required to put in place a few specific policies and systems, including:

> Statewide definitions of "effective teacher," "effective principal," "highly effective teacher," and "highly effective principal," developed in collaboration with teachers, principals, and other stakeholders, that are based in significant part on student growth and also include other measures, such as classroom observations of practice. As states transition to using these measures of effectiveness, we will maintain the provisions of current law relating to "Highly Qualified Teachers," but with additional flexibility.
>
> State-level data systems that link information on teacher and principal preparation programs to the job placement, student growth, and retention outcomes of their graduates.
>
> District-level evaluation systems that (i) meaningfully differentiate teachers and principals by effectiveness across at least three performance levels; (ii) are consistent with their state's definitions of "effective" and "highly effective" teacher and principal; (iii) provide meaningful feedback to teachers and principals to improve their practice and inform professional development; and (iv) are developed in collaboration with teachers, principals, and other education stakeholders. (United States Department of Education, 2010)

The strength of Oregon's current work with schools and districts is that the state has generated the capacity for a sustained effort to focus on leadership development, particularly in the context of equitable practice (Larson, Burk, Chamberlain, & Noor, 2008). With the increasing focus on leadership development, the state is positioned well to address emerging federal requirements for enhancing principal effectiveness. In addition, while a great deal of commitment across the system is being sustained, in spite of enormous fiscal challenges, Oregon's educational leaders remain confident that the momentum and passion for enhancing leadership development remains strong.

SECTION 3.5 – Recommendations

The following recommendations will require additional policy consideration and support from the State of Oregon to address the state's priority for school and district leadership development. We recommend that the legislature direct the Oregon Department of Education, in concert with the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, to work in collaboration with key stakeholders in the Oregon Coalition for Quality Teaching & Learning to address the recommendations below.

- Increasing focus will need to be given to cost-effective coordination among key organizations to provide more coherent and concerted efforts to address the needs of high-needs students.

- Public and private partnership will not only be advantageous and cost-effective, but will strengthen the necessary support for schools and districts. This is particularly vital for schools in improvement under NCLB.
- While all administrator-licensure programs have recently met new and challenging standards for approval, continuous improvement of and collaboration among programs will be essential to support pre-service and in-service development of principals and superintendents.
- More support will be needed to move the policy conversation beyond qualifications to effectiveness. This is a result of increasing federal policy pressure on accountability and the role of principal effectiveness in leading teacher effectiveness.
- Examine and increase policy attention to create incentives for the placement of highly effective teachers and principals to the highest-need schools.
- Create and financially support a comprehensive leadership-development effort to sustain focus on the highest-needs students, with greater attention to improvement of instructional practice to address the needs of students from all cultures.
- Create a comprehensive leadership-development system to sustain focus on high-needs students. This initiative will coordinate education stakeholders, provide ongoing partnership across administrator-licensure programs, and provide research and technical assistance to enhance evidence-based practices and improve instructional and organizational leadership in schools.

SECTION 4.1 – Introduction

Educator licensure is considered a means to an end. It is a policy device that sets the standards for entry and continued practice in the profession with the hope that teacher and principal quality are affected. Accreditation and program approval are also means for improving the standards for entry and continuation in the field and are often driven by licensure requirements and standards. Licensure, program approval, and accreditation have one intended outcome: excellence in student achievement. Therefore, it seems natural to examine licensure, accreditation, and preparation practices, and their effect on educator effectiveness. However, this review is fraught with challenges given the complexity of teaching and learning and the associated variables.

Discussions of educator licensing requirements and related standards have been shaped by the enduring differences in American society about the purpose of education, the role of schools in our society, what our hopes are for children, and who we can trust with the education of our children. Therefore, licensure and its concomitant requirements should be reviewed in the policy context in which it operates, with consideration of all variables and conflicting perspectives.

Educational licensure, as well as other professional licensure, is offered as a mechanism to provide the public with reassurance that certain standards have been met for entry into the profession and sustained or enhanced in order to remain licensed in the profession. However, licensure alone was never intended to represent a guarantee of quality; rather, it was intended to represent that the licensee is ready for the job market based on an assessment of initial skills and abilities. Of course, the biggest challenge for all professions is the ability or failure to develop valid and reliable performance assessments for entry into the profession. As a result, minimum standards for entry into many professions are a culmination of coursework, standardized testing, and some level of preliminary experience.

Measures of educator effectiveness are plagued with reliability and validity issues, so debates rage on about the definitions of effective teaching and administering and how they should be measured. The entanglement of the previously mentioned enduring dilemmas with the values and perceptions in the political arena has hampered progress in defining a clearer path toward measuring educational practice and reform. Moreover, teaching and learning are fundamentally very complex processes, and educational fads, individual and organizational interests and ambitions, and venture philanthropists and publishers have added to the confusion by offering panacea-like solutions which frequently contribute little or nothing to the knowledge base in education. The Gates Foundation's abandonment of its small-schools initiative is an example of venture philanthropy that did not meet anticipated expectations. However, while launched with great gusto, it did succeed in distracting participants from investing in solutions for the core problem the initiative sought to solve: the large percentage of urban students who fail to graduate from high school with a diploma. In part due to these

distractions and the complexity of measurement, there is a tendency to simplify measuring effectiveness to the results of a test given to a group of students on a particular day, which is probably not a comprehensive, valid, and reliable measure of student achievement, let alone educator effectiveness.

Therefore, it is not surprising that studies examining the relationship of qualifications such as licensure to teacher effectiveness also seem to contribute to the polarity of rhetoric on this issue among policy makers and practitioners. A review of the research is not conclusive; it reflects the ideological polarity of contemporary American society. According to Miller and Chait (2008), "Most evidence about the relationship between teacher qualifications and student achievement has to be taken with a grain of salt for two reasons. First, researchers don't know what they don't know. This tautology raises its head in the form of unobserved differences between groups of students assigned to different teachers. For example, administrative data from schools typically lack measures of parental education, which is strongly associated with student achievement." Just as some studies fail to include certain factors, some studies focus only on one factor of teacher qualification such as teacher licensure testing, a particular characteristic of a teacher preparation program, the attainment of an advanced degree or National Board Certification, etc. These variables are frequently correlated to student achievement as measured by standardized tests. Many of these studies also conclude with a call for more research on the issue. In summation and when viewed comprehensively, there is limited direction to be found in the literature about the linkages between licensing practices and teacher effectiveness. According to Cochran-Smith and Zeichner, "The research on certification is limited, but the weight of the evidence generally favors certification over noncertification or undercertification as measured by student achievement." Their conclusion is not a resounding endorsement for licensure qualifications and their correlation to improved student performance, but it offers some guidance.

Accreditation and program approval are designed to enhance the quality of preparation and hopefully have a positive influence on student achievement. Studies regarding accreditation as an indicator of quality are also limited in number and have conflicting conclusions. One study (Gitomer et al.) indicated that students enrolled at NCATE-approved programs passed their respective PRAXIS II tests at a higher rate than students enrolled in non-NCATE-accredited institutions. Darling-Hammond (2010) also found in states with higher percentages of NCATE institutions that teachers were fully certified more frequently. Conversely, Tamir and Wilson (2005) suggest that the lack of credible research on accreditation makes it impossible to proffer empirically based claims about the value added by such processes.

While the research does not clearly establish a direction for policy beyond it being better to license than not to license, there are some promising practices that are supported by professional associations, practitioners, and other stakeholders worthy of consideration. While lacking a research base, program approval and accreditation within the state does prompt professional interaction among practitioners, preparation programs, and the licensing agency that should be beneficial to the exchange of ideas and information and general improvement. So, what might an Oregon policy-maker consider when examining how licensure practices might promote greater teacher effectiveness or how accreditation might prompt improved

teacher preparation? A partial answer rests in examining the strengths and weaknesses in our current Oregon licensure and accreditation system, a review of some promising practices in the field, and a general consideration for principles of good practice, such as the use of multiple measures when considering teacher effectiveness or student achievement.

The Oregon educator licensure system and program accreditation are administered by the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission which currently issues four kinds of licenses: basic and standard; and, post-1998, the initial and continuing licenses. These license types transcend the various areas of educational practice (counselors, teachers, administrators, etc.) and the disciplines (math, language arts, science, etc.).

SECTION 4.2 – Selected Strengths of the Current Oregon Educator Licensure and Accreditation Requirements

General

1. There is an independent licensing board (TSPC) that is composed of a coalition of professional stakeholders (teachers, administrators, higher education, the public, etc.).
2. License fees cover costs of TSPC operation that include licensure, program quality through accreditation, and educator professional practices.
3. Provisions exist for earning a teaching license through traditional and alternative approaches.
4. Annual reports and periodic site visits are required of each approved educator-preparation program.

Pre-service (Preparation prior to licensure)

5. Minimal standards are assured through testing of general and discipline-specific knowledge and professional ethics.
6. All student teachers must complete a Teacher Work Sample, minimally ten lessons over two weeks, that includes pre- and post-assessment, an analysis of learning results, and reporting responsibilities. Two of these work samples must be completed successfully before program completion.
7. The clinical practice (student teaching) requirement is full-time or the equivalent for a minimum of 15 weeks.
8. Initial practice can be completed at the undergraduate or graduate levels.
9. Administrators must have a master's degree to get an administrative license.

In-service (First few years of practice)

10. Administrators must complete a program of continuing licensure that focuses on district-level leadership concerns.
11. Teachers must complete coursework to move from initial licensure to next stage licensure (either Initial II or Continuing Teaching License).
12. Teachers with Initial II and Continuing licenses must complete professional development units in order to renew.

SECTION 4.3 – Selected Weaknesses of the Current Oregon Educator Licensure and Accreditation Requirements

General

1. Site visits are fairly infrequent, and the associated standards currently lack the specificity regarding a standard and agreed-upon measurement of quality. (However, program standards are currently under review with these issues at the forefront of policy discussions.)

Pre-service (Preparation prior to licensure)

2. Educator-preparation programs vary in quality within and outside Oregon.

In-service (First few years of practice)

3. A mentoring program serving all newly licensed and employed educators is not required or supported by the state.
4. There is minimal support in programming and budget to encourage teachers to acquire national certification from the National Board for Teacher Professional Standards.

SECTION 4.4 – Recommendations

What are some promising best practices that have professional support, while recognizing that they lack unequivocal research foundations? There is considerable support for the mentoring of beginning professionals, and some evidence that a positive influence on the first few years of teaching can improve teacher effectiveness and student learning. Additionally, evidence suggests that mentoring improves retention in the first five years of practice. There is also some evidence and general professional support for certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Teacher leadership is also an important and timely topic in the field. Teacher leadership provides a professional opportunity for career advancement without entering into school administration while expanding the leadership core in the profession. Accrediting bodies are changing their practices and making more frequent visits and/or creating different and more meaningful reporting opportunities. The current licensing and accreditation requirements could be restructured to incorporate certain aspects of these practices.

Required Mentoring During the First and Second Year of Practice

With fiscal support, every newly licensed teacher could be entitled to a total of 10 release days during the Initial I licensure period in order to participate in the mentoring program. Work samples, rounds, and dossier assemblage could also become a routine aspect of the requirements for licensure renewal. Mentors could use their experiences with their mentees as part of their Continuing Professional Development (CPD) program along with other CPD-approved experiences. The mentor program could be embedded in higher-education

coursework, and partnerships between higher-education institutions and PK-12 schools could flourish around mentoring.

Forming New Teacher Leaders

TSPC could provide for a voluntary advanced license in leadership for teachers with master 's degrees who complete an advanced teacher-leadership program of 18 semester hours or 24 quarter hours. Such programs would include coursework focused on leadership theory, mentoring, assessment and measurement, change theory, research, law and ethics, curriculum specializations, etc., but it would also include a substantive leadership practicum with work-based projects such as teaching rounds, GLAD, SIOP, etc.

National Boards for Professional Teaching Standards

Several states have adopted supportive programs that assist teachers in achieving national certification through a rigorous review process. Like Washington, Oregon could enhance the educator workforce by paying teachers' expenses to attain certification and reward teachers for achieving certification. The NBPTS is also developing a principal certification program.

Accreditation Changes

National accreditation for teacher education is in the process of restructuring. Oregon's Teacher and Standards program review standards in administrative rule have been under review for the past year. This review also allows for incorporation of the newly re-defined InTASC standards. Collecting all the standards for which programs are accountable under one administrative law division would reduce confusion, clarify expectations, and serve to equalize quality among preparation programs. Rubrics that describe the levels of quality (such as "unacceptable", "acceptable", "target", as opposed to "met" or "unmet") would also increase clarity about quality-related requirements. Increasing the frequency of on-site visits would help hold programs accountable to the standards. TSPC has initiated these changes and hopefully they will be completed by May 2011. Again, while the effects of accreditation on PK-12 student achievement are not clear, it seems logical to be clear about expectations and call programs to meet best-practice targets which may have stronger linkages to student achievement.

SECTION 4.5 – Conclusion

Redesigning educator licensure and accreditation practices has long been viewed as an endeavor that will improve America's schools, and doing so has been the focus of many a research or political agenda. Empirical results demonstrating the effects are sparse and riddled with methodological problems, seriously limiting the value of the conclusions. While there is some linkage between teacher qualifications and student achievement, other variables with greater effect are often cited as more critical. One could ask, should reform energy only be spent on research-proven directions? If that posture were adopted, paralysis would prevail. Therefore, moral imperatives call for action. We cannot continue to allow our schools to be successful for only some students. Since teacher quality is a major variable in student outcomes, adjusting licensure and accreditation requirements and practices that are related to increasing teacher quality seems a worthy direction even though there is limited empirical

evidence. Any such actions should be coupled with an evaluation effort designed to contribute to the professional knowledge.

SECTION 5.1 – Introduction

There clearly is increasing interest in linking educators and educator-preparation programs to student learning. It is easy to gather and analyze student learning data, and claim that student learning data analysis demonstrates the impact of a single factor, such as a teacher, on student learning. Unfortunately, both the data and its analysis are frequently over-interpreted through inattention to complexity or the desire to arrive at a predetermined conclusion. This report opens by drawing attention to the complications in the assessment, analysis, and application of student achievement data to educator effectiveness. We then summarize current applications of student learning data in the nation, in other states, in Oregon, and in a sample of other countries. We close by providing some policy recommendations.

SECTION 5.2 – Distinct Steps in Assessing, Analyzing, and Applying Student Achievement Data

A common complication in considering student achievement data is that the distinct steps of this process are considered as if they are necessarily linked into a single entity. The following table illustrates these independent steps:

STEP 1	PRODUCES	STEP 2	STEP 3	PRODUCES	STEP 4
Assess Student Achievement	Assessment Data	Provide Access to Assessment Data	Analyze Assessment Data	Differences in Student Achievement on the Assessment	Apply Results of Analysis of Student Achievement

Unfortunately, these distinct steps are not always considered as separable. This is clearly illustrated by the fear that, because Value-Added Modeling (an analysis method) is most often based on achievement data garnered from high-stakes standardized tests (an assessment method), the use of VAMs may increase the pressure to perform on current tests, and to teach to them (Braun, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Harris, 2009; Working Group on Teacher Quality, 2007). VAM methods are being used primarily to address the shortcomings of the standardized testing assessments (Baker, Barton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, Ladd, Linn, Ravitch, Rothstein, Shavelson, & Shepard, 2010), but this is not the only way they could be used. Separating the analysis method from the assessment method permits separate evaluation of the contributions of each of them to the outcome.

Methods of Assessment

Step #1, the assessment of student achievement, often involves standardized multiple-choice tests. These tests can have unintended negative consequences that threaten students, teachers, and the validity of the tests (Nichols & Berliner, 2007**;** Jones, Jones, & Hargrove, 2003; Perlstein, 2010; Ravitch, 2010):

- Such tests often
  - fail to address the content or skills the students were to master
  - tend to focus on a small number of subjects and skills
  - are constructed in a variety of ways
  - are administered on a variety of timelines
    (Baker, et al., 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Koretz, 2008, 2010; McCaffrey, et al., 2003; Ravitch, 2010; Rivkin, 2007; Toch & Rothman, 2008);
- Some fields or grade/instructional levels lack a standardized test, which prevents evaluating those who teach in the untested areas;
- Measuring student growth is diminished when tests in consecutive years are not related to each other (Baker, et al., 2010) – some states have aligned their tests (Goldhaber, et al., 2004);
- Small pools of scores can lead to sampling errors (McCaffrey, et al. 2003; Rivkin, 2007; Stewart, 2006).

Nevertheless, carefully employed standardized tests have been used to gauge impacts on student learning by National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certified teachers (Goldhaber, et al, 2004), and standards-based teacher performance scores (Milanowski, et al., 2004). Other student-learning assessment devices from portfolios to on-line adaptive tests are currently under development.

Methods of Analysis

At step #3 the raw data generated by any assessment methods may be analyzed by status, gain, cohort or value-added methods. The simplest analysis examines the student's status via the score on one test at one point in time. Gain analysis compares the student's score before instruction to the score after instruction, and the difference taken as a measure of student learning. One variant of gain analysis is cohort-to-cohort gain, which compares students in a grade to prior years' students in the same grade. This is applied in No Child Left Behind legislation, which specifies states that receive Title I funds must hold schools accountable for "adequate yearly progress" (McCaffrey, et al., 2003).

Value-added modeling is a variation on a gain or growth model that is growing in popularity. VAM is both a promising analytical method and a cautionary tale about using any analytical method with its limitations and its strengths in mind. VAM is best used with several years of student data for all grades and subject areas (McCaffrey, et al., 2003; Noell & Burns, 2006;

Sanders, 2006; Stewart, 2006; Toch & Rothman, 2008; Working Group on Teacher Quality, 2007). VAM use necessitates scaling of tests with the same achievement growth units across tests, grades, and levels of achievement (Braun, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Harris, 1999; McCaffrey, et al. 2003; Sanders, 2006). In an interesting example of applying defects in assessments to critique the analysis method, some testing experts have concluded that VAMs may be less reliable than some status or cohort models (Baker, et al., 2010), not due to shortcomings in VAMs, but due to the weaknesses of many current testing systems.

All data analysis methods are complicated by unavoidable factors that confound determining the impact of any single factor on student achievement. One major technical issue in student achievement data collection and analysis is the non-random assignment of students and teachers. (Braun, 2005; Harris, 2009; Rivkin, 2007; Working Group on Teacher Quality, 2007). Nonrandom assignment impacts the analysis methods, but VAMs are most heavily criticized for this defect, since they were designed for agricultural applications with random assignment (Braun, 2005). Second, as with all of the analysis methods, VAMs also assume that all teachers are effective with all types of students (Harris, 2009).

Properly designed VAMs compare matched sets of student populations to minimize factors beyond the classroom teacher that impact student achievement growth, such as socioeconomics, school resources, staff relationships, peer interactions, and classroom climate (Braun, 2005; Harris, 2009; McCaffrey, et al., 2003; Reardon & Raudenbush, 2008; Rivkin, 2007; Stewart, 2006; Working Group on Teacher Quality, 2007). Improperly designed VAMs are no more useful than any other analysis method. Some recommend school-level rather than teacher-level evaluations with VAMs, citing competition between teachers and the inability of tests to make causal attributions about individual teachers (Harris, 2009; Stewart, 2006).

When considering VAM or any other analysis method in any context, not just education or student achievement, it is essential to ask "relative to what alternative?". A recent National Academies of Sciences workshop summarized the hazards and utility of VAM:

> Although none of the workshop participants argued against the possible utility of value-added modeling, there was a range of perspectives about its appropriate uses…. The most conservative perspective…was that the models have more problems than current status measures and are appropriate only for low-stakes purposes, such as research. Others felt that the models would provide additional relevant information about school, teacher, or program effectiveness and could be employed in combination with other indicators. For example, many suggested that they could be useful in conjunction with status models to identify high and low performers. Still others argued that while the models have flaws, they represent an improvement compared with current practices – namely, status models for determining school achievement under No Child Left Behind or credential-based promotion and rewards for teachers. (Braun, et al., 2010, p. 66)

VAMs provide reliable, useful research data analysis, and properly employed VAMs improve on current methods of analyzing the impact of schools or teachers on student achievement. And

we emphasize again: applying any analysis method, VAM included, to poorly generated data is analogous to painting over rust.

Various Applications

Completing the stepwise analysis of the process, the results of any combination of assessment device and analysis method may be applied at step #4 to evaluate a single teacher at one point in time, or a teacher over multiple years, or a subset of teachers within a school, or an entire school (or some other application). Choices in assessment methods, analysis methods, and database construction do not constrain the uses of the information. High-stakes assessments tend to follow Campbell's law, which states that "the more any quantitative social indicator is used for social decision-making, the more apt it will be to corrupt the social processes it is intended to monitor" (Koretz, 2008, p. 237), as has been seen with airline on-time arrival data, surgery success statistics, and standardized testing in schools. No data analysis method is immune from this tendency.

As with any assessment method and any analysis method, selection of high-stakes or low-stakes applications must result from informed deliberations. Noell and Burns (2006), important developers of Louisiana's VAM system (more below), call high-stakes applications "the most salient policy issue" related to the use of VAMs:

> If it is a low-stakes formative assessment that is used to generate ideas about what may or may not be,…the risks appear to be minimal…. However, the reality is that there will be a natural pull toward a high-stakes, publicly visible reporting in which the potential for harm because of model misspecification, using the data to advance agendas they do not address or simply using the data to create another educational whipping boy is real…. [C]onsiderable care will need to be devoted to…the system that strengthens teacher preparation. (p. 48-49)

Clearly, the use of any assessment method or any analytical method must proceed with an appreciation for what they can and cannot do (McCaffrey, et al., 2003), and for the results of their use in particular applications. This caution should be kept in mind when considering the following survey of the situation in the nation, other states, a few foreign countries, and Oregon.

SECTION 5.3 – National, State, International, and Oregon Developments in Student Achievement Data Use

Application of Student Achievement Data across the Nation

Linking student achievement data to teachers, and teacher-education programs, is becoming a national priority. This is because the standardized testing that is mandated in all states (Working Group on Teacher Quality, 2007) and the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 requires states to match individual student

data to individual teachers (Chait & Miller, 2010). All states will build longitudinal data systems by 2011 (Data Quality Campaign [DQC], 2010a, 2010b). Also, the Race to the Top legislation includes funds to build such data systems, stipulates that states create teacher evaluation and professional development systems that employ data on student achievement growth, and link this growth to individual teachers and teacher-preparation programs (Noell & Kowalski, 2010; Learning Point Associates, 2010).

Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act seeks the same reforms as in the Race to the Top, and so relies on statewide longitudinal data systems to inform state teacher-quality efforts. In September 2010, Teacher Incentive Fund grants were awarded to 62 districts in 27 states. "The administration hopes to pour more than $1 billion into testing educator performance pay in the next five years. . . . But researchers have found that the teachers who elicit the greatest gains from students vary in teaching styles, and measuring what constitutes effective teaching is fraught with controversy. High test scores aren't a valid indicator of the best teacher, for example, since parents' education and income levels play a huge role in how students perform on tests" (Hammond, 2010). The results of reforms that include student achievement data will be monitored nationwide.

Application of Student Achievement Data in Other States

Longitudinal data systems are relatively new, so few states have used data for evaluation. Only five states are engaged in tying student achievement data to specific educator-preparation programs. Louisiana and Florida currently use student achievement data to evaluate teacher-preparation programs, and Texas may do so soon (Crowe, 2010; Vandal & Thompson, 2009). In Ohio five longitudinal projects use student achievement data to study the elements of teacher preparation that contribute most to student achievement (Vandal & Thompson, 2009), and in Wisconsin VAM student achievement analysis and district goals and assessments track progress on proficiency standards (Vandal & Thompson, 2009).

Ohio also uses value-added analysis of student gain scores as one component of rating elementary and middle schools (not individual teachers), and some states and districts use student achievement data in merit or other pay adjustments (Braun, et al., 2010). Achievement data in New York City schools trigger a visit by trained evaluators to help determine why a particular school's test scores are low and perhaps lead to a plan for school improvement (Braun, et al., 2010). These authors also discuss Colorado's Growth Model, which resembles a value-added modeling method by producing growth predictions for individual students, along with status measures to provide a more complete picture of a school's situation.

With respect to teacher and/or administrator evaluation, three states' laws provide for optional use of student achievement data (and other measurements), and at least seven other states require student achievement data be some part of the evaluations. The Education Commission of the States (2010) and Zinth (2010) summarize state legislation since 2000 on using student achievement data in evaluating educators. Most states specify teacher evaluation by multiple measures including student achievement data, and some dictate the weighting of student achievement data in an evaluation. Though only four states—California, Colorado, Illinois, and

New York—in addition to Tennessee and Louisiana (below) legislate VAM data analysis, VAM is used in hundreds of districts across the country (Dillon, 2010).

Tennessee and Louisiana are the states most cited for VAM use. Tennessee's Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS), in use since 1992, is the oldest system (Stewart, 2006) and is the model for some other states. Built on Dr. William Sanders' Educational Value-Added Assessment System (EVASS) model, it produces scores showing teacher effects as the differences between their own students' gains and district average gains (Braun, 2005). Unfortunately, EVASS makes the controversial assumption that comparison to district average gains is an adequate proxy for comparing one teacher's students to a truly matched student population, and so fails to maximize the use of VAM (Braun, 2005).

Louisiana is the first state to use VAM as one component of its link of student achievement to teacher effectiveness and on to teacher-preparation program effectiveness. Louisiana compares the achievement of students of new teachers (less than 3 years' experience) to that of experienced teachers (3 or more years'). This system predicts student achievement based on "prior achievement, demographics, and attendance" before assessing achievement with the above tests and finally producing "effect estimates" which provide achievement comparisons (Noell & Burns, n.d., p. 2). By including student characteristics, Louisiana's system uses the strengths of VAMs and so differs from other states' EVASS.

Application of Student Achievement Data in Other Countries

There is a key difference between the teaching conditions abroad and in the U.S. A substantial part of the work week for teachers in many countries is given to student data analysis and collaboration with colleagues on instruction. "In most European and Asian countries, less than half of a teacher's working time is spent instructing students. . . . The rest—generally about 15 to 20 hours per week—is spent on tasks related to teaching, such as working with colleagues on preparing and analyzing lessons, developing and evaluating assessments. . . . By contrast, U.S. teachers generally have 3-5 hours each week" (Chung Wei, Andree, & Darling-Hammond, 2009, p. 29-30).

Singapore, often a worldwide model for high achievement, invests in education at the "front end" by recruiting high-quality teacher candidates and by developing good initial and continuing training; additionally, new teachers are mentored by master teachers for several years (Stewart, 2010). Teachers are evaluated "annually by a number of people and on multiple measures, including their contribution to the academic and character development of all students in their charge, their collaboration with parents and community groups, and their contributions to their colleagues and the school as a whole" (Stewart, 2010, p. 86).

Finland, another high-performing education system, does not depend on high-stakes testing, though "the government does do periodic sample testing of students to make certain the students, their schools, and the system continue to perform highly . . . but the government refuses to publish the test results for the press or public" (Bassett, 2008, p. 9-10). Like Singapore, Finland invests much of its energy in teacher recruitment and training, but they also

mandate early and heavy intervention if any student shows signs of lagging behind based on diagnostic (not high-stakes) testing (Bassett, 2008).

Application of Student Achievement Data in Oregon

In Oregon, the Oregon DATA (Direct Access to Achievement) Project, administered by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) with support from Oregon's Education Enterprise Steering Committee (EESC), secured a 3-year, $4.7-million grant to improve Oregon's longitudinal data system, access to the data, and training on how to use it (ODE, 2007). Educator professional development includes how to use data to improve learning at the district, school, and classroom (ODE, 2009; DQC, n.d., 2010b); through the Oregon DATA Project, a comprehensive training program was developed to increase educator assessment literacy and to assist school and district leaders in creating a culture of data.

A federal Statewide Longitudinal Data System grant has enabled ODE to partner with seven universities to develop both a single K-16 student identifier and pre-service training modules (DQC, n.d.). ODE is working collaboratively with educator-preparation programs to incorporate their material into university courses.

Additionally, the nonprofit Chalkboard Project has a four-year-old CLASS Project to improve student achievement in a few Oregon school districts, all of which involve multiple measures of teacher effectiveness. Very recently, they announced a $13-million federal grant (McMinnville received an additional $6 million itself) to expand the CLASS Project into seven school districts (CLASS project, n.d.)

SECTION 5.4 – Conclusion

The collection and use of student achievement data, and in particular its application to the evaluation of teachers, schools, and teacher-education institutions, is proceeding along similar lines in all 50 states. The scores from standardized achievement tests are being gathered into longitudinal data systems which allow comparisons by student, teacher, and school across multiple years. These systems facilitate the use of VAM analysis of student data. Some claim VAM can meet the demands of student achievement growth models, avoid overly simple pre-post designs, and correct for some of the problems in using single, unweighted standardized test scores. It seems reasonable to conclude that this treatment and use of student achievement data will be in the future educational landscape, and so must be taken into account in any proposal on the topic of teacher or teacher-education institution evaluation. That being said, other methods of analysis or use of data, possibly those used internationally, should also be considered.

SECTION 5.5 – Recommendations

Given the limitations of and concerns about standardized test scores and VAM, and the idea that high-stakes decisions ought not be based on a single score (Heubert & Hauser, 1999, quoted in Ravitch, 2010; Koretz, 2008), student achievement data should form only part of a comprehensive system of educator evaluation and educator-preparation program evaluation. Systems should be built not only for identification or accountability, or to work in a punitive fashion, but should instead be designed to facilitate educator and educator-preparation program improvement (Baker, et al., 2010; Braun, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2010), and they should include data drawn from a variety of assessment sources, not limited to standardized test scores. District demographic information and other data relevant to educator placement should also be included so as to present as informative a picture as possible for teacher-education program evaluation purposes.

Further work is needed to determine how best to evaluate educator effectiveness and how this should contribute to the analysis and development of educator-preparation programs. Methods of assessing student achievement and educator and preparation-program effectiveness should be examined with the goals of improving upon the use of student achievement data as provided by standardized test scores, applying assessments across all grades and subject areas, and including locally designed and formative assessments. Comprehensive educator-evaluation systems can include observations by multiple trained evaluators utilizing standardized rubrics, peer review, teacher interviews, and district evaluation teams. Sources of evidence can include portfolios of lessons and assignments, self-assessments, examples of student work, analyses of students and of school and classroom context, and surveys of students, parents and administrators. Tracking of educator persistence and of local decision-making control for administrators are also recommended (Baker et al., 2010; Braun, 2005; Chait & Miller, 2010; Crowe, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Noell & Kowalski, 2010; Rivkin, 2007; Toch & Rothman, 2008). National trends in educator-preparation analysis and evaluation should be examined and assessed for relevance to Oregon. Examples provided of evaluation systems include the Teacher Advancement Program, Connecticut's Beginning Educator Support and Training Program, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, among others (Toch & Rothman, 2008). It should be noted here that both the Tennessee and Louisiana VAMs are parts of multifaceted teacher-evaluation systems (Learning Point Associates, 2010).

Study of VAM implementation has drawn out the fact that data, even if available, may be used in inappropriate ways, and may not be used much at all by administrators and teachers, leading to unintended negative consequences. This suggests that further study of any methods of assessing student achievement and tying it to educator-preparation program analysis and evaluation should consider the limitations of such methods and the negative consequences of high-stakes applications of them. This also suggests, as McCaffrey and Hamilton (2007) put it, "that providing educators with assistance to help them understand and use the data is likely to be one of the primary challenges associated with adopting such systems" (p. xviii). Thus,

effective evaluation systems must include provisions for access to the data and for training on its use (Data Quality Campaign, n.d.; Noell & Burns, n.d.; Stewart, 2006; Working Group on Teacher Quality, 2007). Clear guidelines for correct and valid use of data could also avoid unintended negative consequences (Baker, et al., 2010).

Summary of Recommendations for Student Achievement Data Use in Analysis of Teacher Preparation Programs

- Develop a database for use in the analysis of teacher-preparation program effectiveness, including information on:
    1) placement of all newly hired educators;
    2) longevity of educator placements;
    3) the nature of placements, including teaching assignments relative to licensure and certification, and district demographics; and
    4) educator and employer satisfaction with educator preparation.

  Upon completion of the second recommendation (immediately below), include student achievement data in the analysis of educator-preparation program effectiveness, with the condition that "student achievement" is assessed by multiple measures and not limited to standardized test scores.

- Conduct an in-depth study of the use of student achievement data in the analysis of teacher-preparation programs so as to determine how best to evaluate educator effectiveness and contribute to the analysis and development of such programs. This study should:
    1) examine national trends in educator-preparation analysis and evaluation;
    2) evaluate methods of assessing student achievement and educator and educator-preparation program effectiveness which improve upon the use of student achievement data as provided by standardized test scores, which can be applied across all grades and subject areas, and which may include locally designed and formative assessments;
    3) describe the limitations of any methods of assessment and analysis;
    4) address the negative consequences of high-stakes applications of such methods; and
    5) investigate how such achievement data may best be used, not in a punitive fashion, but rather to facilitate improved educator effectiveness.

- Concurrent with the development of the database, develop systems for regular access to data and for training in its use for educators, including those in higher education, particularly in educator-preparation programs.

SECTION 6.0 – Summary of Recommendations

The tables below list the recommendations of the Task Force. The Task Force found many ways Oregon can improve the preparation and professional development of educators without spending more money. In those cases we identified policies or practices of agencies or organizations that could be changed. In cases where additional funding is necessary, we identify the legislature along with the agency that must follow through with the recommendation.

Teacher Preparation and Professional Development

Recommendations	Comments, costs, and next steps
TSPC: Adoption of one set of core teacher standards for Oregon based on updated InTASC standards that provide a common vision of an effective teacher in Oregon, leading to the development of commonly agreed-upon performance indicators and rubrics aligned with one set of standards that differentiate between the stages of a teacher's development and that can guide the assessment and support of teachers. The process could result in alignment of measures used by teacher-preparation programs to guide and assess teacher candidates, measures used by districts to evaluate teachers once they are employed, and measures used to document teachers' professional development.	TSPC to adopt InTASC standards. No cost. Requires convening of the Oregon Coalition on Quality Teaching and Learning to develop agreed-upon documents and to guide implementation for incorporation into ongoing professional development after licensure
TSPC/Legislature: Develop an annual event that focuses on best practices emanating from shared responsibility for clinical-preparation models across the continuum of professional development, focusing on what is known about teacher recruitment, preparation, persistence, and success in impacting PK-12 student learning.	$10,000 (recover costs through conference admission)
Legislature: Create an Educator Preparation Improvement Fund in order to advance university and district partnerships that respond to: (1) changes in Oregon PK-12 education; (2) collaboration around delivery models that provide effective professional preparation; (3) Oregon's educator workforce needs, including recruiting individuals into high-need areas and individuals from diverse backgrounds; (4) dissemination of research and best practices that address the needs of Oregon's schools; (5) focused collaboration around initiatives that support student success and post-secondary achievement; and (6) efforts to meet national accreditation requirements	$500,000 annual budget to ODE in partnership with TSPC to distribute through an RFP process.

Administrator Preparation and Professional Development

Recommendations	Comments, costs, and next steps
Create a comprehensive leadership development system to support all Oregon students with a focus on Oregon's highest need students. This initiative will provide research, technical assistance to enhance evidence-based practices, and strengthen diversity and human capital capacity for the improvement of instructional and organizational leadership in schools. This system will include, but not be limited to, the following research-based strategies: 1. Developing a plan for cost-effective coordination among key public and private organizations to provide more coherent and concerted capacity-building and technical assistance to address the needs of high-needs students; 2. Designing continuous improvement of and collaboration among administrator-licensure programs to support pre-service and in-service development of principals and superintendents, with a focus on the recruitment and success of minority candidates and those candidates who work in rural school districts; 3. Disseminating evidence-based practices to support the development of effective principals and teachers; 4. Providing research and technical assistance to districts for the placement of highly effective teachers and principals in the highest-need schools.	Cost $5,000,000 annual to ODE in partnership with TSPC, divided as follows: — Will seek private sector funding match of $2.5 million/annual — The HB 3619 Task Force should map the system and look for ways to make the system more coherent and cost-effective, Cost Share $500,000 — Monitor provider progress in meeting the new TSPC standards and continue to look for ways to improve programs, particularly for minority and rural candidates, $1,000,000 — Convene key stakeholders to examine and disseminate evidence-based practices in support of developing effective principals and teachers, $1,000,000 — Convene key stakeholders to examine R&D needs.

Licensure

Recommendations	Comments, Costs and next steps
Legislature: Fully fund the mentor teacher program	$10 million annual
TSPC: Create a voluntary advanced leadership endorsement for educators engaging in mentoring, induction, instructional leadership and school improvement	TSPC to develop a new endorsement for teacher leadership. No additional costs
Legislature/TSPC: Encourage teachers to pursue National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification	$2 million annual state funding to support preparation for teachers pursuing NBPTS certification and bonus money for successful applicants (fund established at TSPC)
TSPC: Incorporate national accreditation standards and InTASC standards into Division 17 and develop rubrics for those standards	Limited costs to TSPC. Implementation costs for teacher-preparation institutions

Data Use in Analysis of Teacher Preparation

Recommendations	Comments, Costs and next steps
Develop a database for use in the analysis of teacher-preparation program effectiveness, including information on 1) placement of all newly hired educators, 2) longevity of educator placements, 3) the nature of placements, including teaching assignments relative to licensure and certification, and district demographics, and 4) educator and employer satisfaction with educator preparation. Upon completion of the second recommendation (immediately below), include student achievement data in the analysis of educator-preparation program effectiveness, with the condition that "student achievement" is assessed by multiple measures and not limited to standardized test scores	$90,000 annual budget for research and staffing
Conduct an in-depth study of the use of student achievement data in the analysis of teacher preparation programs so as to determine how best to evaluate educator effectiveness and contribute to the analysis and development of such programs. This study should 1) examine national trends in educator-preparation analysis and evaluation, 2) evaluate methods of assessing student achievement and educator and educator-preparation program effectiveness which improve upon the use of student achievement data as provided by standardized test scores, which can be applied across grades and subject areas, and which may include formative and locally designed assessments, 3) describe the limitations of any methods of assessment and analysis, 4) address the negative consequences of high-stakes applications of such methods, and 5) investigate how such achievement data may best be used, not in a punitive fashion, but rather to facilitate improved educator effectiveness	$250,000 annual budget for research and staffing; validation of results
Concurrent with the development of the database, develop systems for regular access to data and for training in its use for educators, including those in higher education, particularly in educator-preparation programs	Cost to be estimated once scope of database known

APPENDIX A – Oregon Approved Teacher Education Institutions

Concordia University ** 2811 NE Holman St. Portland, OR 97211 TEL 503-493-6231 www.cu-portland.edu	**Marylhurst University** 17600 Pacific Highway Marylhurst, OR 97036-0261 TEL 503-636-8141, ext 3334 www.marylhurst.edu/education	**University of Phoenix *** 13221 SW 68th Parkway, Suite 500 Tigard, OR 97223 TEL 503-495-2028
Corban University 5000 Deer Park Drive SE Salem, OR 97301-9392 TEL 503-375-7020 www.corban.edu/academics/education/	**NW Christian University** 828 E. 11th Avenue Eugene, OR 97401-3727 TEL 541-684-7279 www.nwcc.edu	**University of Portland * **** 5000 N. Willamette Blvd. Portland, OR 97203-5798 TEL 503-943-7135 www.up.edu
Eastern Oregon University One University Boulevard La Grande, OR 97850-2899 TEL 541-962-3772 www.eou.edu/ed/	**Oregon State University *** Education Hall 210 Corvallis, OR 97331-3502 TEL 541-737-4661 http://oregonstate.edu/education	**Warner Pacific College** 2219 SE 68th Avenue Portland, OR 97215-4099 TEL 503-517-1052 www.warnerpacific.edu
George Fox University * ** 414 N. Meridian Street Newberg, OR 97132-2697 TEL 503-554-2840 www.georgefox.edu	**Pacific University *** 2043 College Way Forest Grove, OR 97116-1797 TEL 503-352-1435 http://www.pacificu.edu/coe/	**Western Oregon University *** 345 N. Monmouth Avenue Monmouth, OR 97361-1394 TEL 503-838-8389 www.wou.edu/education
Lesley University 1351 Pine Ridge Drive Glide, OR 97443 TEL 866.600.3245 cbusic@mail.lesley.edu	**Portland State University * **** PO Box 751 Portland, OR 97207-0751 TEL 503-725-4758 www.pdx.edu/education	**Willamette University *** 900 State Street Salem, OR 97301-3922 TEL 503-375-5453 www.willamette.edu
Lewis & Clark College * ** 0615 SW Palatine Hill Rd. Portland, OR 97219-7899 TEL 503-768-6200 http://graduate.lclark.edu	**Southern Oregon University **** 1250 Siskiyou Boulevard Ashland, OR 97520-5061 TEL 541-552-6936 www.sou.edu/education/	
Linfield College 900 SE Baker Street #A474 McMinnville, OR 97128-6894 TEL 503-883-2674 www.linfield.edu	**University of Oregon **** 1215 University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403-1215 TEL 541-346-1491 http://education.uoregon.edu	

- NCATE-accredited

** School Administration program

APPENDIX B-1 – Snapshot of Teacher Preparation Program [Western Oregon University- Undergraduate]

Undergraduate Education Program

Authorization Levels:
Early Childhood Only
Early Childhood-Elementary
Elementary- Middle School
Middle School- High School
High School Only.

Program Admissions

Minimum Cumulative GPA 2.75
Basic Skills Test (Ece/Elem/ML)
ORELA: Multiple Subject Exam. (Ece/Elem/ML)
30 Hours practicum experience for each authorization level being sought
2 letters of recommendation, one from a public school setting and one confidential
Signed agreement for : Evaluation of professional qualities, disposition form. Interview.

Student Teaching Practicum

Term I: 30 hours of unsupervised observation. Students observe in a diverse school setting. (Example: Observing an ESOL teacher, Reading Specialist, School Counselor, Music, PE teacher).
Requirements:

- Assignment linked to the diversity class.
- Explore the culture of the school through community mapping.
- Development of the site description.

Term II: Half time in the classroom for 10 weeks.
Requirements:

- Plan, teach and evaluates a mini unit of three lessons.
- University supervisor completes one formal observation.
- Mentor gives informal feedback on students teaching.
- Mentor, student and university supervisor complete a formative evaluation of the five teaching competencies and disposition form at the end of the term.

Term III: Half time student teaching. 10 weeks back in the same setting as Term I

- Student plans, teaches and evaluates a 10 lesson Work Sample.
- University supervisor completes two formal evaluations.
- Mentor completes two formal evaluations.
- Mentor, student and university supervisor complete a formative evaluation of the five teaching competencies and disposition form at the end of the term.

Term IV: Full time student teaching 10 weeks.

- Student plans, teaches and evaluates a 10 lesson Work Sample.
- University supervisor completes two formal evaluations.
- Mentor completes two formal evaluations.
- Mentor, student and university supervisor complete a formative mid-term evaluation of the five teaching competencies and disposition form at the end of the term.
- Mentor, student and university supervisor complete the TSPC Summary Report.
- Service Learning Project completed in the classroom/school.

APPENDIX B-2 – Snapshot of Teacher Preparation Program [University of Portland- Graduate]

The Preparation of a University of Portland Teacher

Graduate Program – Secondary Teacher

Master of Arts in Teaching Degree
Requirements – 36 semester hrs.

Middle School – High School

University Admission

- Undergraduate-Minimum Cumulative GPA- 3.0
- Undergraduate Content Minimum GPA – 2.7
- Four letters of recommendation
- Basic Skills Test – CBEST
- Multiple Subjects Endorsement Test – ORELA
- Endorsement Test - PRAXIS II
- Statement of Goals
- Resume
- Interview

Fingerprint/Criminal Check

First Aid/CPR Training

TSPC Fitness Questionnaire – PA-1

Minimum GPA

Assessment of Dispositions Each Semester

Civil Rights and Ethics Test

Summer Tutoring Program

Student Teaching (Clinical Practice)

Placement A: 10 Weeks – Half time

- 8 Observations
  - 4 from University Staff
  - 4 from Field Teacher
- Midterm Evaluation
- Final Evaluation

Placement B: 5 Weeks – Half time
10 Weeks – Full Time

- 12 Observations
  - 6 from University Staff
  - 6 from Field Teacher
- Midterm Evaluation
- Final Evaluation

Clinical Practice Three Way Evaluation

- Student
- Cooperating Teacher
- University Clinical Faculty

Consortium Focus Groups

- Consortium Survey
- Employer Survey

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

AYP: Adequate Yearly Progress—the minimum level of improvement that school districts and schools must achieve each year as determined under the No Child Left Behind Act
CAEP: Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
CCSSO: Council of Chief State School Officers
COSA: Confederation of School Administrators
CPD: Continuing Professional Development—all licensed educators are required to have an ongoing plan for advanced education and preparation
DATA: Direct Access to Achievement [Oregon Dept. of Education database grant]
EESC: Education Enterprise Steering Committee (Oregon)
ESEA: Elementary and Secondary Education Act [federal legislation]
ESOL: English as a second/other language
GLAD: Guided Language Acquisition Design
InTASC: Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium
NBPTS: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
NCATE: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
NCLB: No Child Left Behind [federal program]
NSDC: National Staff Development Council
OACTE: Oregon Association for Career and Technical Education
OCQTL: Oregon Coalition for Quality Teaching & Learning
ODE: Oregon Department of Education
OEA: Oregon Education Association
OICA: Oregon Independent Colleges Association
OLN: Oregon Leadership Network
ORPEA: Oregon Professors of Educational Administration
OSBA: Oregon School Boards Association
OSPA: Oregon School Principals Association
OUS: Oregon University System
SIOP: Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol
TOSA: Teacher on Special Assignment
TSPC: Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
TWS: Teacher Work Sample
VAM: Value-added modeling

In-service—denotes educators working in the schools
ORELA—a multiple-subject exam taken by students intending to teach at the PK-8 levels
PRAXIS II—national Educational Testing Service exams; content-area tests are taken by students intending to teach at the high school level
Pre-service—denotes students preparing to become educators
Professional Development—continuing education via workshops, courses, and other training

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2010). *The clinical preparation of teachers: A policy brief*. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from: http://aacte.org/index.php?/Research-Policy/AACTE-Research-and-Policy-Statements/the-clinical-preparation-of-teachers-a-policy-brief.html

Baker, E.L., Barton, P.E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H.F., Linn, R.L., Ravitch, D., Rothstein, R., Shavelson, R.J., & Shepard, L.A. (2010). *Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers*. Briefing Paper #278. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.

Bassett, P.F. (2008). The Finnish model. *Independent School*, *68* (1), 9-12.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

Braun, H.I. (2005). *Using student progress to evaluate teachers: A primer on value-added models.* Policy information perspective. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service Policy Information Center.

Braun, H., Chudowsky, N., & Koenig, J., eds. (2010). *Getting value out of value-added: Report of a workshop.* Committee on Value-Added Methodology for Instructional Improvement, Program Evaluation, and Accountability: National Research Council and National Academy of Education: Washington, D.C. The National Academy Press.

Chait, R. & Miller, R. (2010). *Treating different teachers differently: How state policy should act on differences in teacher performance to improve teacher effectiveness and equity.* Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress.

Chung Wei, R., Andree, A., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). How nations invest in teachers. *Educational Leadership*, *66* (5), 28-33.

CLASS project : Performance evaluation. (n.d.). Chalkboard Project. Retrieved from: http://educators4reform.org/what-is-class/performance-evaluation/?phpMyAdmin=Ozqkf1ipU3GNTkDSiWLExCBABA7

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (2005). *Studying teacher education.* Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/Model_Core_Teaching_Standards.html

Crowe, E. (2010). *Measuring what matters: A stronger accountability model for teacher education*. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from: http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/07/teacher_accountability.html

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009a). Teacher learning: What matters? *Educational Leadership, 66*(5), 46-53.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009b). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1-2), 35-47.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Recognizing and developing effective teaching: What policy makers should know and do.* Policy brief. Washington, D.C.: Partnership for Teacher Quality.

Data Quality Campaign. (2010a). *Inaugural overview of states' actions to leverage data to improve student success.* Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/files/DQC_survey_report_JAN_2010_3.11.10_singles.pdf

Data Quality Campaign. (2010b). *Leveraging state longitudinal data systems to inform teacher preparation and continuous improvement.* Webinar template. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Data Quality Campaign. (n.d.). *Educator capacity to use data. State actions to change the culture around data – from building to using data.* State action 9. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/files/ACTION_9_-_Educator_Use_FINAL.pdf

Dickson, K., & Sommers, D. (2008). *Oregon coalition for quality teaching and learning: A partnership proposal*. Portland: Chalkboard Project.

Dillon, S. (2010, August 31st). Formula to grade teachers' skill gains acceptance, and critics. *The New York Times,* A1.

Education Commission of the States. (2010). *Recent state policies/activities. Teaching quality--Evaluation and effectiveness.* Retrieved from: http://www.ecs.org/ecs/ecscat.nsf/WebTopicView?OpenView&count=-1&RestrictToCategory=Teaching+Quality--Evaluation+and+Effectiveness

Gitomer, D.H., Latham, A.S., & Ziomek, R. (1999). *The academic quality of prospective teachers: The impact of admissions and licensure testing.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2004). *Can teacher quality be effectively assessed?* Seattle, WA: University of Washington & Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. Retrieved from: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410958_NBPTSOutcomes.pdf

Grissom, J.A., & Loeb, S. (2009). *Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills*. CALDER Working Paper 35. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Gross, S. J. (1986). *Professional licensure and quality.* Cato Institute Policy Analysis 79. Washington, D.C.: The Cato Institute.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*, 157-191.

Hammond, B. (2010, Sept. 23). Oregon schools win $20 million from feds to raise teacher effectiveness, institute performance pay. *The Oregonian,* A1. Retrieved from: http://www.oregonlive.com/education/index.ssf/2010/09/oregon_schools_win_18_million.html

Harris, D.M. (2009). Would accountability based on teacher value-added be smart policy? An examination of the statistical properties and policy alternatives. *Education Finance and Policy, 4* (4), 319-350.

Hart, P. D., Research Associates (2008). *Teaching as a second career*. Princeton, NJ: Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.

Heubert, J., & Hauser, R.M. (1999). *High stakes: Testing for tracking, promotion, and graduation.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Hill, D., Jeffrey, J., McWalters, P., Paliokas, K., Seagren, A., & Stumbo, C. (2010). *Transforming teaching and learning: a vision for a high-quality educator development system*. Washington D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Jones, M.G., Jones, B.D., & Hargrove, T.Y. (2003). *The unintended consequences of high-stakes testing.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Koretz, D. (2008). *Measuring up: What educational testing really tells us.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Koretz, D. (2010). Tyler Heights is not alone: Score inflation is common in education – and other fields. *American Educator, 32* (2), 8-9.

Larson, R., Burk, P., Chamberlain, V., & Noor, S. (2008). Policy development: The agency of state leadership. *Educational Leadership Review*, *9*(1), 10-27.

Learning Point Associates (2010). *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: Emerging trends reflected in the state phase 1 Race to the Top applications.* Naperville, IL: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/RttT_Teacher_Evaluation.pdf

Levine, M. (2009). *Preparing high quality teachers for high needs schools: Investing in clinical education and partnerships*. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

McCaffrey, D.F., & Hamilton, L.S. (2007). *Value-added assessment in practice: Lessons from the Pennsylvania Value-Added Assessment System pilot project.* Technical report. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

McCaffrey, D.F., Lockwood, J.R., Koretz, D.M., & Hamilton, L.S. (2003). *Evaluating value-added models for teacher accountability.* Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation. Retrieved from: http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG158.pdf

McCloskey, W., Stonge, J.H., et al. (2005). *Teacher effectiveness, student achievement, and national board certified teachers: A comparison of national board certified teachers and non-national board certified teachers: Is there a difference in teacher effectiveness and student achievement?* Arlington, VA: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Milanowski, A.T., Kimball, S.M., &White, B. (2004). *The relationship between standards-based teacher evaluation scores and student achievement.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved from: http://cpre.wceruw.org/papers/3site_long_TE_SA_AERA04TE.pdf

Miller, R., & Chait, R. (2008). *Teacher turnover, tenure policies, and the distribution of teacher quality: Can high-poverty schools catch a break?* Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, (2001). *Standards for professional development schools.* Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=FcHbf2B%2b670%3d&tabid=125

Neville, K., Sherman, R., & Cohen, C. (2005). *Preparing and training professionals: Comparing education to six other fields.* Washington, D.C.: Finance Project.

Nichols, S., & Berliner, D. (2007). *Collateral damage: How high-stakes testing corrupts America's schools.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Noell, G., & Burns, J.M. (n.d.). *Value added teacher preparation assessment overview of 2007-08 study. Louisiana's Teacher Quality Initiative*. Retrieved from: http://regents.state.la.us/Academic/TE/2008/Overview%20of%202007-08%20Value%20Added%20Teacher%20Preparation%20(12.03.08).pdf

Noell, G., & Burns, J.M. (2006). Value-added assessment of teacher preparation: An illustration of emerging technology. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(1), 37-50.

Noell, G. & Kowalski, P. (2010). *Using longitudinal data systems to inform state teacher quality efforts.* Policy brief. Washington, D.C.: Partnership for Teacher Quality.

Oregon Department of Education. (2007). *The Oregon data project: Direct access to achievement.* Grant abstract. Retrieved from: http://nces.ed.gov/Programs/SLDS/pdf/Oregonabstract.pdf

Oregon Department of Education. (2009). *The Oregon DATA project: Summer 2009 summary.* Retrieved from: http://data.k12partners.org/content/two-year-summary-report

Perlstein, L. (2010). Unintended consequences: High stakes can result in low standards. *American Educator, 32* (2), 6-9.

Pianta, R., Hitz, R., & West, B. (2010). *Increasing the application of developmental sciences knowledge in educator preparation: Policy and practice issues*. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Reardon, S.F. & Raudenbush, S.W. (2008, April). *Assumptions of value-added models for estimating school effects*. Paper prepared for the National Conference on Value-Added Modeling, University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Ravitch, D. (2010). In need of a renaissance: Real reform will renew, not abandon, neighborhood schools. *American Educator, 32* (2), 10-13, 16-22, 42.

Rivkin, S.G. (2007). *Value-added analysis and education policy.* National Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER). Working Paper #3. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved from: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411577_value-added_analysis.pdf

Sanders, W.L. (2006, October). *Comparisons among various educational assessment value-added models*. Paper presented at The Power of Two – National Value Added Conference, Columbus, OH. Retrieved from: http://www.talentedteachers.com/pubs/comparisons_models_sanders.pdf

Sawchuk, S. (2010, Sept. 1). State group piloting teacher prelicensing exam. *Education Week 30,* (2), 1.

Schleicher, A. (2010). *Is the sky the limit to educational improvement?* Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, Atlanta, GA.

Seashore Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S.E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings.* St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/CurrentAreasofFocus/EducationLeadership/Documents/Learning-from-Leadership-Investigating-Links-Final-Report.pdf

Snyder, J., & Lit, I. (2010). *Principles and exemplars for integrating developmental sciences knowledge into educator preparation*. Washington D.C.: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Stewart, B.E. (2006). *Value-added modeling: The challenge of measuring educational outcomes.* 2006 Carnegie Challenge. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York. Retrieved from: http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/centennialmoments/value_added_chal_paper_mockup.pdf

Stewart, V. (2010, April). Dream, design, deliver: How Singapore developed a high-quality teacher force. *Kappan*, *91* (7), 85-86.

Tamir, E., & Wilson, S. (2005). Who should guard the gates? Evidentiary and professional warrants for claiming jurisdiction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56* (4), 332-342.

Teitel, L. (2003). *The professional development schools handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). *Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education.* Education Sector Reports. Washington, D.C. : Education Sector. Retrieved from: http://www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/RushToJudgment_ES_Jan08.pdf

United States Department of Education. (2010). *A blueprint for reform.* Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/publication_pg5.html

Vandal, B., & Thompson, B. (2009). *State partnerships for quality teacher education*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Waggoner, J., Carroll, J., & Weitzel, B. (2010, February). *Examining candidate professional growth through assessment of student learning in P-12 classrooms*. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago.

Waters, T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.

Working Group on Teacher Quality. (2007). *Roundtable discussion on value-added analysis of student achievement: A summary of findings.* Retrieved from: http://www.tapsystem.org/pubs/value_added_roundtable_08.pdf

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1-2), 89-99

Zimpher, N., & Jones, D. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers.* Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Zinth, J. D. (2010). *Teacher evaluation: New approaches for a new decade.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from: http://www.ecs.org/html/IssueSection.asp?issueid=129&subissueid=62&ssID=0&s=What+States+Are+Doing

Cover Photos, Courtesy of Oregon University System. From left to right, Oregon State University, Portland State University, Eastern Oregon University. Copyright 2010 OUS.

Photos, Page 47-48, Courtesy of Western Oregon University and University of Portland.