

June 2009

A Teacher Development Continuum

The Role of Policy in Creating a Supportive Pathway into the Profession

Liam Goldrick, *Director of Policy, New Teacher Center*

Teachers are the strongest school-related influence on student learning. They impact how much children learn and whether they are academically prepared to succeed in subsequent grades. Beginning educators, on average, are less effective than their more experienced peers. Research has consistently found a positive relationship between years of teaching experience and higher student achievement, with teachers who have five or more years in the classroom demonstrating greater effectiveness.¹ Despite good intentions, new teachers have yet to develop their skills and knowledge. Potentially exacerbating this dynamic is the practice of assigning our newest teachers to the most challenging schools and classrooms which are more likely to be populated by low-income and minority students. The students in greatest need of the most highly accomplished teachers are more likely to be taught by the least effective and least prepared.

Teaching's "Three Simple Premises"

- What teachers know and can do is the most important influence on what students learn.
- Recruiting, preparing, and retaining good teachers is the central strategy for improving our schools.
- School reform cannot succeed unless it focuses on creating the conditions under which teachers can teach and teach well.

What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future
National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996

The learning curve of beginning teachers poses a challenge for schools. For urban schools, which employ a disproportionate number of new educators and often exhibit higher rates of teacher turnover, the lower effectiveness of beginning teachers is a major threat to those schools' ability to provide an excellent education to their students and to close achievement gaps. Demographic changes will ensure that this challenge is one that more and more school districts across the nation grapple with in the coming years. More than half of the current education workforce is eligible to retire within the next decade.² Supporting the cadre of new educators who will replace them to become more effective more quickly should be a primary goal for policymakers and education leaders alike.

The national conversation about "teacher effectiveness" provides both an opportunity and a threat to all organizations in the business of teacher development—especially traditional preparers of teachers. The opportunity lies in the teacher development community broadening the teacher effectiveness conversation. It must be broader than simply identifying "good" and "bad" teachers through value-added methodologies to reward the effective and fire the ineffective. Fundamentally, value-added data should inform a concerted human capital strategy to strengthen teacher preparation, induction, and professional development to improve the skills and abilities of all teachers. They should be used purposefully to look at what behaviors, characteristics, or knowledge result in certain educators being more effective than others and then determine how to scale up approaches to initial training or on-going professional development programs to help make the vast majority of teacher candidates, beginning teachers and veteran teachers better.

The threat from the increased focus on teacher effectiveness lies in doing nothing to rethink traditional notions about and approaches to teacher development and teacher preparation. University-based routes into teaching are being challenged by market forces and rising accountability demands. The growth of alternative teacher preparation programs has occurred as a result of a variety of dynamics: the absence of overwhelming research about preparation's impact on teaching effectiveness, the failure of higher education to adapt to the needs of school

districts and teacher candidates, the rise of enterprising outfits such as Teach For America and The New Teacher Project and their appeal to a younger generation of teacher candidates, and a policy push for greater accountability in teacher preparation.

The Carnegie Corporation's *Teachers for a New Era (TNE)* initiative is an attempt to rethink teaching by building upon what works, focusing on available evidence to improve, and learning from successful reform models. In effect, it is an opportunity and a call for traditional teacher preparation to reinvent itself. Specifically, TNE's focus is to rethink how we initially prepare educators and induct them into the profession. One of TNE's grounding principles is that education should be understood as "an academically taught clinical practice profession, requiring close cooperation between colleges of education and actual practicing schools; master teachers as clinical faculty in the college of education; and residencies for beginning teachers during a two-year period of induction." At root, it is about developing and disseminating successful partnership models to accelerate beginning teacher development.

Support from the Carnegie Corporation enabled the New Teacher Center to host a Policy Roundtable on Pre-service/Induction Linkages in May 2008. This meeting brought together representatives of the TNE/Learning Network institutions that partnered with the NTC during the 2007–08 academic year and state policy leaders who shape policies influencing teacher preparation and new teacher induction programs.³ We brought these individuals together to share their expertise and learn from the work they are doing at their institutions and in their respective states. This meeting shed new light on the important topic of linking university-based pre-service education with induction support that new teachers need to succeed during their initial years in the classroom.

The common goal that all meeting participants shared was a commitment to envision a continuum of teacher support, beginning during pre-service education, spanning the entire teaching career. A primary outcome of the meeting focused on distilling key policy insights pursuant to the alignment of pre-service education and new teacher induction. The recommendations offered within this paper draw upon the knowledge and wisdom of the assembled meeting participants. The NTC is grateful to those policy and higher education leaders for sharing their time and expertise in the pursuit of better understanding about how to build meaningful partnerships between states, school districts and teacher training institutions to advance quality educator development and strengthen classroom instruction.

The Current State of Teacher Development

There are typically three phases to a new teacher's development: 1) pre-service education; 2) new teacher induction; and 3) career-long professional development. At an individual level, becoming a teacher involves a transition from pre-service training into the profession of teaching. This transition requires a shift in role orientation and a move away from studying teaching to knowing how to teach by confronting the daily classroom challenges.⁴ A challenge for practitioners and policymakers alike is to envision and create a continuum of teacher support which stretches from the first days of pre-service education throughout the entire teaching career. The critical element of this challenge is to strengthen the connection between the pre-service curriculum and district-based teacher induction program and to develop mutual accountability for new teacher development among the key stakeholders. The reality is far from this vision.

The developmental pathway into teaching and through the teaching career is characterized by a largely fragmented and incoherent system of training and support. It is a haphazard system that seldom meets the needs of individual educators and certainly does not maximize the development of beginning educators for the benefit of the system as a whole. "Nowhere is the absence of a seamless continuum in teacher education more evident than in the early years of teaching," write Kenneth Howey and Nancy Zimpher. "At the same time, no point in the continuum has more potential to bring the worlds of the school and the academy together into a true symbiotic partnership than the induction stage."⁵

In a typical university-based preparation program, Arts & Sciences faculty bear responsibility for subject matter expertise and College of Education faculty are responsible for pedagogical theory and training, but the coursework is often unrelated. School districts then generally bear responsibility for teacher assignment and the induction of teachers who come to them through a variety of preparation routes, both university-based and non-traditional, and a variety of institutions and programs. Teacher mentors are often asked to assist new colleagues without a clear vision of their role, curriculum or standards to guide their work, quality training, or sufficient time and its impact is largely dependent on the individual. Typically, school districts have little say about the pre-service experiences of their candidates, even when a given institution of higher education places a large percentage of its graduates in that districts. Historically, college and universities haven't regarded induction as within their purview.

At a policy level, the system is no less disconnected. State departments of education, state boards of education, and professional standards boards are in charge of teacher licensing requirements and, if any, induction and mentoring requirements. Teacher education programs are accredited by national, state and/or local organizations. School districts establish their own curriculum, hire and evaluate their own teachers, set school schedules, and distribute resources differently. Teachers' unions often set the terms of work contracts and influence teacher assignment policies. Teacher professional development of varying quality and alignment is offered by a variety of entities which often compete with one another. A coherent system generally does not exist.

Incoherence flies in the face of the inter-reliance that higher education and k–12 education share. Higher education prepares the educators that form the heart of schools. Schools graduate students that go onto colleges and universities. A lack of quality teacher training and support and an absence of excellent instruction hamper both partners in fulfilling their missions of teaching students. As the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future's (NCTAF) National Summit on High Quality Teacher Preparation concluded, "teacher preparation and student learning form a closed loop: the teachers they prepare are the basis for the quality of their future student body."⁶

Pre-Service Education

Accredited teacher education programs are characterized by three primary elements. First, liberal arts courses provide teacher candidates the knowledge and understanding of the content they will teach. Second, pedagogical courses teach them about how students learn, how to teach their content, and how to manage classrooms to maximize student learning. Third, clinical and field experiences provide an opportunity for candidates to apply their knowledge of teaching and learning in a specific school community.

The curriculum in university-based teacher preparation programs often does not prepare program graduates for the school and classroom contexts where they teach. Sometimes too much attention is paid to theory at the expense of more practical training, and teacher candidates may not receive sufficient on-site experiences in real-world classrooms. It is challenging for even the best preparation programs to customize their curriculum to the widely varying contexts in which their graduates are placed. While teacher graduates typically take their first job near where they graduated, a given institution of higher education may place its graduates in dozens of school districts.

The jury is still out about whether teacher education makes a positive difference in the effectiveness of their graduates. *Studying Teacher Education*, a 2005 report by the American Educational Research Association Panel on Research and Teacher Education, found there is little empirical evidence to support the current methods or existing structures used to prepare American teachers.⁷ The Teaching Commission, led by former IBM Chairman and CEO Louis Gerstner, came to a similar conclusion in its 2006 report, saying "we simply cannot tell what characterizes the most effective teacher education programs because we have no way of measuring success. Without this knowledge, it is impossible to learn from the best training programs or to correct or close the worst."⁸

The conclusions of a 2008 paper by researchers based at Stanford University, the University of Albany and the University of Virginia, however, suggest that teacher preparation programs that provide opportunities for contextualized application of classroom teaching and time for analysis of and reflection on those activities can contribute to the greater effectiveness of first-year teachers. The authors write of their research in New York City: "Programs that provide more oversight of student teaching experiences or require a capstone project supply significantly more effective first-year teachers... Teachers who have had the opportunity in their preparation to engage in the actual practices involved in teaching also show greater student gains during their first year of teaching. Similarly, teachers who have had the opportunity to review curriculum...perform better in terms of student test score gains."⁹

Teacher Induction

Teacher preparation is a beginning—not an end. "Teachers are not 'finished products' when they complete a teacher preparation program," stated *No Dream Denied*, the 2003 report of the NCTAF. It recommended "guided entry into teaching, via residencies and mentored induction" as "a standard feature of every high quality teacher preparation approach."¹⁰

The learning that takes place in a beginning teacher's first few years on the job is different from their preparation experience and is different from their subsequent professional learning. There is no period as formational to a teacher's career as the initial years in the classroom. For the first time, novice teachers are fully responsible for blending the insights learned from their own educational experiences and the pedagogical theory gleaned from teacher preparation with the reality of teaching students on a daily basis. These initial years serve to set the professional norms, attitudes, and

standards that will guide practice over the course of a career. Unfortunately, this period can also determine whether the educator stays in the profession or becomes a statistic—one of the 40 percent or more who leave within their first five years on the job.

Most beginning teachers receive insufficient on-the-job support during their initial years in the profession. Induction or mentoring often runs the gamut between an informal buddy system and high-quality, formalized, multi-year induction programs that are integrated into school learning communities. In many places beginning teachers may be assigned a mentor teacher—someone to help them learn the ropes—but unfortunately, that mentoring often goes little beyond providing a shoulder to cry on or advice about how to obtain classroom supplies. Too seldom is mentoring instructionally focused—such as how to plan a lesson or how to differentiate instruction for students with different learning needs. Richard Ingersoll and Thomas M. Smith have defined four types of induction models, and suggest that **less than one percent** of new teachers have access to the most robust, comprehensive induction support: an in-field mentor, communication with an administrator, common planning time, new teacher seminars, new teacher support network, reduced number of class preps, and a teacher's aide.¹¹

Perhaps this systemic fragmentation would be acceptable if the individual components—including pre-service training and induction—routinely demonstrated strength and impact on teaching practice. But, sadly, that is often the exception rather than the norm. There is ample evidence to suggest that each element independently and in its most typical form does not provide educators with the knowledge and skills they need to maximize their effectiveness in the classroom. We must move toward an integrated continuum of teacher development defined by collaboration between higher education and k–12 schools.

A New Vision of Teacher Development

The conversation about collaboration between universities and schools around teacher preparation began in the mid-1980s with the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum on Education and The Economy. Both initiatives recommended university-school partnerships to improve teaching. The Holmes Group recommended the establishment of professional development schools—laboratory schools, in effect—where teachers and administrators work in partnership with university faculty. The Carnegie Forum's report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, recommended the establishment of partner schools where university faculty could collaborate with k–12 educators. The Carnegie Corporation's *Teachers for a New Era* initiative is a next step in this discussion.

The research literature provides important insights upon which to draw in this quest for a more coherent, aligned system. A leading theoretician in the field is Sharon Feiman-Nemser. She authored a journal article in 2001 “to stimulate discussion and debate about what a professional learning continuum from initial preparation through the early years of teaching could be like.” Based on her theory that “much of what teachers need to know can only be learned in the context of practice,” she suggests that it requires “coherent and connected learning opportunities that link initial preparation to new teacher induction.”¹²

Existing university-school partnership models already in existence include some common structural elements from which others can learn. In addition, this paper builds upon the insights and recommendations of the NTC Policy Roundtable on Pre-service/Induction Linkages for additional guidance on what effective partnerships look like.

Partnerships

John Goodlad, in a 2004 book, suggests that partnerships between universities and schools can be built upon “positive symbiosis” and a spirit of “simultaneous renewal.” Both school districts and universities have interests that could be enriched by such collaboration. For example, university faculty need school settings in which to conduct research and k–12 schools can benefit from cutting-edge academic research about their curriculum, funding, leadership, programs, and structure.¹³ While such common interest can potentially impel collaborative conversations, better information about existing models is needed to guide the design and growth of university-school partnerships around teacher preparation and induction.

The design of such partnerships is complex. In order for the whole system to be coherent, there has to be “connective tissue” between each phase of a teacher’s development.¹⁴ This connective tissue is hard to create and hard to sustain. It requires that a strong partnership and collaboration between Arts and Sciences faculty, College of Education faculty, and k–12 teachers. These partnerships must then think strategically about how linking their work serves the needs of novice educators.¹⁵

In a 1999 *Journal of Teacher Education* article, three California State University, Northridge professors and one Los Angeles educator suggest the following conditions to re-craft teacher education as a shared responsibility and a collaborative effort between higher education and school districts:

- establishing cross-institutional positions and school-university committees that govern and guide the collaborative;
- building collaborative time among faculty and school personnel; and
- engagement of high-level leadership at both institutions.¹⁶

The New Teacher Center has its roots in one such in a university-led induction program: the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project (SCNTP). NTC Executive Director Ellen Moir developed the SCNTP in 1988 when she was Director of Teacher Education at the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC). Her goal was to follow UCSC teacher education graduates into their early years in the profession, providing them with school-based support specifically aligned with pre-service preparation. An SCNTP innovation was to release exemplary classroom teachers on a full-time basis and provide mentor training, both prior to assuming their new roles and throughout their three-year terms. UCSC clinical faculty and NTC induction program mentors now receive the same training. The NTC and UCSC have co-developed a *Learning to Teach Continuum* and have created a matrix outlining the courses, seminars, and field experiences candidates and new teachers experience over four years from pre-service through induction. In addition, clinical supervisors use aspects of the NTC Formative Assessment System that induction program mentors employ as they support the development of new teachers.

One lesson the NTC has learned through this university/school district partnership is how mentor training for induction programs can be successfully adapted to the needs of IHE clinical faculty. As a result, UCSC teacher graduates recognize that their pre-service preparation was grounded in the same vision of good teaching that their new teacher mentor reinforces throughout their two-year-long induction program. This partnership has created a rich feedback loop, thereby enhancing the quality of the UCSC teacher education program and the induction experience of new teachers.

When teachers are prepared and supported by a coherent system, they receive a very different kind of message about their own professional obligations. Teachers developed through an aligned system are more likely to embrace the notion of the teaching profession as one that requires continuous professional growth.¹⁷ Such professional obligations on the part of teachers can lead them to demand the type of support and the type of school culture that can support continuous improvement and personal growth. A high-quality induction program can provide exactly that during the initial years in the profession.

Comprehensive, High-Quality Induction

Regardless of how teachers are prepared or what form such university-school partnerships might take, the need for high-quality induction support remains paramount. For the Carnegie TNE vision of teacher preparation and induction to become the norm rather than the exception, states and school districts need to strengthen induction policies and frameworks and to view induction as an integrated component within a continuum of teacher development continuum. At its best, induction is a form of high-quality professional development with the power to transform the culture of teaching from an individual to a collective venture. All critical partners in this work—teachers, IHEs, policymakers, schools and districts—benefit from a deeper understanding of the elements of effective induction programs.

Induction is a distinct phase of teacher development as well as a period of enculturation and socialization—where theory meets practice, day-after-day. Induction also represents a formal program of support and guidance provided to novice educators in the early years of their careers. It encompasses orientation to the workplace, socialization, and guidance through the early stages of instructional practice. It is important to understand that induction will occur even in the absence of a formal program. It will happen haphazardly, with new teachers left to ‘sink or swim’ in the isolation of their own classrooms.

The New Teacher Center has identified the following as key elements of high-quality induction:

- A multi-year program;
- Rigorous mentor selection;
- On-going professional development and support for mentors;
- Sanctioned time for mentor-new teacher interaction;
- On-going beginning teacher professional development;
- Participation in a network of beginning teachers;
- Intensive and specific guidance moving teaching practice forward;
- Professional teaching standards and data-driven conversation;
- Clear roles and responsibilities for school administrators; and
- Collaboration with all stakeholders.¹⁸

Supporting new teachers is a critical strategy for improving retention and increasing teacher effectiveness. It can be a high-impact endeavor. High-quality mentoring and induction can reduce the rate of new teacher attrition, accelerate the professional growth of new teachers, and provide a positive return on investment through reduced personnel costs and greater student learning gains.¹⁹ Fundamentally, induction is about accelerating teacher development. It is reform-minded—not in service of the status quo. High-quality induction transforms how beginning teachers are regarded and are welcomed into the profession, but also with regard to how mentors and beginning teachers, alike, approach professional learning, become leaders, and acquire and practice new professional norms. Induction is not a stand-alone program or a unique event, but a process that is woven into the fabric of a teacher's career and a district's overall approach to supporting teaching and learning.

Opportunities & Challenges

Numerous opportunities and challenges exist in initiating and succeeding in this work of building partnerships between institutions of higher education (IHEs) and k–12 schools to design a continuum of teacher development. Participants in the NTC's 2008 Policy Roundtable identified chief opportunities and challenges with regard to this work.

Opportunities:

- **Teacher Quality:** The existing research base suggests that the teacher is the most important school-based impact on student learning. In addition, the research provides evidence that high-quality preparation and induction can make a difference for teachers and students alike.
- **Vision:** Carnegie's *Teachers for a New Era* initiative and other similar national, state and local campaigns have provided a vision and an impetus for action.
- **P-16:** State and regional P-16 councils provide an existing forum where partners can learn from one another and work collaboratively to create an aligned teacher development system.
- **Symbiotic Partnerships:** Collaboration provides IHE faculty access to clinical sites for research and provides the k–12 community more ready access to academic research.
- **College Readiness:** Universities have an interest in ensuring that better k–12 teaching quality, particularly in secondary schools, leads to improved student preparedness for higher education.
- **Accountability:** The Higher Education Act (HEA) challenge universities to demonstrate their impact on the readiness of their teacher graduates to achieve state certification and impact student learning.
- **Funding:** HEA (and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009) provide funding for partnership work among IHEs and high-need schools and districts.
- **Competition:** Pressure from alternative preparation providers should propel universities to revise and strengthen their approach to teacher training; indeed, there may be things for universities to learn from high-quality alternative models.

Challenges:

- **Contextualization:** One challenge is to contextualize the work for each institution and to meet the needs of individual teachers often teaching in wildly varying classroom, school and district environments.
- **Leadership:** Leadership at a variety of levels is needed to bring a diverse set of stakeholders to the table, get them committed to the work, and achieve consensus.
- **Pernicious Norms:** Viewing teacher development as a segmented system, made up of distinct pre-service, induction and professional development phases, is difficult to overcome.

- **Inertia:** The resistance of individuals and large bureaucracies to analyze and reflect upon their practices, and change if necessary, is a sizable barrier to this work. The lack of time to engage in these conversations leads people and institutions to keep doing what they're doing.
- **Resources:** Apart from some modest federal funding, there is little dedicated funding to engage in and fund the implementation of such partnership work. Although states have increasingly mandated new teacher mentoring, failure to adequately fund mandates, articulate a robust program vision, and inability to monitor compliance means that local programs vary greatly in design and implementation.
- **Silos:** K–12 and higher education continue to operate in separate governance systems. In addition, college and universities are comprised of separate components as well, with Arts & Sciences and teacher education the two most critical to this work.
- **Local Control:** A penchant for local control can prevent external partnerships from blossoming. Union contracts can sometimes act as a barrier to changing the way new teachers are inducted into the profession, including mentoring support and initial assignments.
- **Research:** While research exists to support a partnership approach to teacher development, there is limited outcome data to demonstrate the impact that such an aligned system can have on teacher effectiveness and student learning.

Among the many challenges that roundtable participants identified, data may loom largest as a roadblock. IHE, state and school district databases are seldom aligned to support teacher preparation programs in tracking teacher graduates. Further, data linking beginning teacher effectiveness to initial preparation does not exist in most places. Another challenge is how universities can continue to support their program graduates when they are not employed locally. While online induction models exist—such as the eMentoring for Student Success project targeted at secondary math and science teachers (a partnership between the NTC, National Science Teachers Association, and Montana State University at Bozeman)—there are numerous challenges in integrating virtual support with site-based assistance and in ensuring that virtual support is of sufficient quality.

Promising Models

The power of exemplary university-school partnership models is clear. Linda Darling-Hammond made it a central focus of her 2006 book, *Powerful Teacher Education: Lessons From Exemplary Programs*. “When universities and districts work in concert during pre-service and induction, new teachers not only develop, they thrive.”²⁰ Fortunately, leading universities that have built such effective partnerships do exist and a number of them participated in the NTC’s Policy Roundtable on Pre-service/Induction Linkages in May 2008. We feature several of them as examples of this work below. Some of the common elements shared by these promising teacher development models include a clear vision, strong partner engagement, collective responsibility, a data-driven focus, and a focus on the individual needs of teacher candidates.

University-School Partnerships

Alverno College

Alverno College has built an induction partnership with schools operated by the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. The partnership involves 132 schools in urban, suburban and rural areas in 10 Wisconsin counties. It is especially focused on meeting the differentiated needs of suburban, rural, and urban schools and in learning about the performance of Alverno graduates once they enter the Archdiocesan teaching force.

Alverno and the Archdiocese provide a series of eight beginning teacher and mentor seminars through which College and Archdiocesan faculty collaborate. College credit is provided to seminar participants. Much of the partnership work has focused on systems alignment. For example, NTC formative assessment tools have been modified to meet Wisconsin teaching standards and are being used by College faculty and Archdiocesan mentors to support beginning teacher awareness, understanding, and application of curricular content and pedagogy. In addition, the partnership is collecting data through stakeholder surveys, collecting retention data, analyzing mentor and beginning teacher seminar evaluations, and observing instructional approaches, curriculum content, and resources used in Archdiocesan schools.

Montclair State University

Montclair State University's (MSU) teacher education program focuses on all three TNE design principles: data-driven decisions, engagement of Arts & Science faculty, and an emphasis on teaching as a clinical practice profession. Data from MSU's Teacher Education Assessment System as well as evidence derived from performance assessments is analyzed to inform programmatic adjustments and improvements. Its Center of Pedagogy engages arts and science and public school colleges as equal partners in teacher education. MSU also is increasing and intensifying mentoring during field experiences coupled with on-site courses for teacher candidates in partner schools.

In its partnership with Newark (New Jersey) City Schools, MSU has convened clinical faculty and mentors in forums to learn common strategies and skills that can be utilized both at the pre-service and induction programs. The partnership utilizes NTC's formative assessment system to provide a common framework for conversations about teaching practice and to accelerate new teacher growth and development.

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) bases its partnership work on two assumptions. First, teacher education programs must be relevant to schools in order to have access to quality settings. Second, school and university programs are imperfect—there is always room for improvement. The goal of the partnership should be simultaneous improvement and the focus of the partnership work should be of mutual benefit.

The Teachers Academy is the organizational umbrella for all professional education programs at UNCG. Its central purposes are the coordination of teacher education and the creation and maintenance of community of professional education. UNCG and the Guilford County Schools established the Guilford Education Partnership to develop system-level plans that focus attention and resources on collaboratively identified and shared concerns such as teacher recruitment and retention, preparing teachers to teach in high-need schools, and raising student achievement in high-need schools. UNCG has created a network of trained mentors to work with its graduates and other novice teachers in their first years of teaching.

Western Kentucky University

Western Kentucky University (WKU), Warren County Schools, and Bowling Green Schools have been working collaboratively—as the Green River Educational District Consortium (GREDC). A group of ten WKU teacher education faculty, seven Arts & Science faculty, nine school administrators or coordinators, and 21 new teacher mentors—supported by the NTC—have been investigating actions that could support curricular and formative assessment alignments between WKU's teacher preparation program and the school districts' new teacher induction programs.

There is much shared work within the Consortium. GREDC trains clinical faculty and teacher mentors. Arts & Sciences faculty serve on the mentoring leadership team that developed the Consortium's mentoring model. Two A&S faculty have agreed to become trainers in mentoring processes for other A&S faculty. The WKU data system can collect performance data on first-year teachers, including from teacher work samples and P-12 student learning during an instructional unit. A&S faculty redesigned four content courses required of elementary teacher candidates based on feedback from data collection and analysis. A continuous assessment plan was developed at WKU with input from school stakeholders that measures and reports teacher candidate, experienced teacher, and school leader growth. Finally, an innovative induction program coupled with a new master's program has been piloted tested at WKU.

State Partnerships and Policies

State policy has a critical role to play in bridging the divide between the higher education and k-12 communities around teacher training, support and development. It is the glue that can make an aligned teacher development system stick. Collaborative state ventures, such as p-16 councils and specialized teaching commissions that include a broad set of stakeholders, can initiate needed conversations to get the ball rolling and to hold stakeholders accountable for agreed-upon action to align teacher preparation with induction and on-going professional development.

States hold the primary policy levers to connect key elements of teacher policy—professional standards, accreditation, preparation, licensure, induction, and professional development—and communicate and help to operationalize this aligned vision within their borders. Unfortunately, the policy world offers few beacons to which other states can turn for guidance. Few states can rightly claim to have created or even envisioned a fully aligned system that addresses the needs of beginning teachers from pre-service into the classroom. However, several have moved the dial forward in important ways

At the Policy Roundtable on Pre-service/Induction Linkages, the New Teacher Center asked participants this simple question, “*What is good state policy?*” with regard to teacher preparation and induction. The collective response suggested that good teacher preparation and induction policy: *encourages collaboration; is systemic; is intensive and structured; provides flexibility to contextualize the work; is informed by practice; is data driven; and is aligned with other teacher quality policies.* These criteria are instructive as we look to identify states that have developed policies or programs that advance a continuum of teacher development by building cross-system partnerships and aligned programs of support for new teachers. In addition to the policy elements mentioned above, other shared conditions of the states identified below are strong leadership support for the work, sustained funding around aspects of the work, and a commitment to partnerships by key stakeholders.

California—Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment

California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program is arguably the most robust state model for teacher induction in the nation. It is comprised of a robust program vision, a multi-year program, induction program standards, and generous and sustained state funding. The state finances mentoring support for all first- and second-year teachers through the BTSA program. In the 2008–09 school year, school districts received more than \$4,000 for each first- and second-year teacher, with a required local match of \$2,000 per teacher.

The legislation that established BTSA encouraged collaboration between local school districts, county offices of education, and colleges and universities to organize and deliver professional development for beginning teachers. In California, induction programs may be offered by school districts, county offices of education, and/or institutions of higher education. BTSA Induction programs vary in organizational design and include single district programs, consortia of districts as well as large, county office of education-based consortia. Each BTSA Induction program works in collaboration with one or more college or university partners. The Santa Cruz New Teacher Project (SCNTP) is one such induction partnership model that began as a state-funded pilot program prior to adoption of the statewide BTSA program. The New Teacher Center continues to operate this initiative.

California state policy has created a fully aligned system of teacher development. All of the pre-service programs must be designed around program standards that are directly related to the state’s induction program standards.

The design is intended to scaffold learning for pre-service candidates which is then applied in the induction program. The pre-service program standards explicitly reference the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Both pre-service and induction standards and practices share common qualities: intensive support and frequent classroom visits, individual learning plans, formal observation cycles conducted in identified areas of professional goals aligned with teaching standards, and formative assessment of new teacher practice using a standards-based developmental continuum. In addition, California has built teaching performance expectations into its pre-service program standards and developed a Teaching Performance Assessment that provides formative assessment information and performance assessment results to successful candidates in a manner that is usable by the induction program to inform individualized induction plans.

Louisiana Blue Ribbon Commission

In 1999, the Governor of Louisiana, the Board of Regents and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education created the Blue Ribbon Commission to create a cohesive PK-16 system to for recruiting, preparing, and supporting quality teachers. Through the Commission’s work, Louisiana has created the strongest accountability system in the nation around teacher education, using student achievement to examine the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs through its Value Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model. The state’s teacher education accountability system focuses on teacher quantity, institutional performance, and university-district partnerships. The 2007-08 Value Added Teacher Preparation Assessment study revealed significant findings, including that some teacher preparation programs are producing new teachers whose effectiveness equals that of experienced teachers, and that “[v]arying levels of effectiveness exist within teacher preparation programs and across teacher preparation programs.”²¹ In terms of institutional performance, the state is now collecting data on: the percentage of program completers who took and passed PRAXIS subtests and ratings by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare them for their first year of teaching.²²

Louisiana has not created systemic linkages between its pre-service institutions and k–12 schools however. There is no real involvement from higher education in new teacher induction. Participation in the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program (LaTAAP), in place since 1994, is required however. LaTAAP, a two-year mentoring and assessment program, has two basic purposes: 1) To provide new teachers with a planned program of leadership and support from experienced educators; and

2) To provide assurance to the state prior to the issuance of a permanent Louisiana teacher certificate that the new teacher demonstrates competency in the understanding and use of the Louisiana teaching standards.

A relatively new state initiative does involve higher education in a targeted induction program for high-need school districts. The La FIRST (Framework for Inducting, Retaining and Supporting Teachers) Online program links high-need school districts to exemplary La FIRST school districts and supporting universities. The program provides induction support to new teachers in their first five years in the profession. In the 2008–09 school year, the FIRST Teacher Induction Partnership (TIP) program includes an initial 4–5 days of induction training before school begins, online professional development, and enhanced mentoring. Features of the E-Mentoring component include Department of Education contracted and supervised mentors, a mentor/new teacher ratio of 1:15, new teacher participation in an online environment, a focus on Louisiana teaching standards, and face-to-face meetings between mentors and new teachers.

Ohio—Teacher Quality Partnership

The Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) is a consortium of Ohio’s 50 teacher preparation institutions, the Ohio Department of Education, and the Ohio Board of Regents. It was formed out of the state’s desire to improve teacher preparation based on data on new and practicing teachers. The Ohio TQP is led by a Board of Directors made up of education deans from the University of Cincinnati, Cleveland State University, the University of Dayton, and Ohio State University. An Ohio Advisory Board with representatives from virtually all educational stakeholder groups in Ohio monitors project goals and planning and will become the forum for exploring the policy implications of the research findings. The Ohio TQP has embarked upon a series of five inter-related research studies to learn more about the characteristics of effective teachers and to identify the patterns of teacher preparation and professional learning that promote student achievement at different grade levels, in different subjects, and with different types of students.

Ohio Department of Education— Pre-Service Connections Committee

In partnership with the New Teacher Center, the Ohio Department of Education convened a Pre-Service Connections Committee during the 2008–09 school year to develop a set of recommended pre-service/induction linkages for Schools of Education that foster a more coherent and seamless transition into the teaching profession. The Committee has identified examples of pre-service tools and practices that support the recommended linkages and that align with the proposed induction program components developed by a concurrent k-12 Induction Program Committee. In addition, the Committee is seeking to identify ways in which schools of education can more deeply embed Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession into their programs, recommend standards-based formative assessment profiles around which induction program supports can be differentiated for individual beginning teachers.

Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative

Wisconsin, at least in spirit, actively engages IHE partners in the licensure of its initial educators. Approved by the State Legislature and endorsed by the Wisconsin PK-16 Council, the PI 34 administrative rule (the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative) governing educational program approval and licensing mandates a performance-based licensure system for teachers, and “for a period up to five years,” requires districts to provide a mentor, ongoing orientation, and support seminars for beginning teachers. Beginning teachers must convene an initial educator team that includes an IHE representative to approve goals and verify completion of a professional development plan. In practice, however, the IHE representative on the initial educator team is not always someone from the candidate’s preparation institution or someone knowledgeable about teacher development.

Fully implemented in 2004, PI 34 was developed collaboratively over a ten-year period. In 1995, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Restructuring Teacher Education and Licensure in Wisconsin Task Force—charged with developing a new structure for educator preparation and licensure—recommended what became PI 34. After years of public hearings and other gathered input, the final iteration of PI 34 was submitted to and approved by the state legislature in 2000 and rules were promulgated by the State Superintendent in 2001.

Strategic Road Map

The following steps are potential actions that key stakeholders—institutions of higher education (IHEs), states, and school districts—can take to create and implement a vision of an aligned teacher development system. As envisioned in this paper, the overarching goal is creating shared responsibility for teacher development among IHEs, states, and school districts. In many cases, actions can be taken by multiple stakeholders; often, such unified action is necessary to move a common vision forward. Nonetheless, as the traditional preparer of teachers and as the first step in the process of becoming a teacher, a disproportionate burden of the work necessarily falls on higher education. The following are suggested actions that can move alignment and partnership forward:

Higher Education

- **Convene a regularly occurring roundtable meeting** that includes all key stakeholders to build a strong partnership with a school district or consortia of districts. Key stakeholders would include campus leadership as well as faculty representing both the schools of education and arts & sciences. At the district level, stakeholders might include district and school administrators, school boards, teachers' unions, mentors and other teacher leaders.
- **Establish a partnership with districts where a large percentage of a pre-service program's graduates are placed.** A key purpose of such a partnership would be to identify schools to serve as clinical models of teacher preparation.
- **Improve the quality of district-based induction programs.** Building capacity to design and operate a quality induction program often is a challenge for school districts. IHE expertise can provide technical assistance in this regard and offer an opportunity for alignment with pre-service.
- **Make teacher education a university-wide commitment.** Leadership from university presidents, chancellors, and boards of regents is needed to bring together disparate campus interests—including schools of education and colleges of arts and sciences. A number of national organizations, including the American Council on Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the State Higher Education Executive Officers have identified this as a priority.
- Schools of education should **require all teacher candidates to student teach in a Title I school** so that they get a sense of school culture and how to employ culturally-responsive pedagogy. Teacher preparation candidates should enter these schools as early as possible in their pre-service education.

- **Modify tenure and promotion systems** to reward and encourage faculty to supervise K–12 clinical practice. A change in such policies could reduce a roadblock to college faculty participation in new teacher induction. Given its value, clinical work should not take a back seat to research and teaching in the tenure process.
- **Support virtual communities of mentors.** To continue supporting all program graduates, IHEs should stay engaged or connected with graduates during the induction period in schools located far from campus. Solutions such as web-based mentoring systems, distance learning technologies, and structured email accounts should be considered.
- **Provide a “road map” for beginning teachers.** To give a better sense of how teacher candidates get from here to there and how the pre-service programs connects to initial placement, IHEs should consider developing a continuum outlining the courses, seminars, and field experiences candidates and new teachers experience from pre-service through the induction period.

Schools and Districts

- **Establish a partnership with IHEs that prepare a large percentage of the district's new teachers.** A goal of such a partnership is to improve the content and contextualization of the pre-service program to the specific needs and realities of teaching in the district—including academic curriculum and the instructional needs of students.
- **Create an Office of Teacher Education.** Such an entity can help to facilitate critical stakeholder collaboration, interface with any coordinating bodies that might exist, and sustain a partnership with an IHE.
- **Design and implement a high-quality induction program for new teachers.** Such a program should seek to accelerate the learning curve of new teachers, not simply focus on administrative or psychological support. Elements such as a multi-year program, carefully selected and trained mentors, sanctioned time for mentor-new teacher interaction, and ongoing professional development for both beginning teachers and mentors characterize high-quality induction.
- **Establish a teacher residency program.** Teacher residency models pair academic instruction with a rigorous classroom practicum alongside an effective veteran teacher. In addition to meeting the needs of new teachers as well as individual schools and districts, the presence of such program outside can potentially create an impetus for reform of teacher education. Such programs, like the Boston Teacher Residency Program, can involve an IHE partnership. The University of Massachusetts-Boston awards successful program completers a Master's degree in education.

- **Develop lend-lease programs** where master teachers can work as adjunct professors in schools of education, without forfeiting their role as K–12 teachers. This is way to bring both clinical and contextualized knowledge of schools and districts into teacher training. Such a program may necessitate changes to employment contracts as well as a willing IHE partner.

States

- **Build a statewide p-16 data system.** States should ensure that data systems span the k–12/higher education divide and can link student and teacher data. States like Louisiana are beginning to use such value-added data to evaluate teacher preparations programs and measure the impact of new teachers in the classroom. The creation of such data systems is a specific requirement in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009—the federal stimulus legislation.
- **Create a commission focused on strengthening teacher education and induction.** State leaders—including governors, chief state school officers, boards of education, and legislators—can create a commission to examine the teacher development challenge specifically or to look more broadly at teacher quality. For example, Pennsylvania Governor Edward Rendell’s Commission on Training America’s Teachers examined and made specific recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and to link prek–12 education with teacher preparation.
- **Strengthen state vision, requirements, program standards, funding and infrastructure for new teacher induction.** State leadership is needed to recognize induction’s power to strengthen teacher practice and effectiveness rather than simply as a policy to address teacher retention. To move beyond the practice of simply providing a ‘buddy’ for new teachers, states should require universal participation of new teachers in an induction program, develop program standards as a tool to drive program quality and measure accountability, ensure a multi-year program of support, insist upon trained and supported mentors, and provide sufficient and stable funding. States may also want to give consideration to requiring that programs be designed, implemented & evaluated jointly by states, districts and IHEs.
- **Provide funding to develop collaborative partnerships between IHEs and school districts.** While some federal funding is available around such work—namely, Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants as authorized by the Higher Education Act—some seed money can go a long way to bringing partners together.

Conclusion

The alignment of teacher preparation and induction has been a focus of conversation among academics, practitioners, and policymakers for more than two decades. Calls continue to come from many quarters for greater action on this front. Most recently, James G. Cibulka, president of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, has vowed to use the organization as a “lever for reform,” urging institutions of higher education to build intensive partnerships with schools and districts.²³

Only in a select few settings have imagined reforms actually occurred. An on-going challenge is to continue to move this work forward and to create replicable partnership models and policies. Another challenge is actually demonstrating the impact of such work—not just for teachers, but also for their students and the schools they serve.

Advocates of such a system, including the Carnegie Corporation’s Teachers for a New Era initiative, have made a compelling case that an aligned system of teacher development is in the best interest of the educators themselves. But does it result in more effective teachers? And does it benefit students and schools? Perhaps it does, but we don’t really have sufficient evidence to demonstrate it.

Due to the rarity of data systems that bridge the divide between higher education and k–12 schools, it has been nearly impossible to measure the impact of the small number of partnerships and state policies that have sought to create a seamless teacher development continuum encompassing both pre-service education and new teacher induction. Theoretically, if the alignment is strong, then we should see a number of outcomes as a result: greater teacher satisfaction, increased educator self-efficacy, reduced new teacher attrition, stronger teacher evaluation data, and perhaps even improved student achievement.

If this paper leaves the reader with lasting impressions, the author would hope that they include the fundamental importance of systems alignment, the role of policy in envisioning and nurturing such a system, and the need for serious evaluation and research into the specific impacts of such a system on new teacher satisfaction, practice, retention and effectiveness.

This Policy Brief was produced with grant support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Endnotes

- 1 Robert Greenwald, Larry V. Hedges & Richard D. Laine, "The effect of school resources on student achievement," *Review of Educational Research* (Autumn 1996), pp. 361–396; Steven G. Rivkin, Eric A. Hanushek, and John F. Kain, "Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement," *Econometrica* (March 2005), pp. 417–458.
- 2 *A Baby Boom Tsunami: What Does It Mean For The Teaching Profession?* (Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, March 2009).
- 3 The institutions of higher education represented included Alverno College, California State University-Northridge, East Carolina University, Jackson State University, Montclair State University, Southeastern Louisiana University, University of Cincinnati, University of North Carolina-Greensboro, University of Texas-El Paso, and Western Kentucky University. (The NTC also worked with New York University and Stanford University but they were unable to have a representative at the meeting.) States with policy representation included California, Kentucky, New Jersey, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin.
- 4 Sharon Feiman-Nemser, "From Preparation to Practice: Designing a Continuum to Strengthen and Sustain Teaching," *Teachers College Record* (Vol. 103, No. 6, December 2001), pp. 1013–1055.
- 5 Kenneth R. Howey & Nancy L. Zimpher, "Pervasive problems and issues in teacher education," in G.A. Griffin (Ed.), *The education of teachers: Ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), pp. 279–305.
- 6 *Executive Summary: National Summit on High Quality Teacher Preparation June 28-30, 2004*, (Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and American's Future, 2004), retrieved at http://www.nctaf.org/resources/events/assessment-of-teacher-prep/documents/Executive_Summary-HQTP_Summit_Alverno.doc.
- 7 *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2005)*.
- 8 *Teaching at Risk: Progress & Potholes*, (New York: The Teaching Commission, Spring 2006), pp. 39–40.
- 9 Don Boyd, Pam Grossman, Hamp Lankford, Susanna Loeb & Jim Wyckoff, *Teacher Preparation and Student Achievement*, (August 2008), retrieved at <http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/portals/1/pdfs/Teacher%20Preparation%20and%20Student%20Achievement%20August2008.pdf>.
- 10 *No Dream Denied: A Pledge To America's Children*, (Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, January 2003).
- 11 Richard Ingersoll and Thomas M. Smith, "Do Teacher Induction and Mentoring Matter?" *NAASP Bulletin* (Vol. 88, No. 638, March 2004), pp. 28–40.
- 12 Feiman-Nemser, 2001.
- 13 John I. Goodlad, et.al., *The Teaching Career* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004).
- 14 Feiman-Nemser, 2001.
- 15 Patricia A. Wasley, *The Strengthening and Sustaining Teachers Initiative 1998-2007* (Seattle: University of Washington, undated). Retrieved at: http://www.nctaf.org/resources/demonstration_projects/sst/documents/SSTFinalReport.pdf.
- 16 Nancy Burstein, David Kretschmer, Christine Smith & Phyllis Gudoski, "Redesigning Teacher Education as a Shared Responsibility of Schools and Universities," *Journal of Teacher Education* (Vol. 50, No. 2., March–April 1999).
- 17 Patricia A. Wasley.
- 18 *High Quality Mentoring and Induction Practices* (Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center, 2007), http://www.newteachercenter.org/pdfs/Cap_Hill_HQM_final.pdf
- 19 Liam Goldrick, *New Teacher Support Pays Off*, (Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center, 2007), http://www.newteachercenter.org/pdfs/NTC_Policy_Brief-Hill_Briefing.pdf.
- 20 Linda Darling-Hammond, *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006).
- 21 George Noell (Louisiana State University and A&M College) and Jeanne M. Burns (Louisiana Board of Regents/Governor's Office), *Value Added Teacher Preparation Assessment, Overview of 2007-08 Study*, retrieved at [http://www.regents.louisiana.gov/Academic/TE/2008/Overview%20of%202007-08%20Value%20Added%20Teacher%20Preparation%20\(12.03.08\).pdf](http://www.regents.louisiana.gov/Academic/TE/2008/Overview%20of%202007-08%20Value%20Added%20Teacher%20Preparation%20(12.03.08).pdf).
- 22 Bruce Vandal and Barbara Thompson, *State Partnerships For Quality Teacher Preparation* (Denver: Education Commission of the States, May 2009).
- 23 *The Changing Context for Teacher Preparation and NCATE's Redesign to Align with Local, State, and National Needs* [PowerPoint], National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (February 2009); Vaishali Honawar, "New President Hopes to Use NCATE as Reform Lever" (Bethesda, MD: *Education Week*, October 8, 2008).

About The New Teacher Center

The New Teacher Center (NTC) was established in 1998 as a national resource focused on teacher and administrator induction. NTC implements and promotes induction best practices through a variety of innovative professional development opportunities and materials that assist educators and policy makers in supporting the next generation of education professionals. Using an integrated, collaborative approach, NTC strives to support essential research, well-informed policy, and thoughtful practice that encourage teacher development from pre-service throughout the career of a teacher.

New Teacher Center

Improving Teaching and Learning in America's Schools



This publication is printed on 10% post-consumer waste recycled paper using chemistry-free printing plates and vegetable-based inks. The virgin fiber is grown domestically and is certified by the Forest Stewardship Council as coming from sustainable forests.



725 Front Street, Suite 400, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
831-600-2200 | Fax: 831-427-9017 | info@newteachercenter.org
www.newteachercenter.org