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In 2012, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) released Our Responsibility, Our Promise, boldly challenging chiefs and other state leaders to raise expectations and strengthen policies for teacher preparation. The report argued that change was urgently needed in order for teacher preparation to keep pace with the increased demands being placed on P-12 students.

CCSSO supported this call to action by creating the Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP), a multi-year collaborative of states committed to taking policy action to ensure teachers are “learner-ready” from their first day in the classroom.

States that joined NTEP committed to using their authority over policy levers for teacher licensure, program approval, and data collection and reporting to pursue one or more of the 10 policy recommendations in Our Responsibility, Our Promise. Each NTEP state received technical support as part of its participation in the network, which concludes in late 2017.

I’m pleased to report that each state made important changes that will help ensure better-prepared teachers for our students. The network, which grew from an original cohort of seven states to 15 total, helped push educator preparation to the forefront of policy agendas at the state level and nationally. All 50 states have taken at least two of the 10 recommended policy actions, which far surpassed our original goal for 25 states to take action.

States that participated in NTEP will leave a legacy of innovation and lessons that will shape and guide continuous improvement in teacher preparation for years to come. For example, preparation program evaluations are more focused on how well aspiring teachers deliver instruction to students and the rigor of their clinical teaching experiences. States are raising standards for the approval of preparation programs. New data systems also are helping states to determine whether teachers are well prepared, find exemplars and identify struggling programs, and meet supply-and-demand challenges.

We prepared this document as a “playbook” for other states to follow in their efforts to strengthen teacher preparation. We offer specific steps that states can take, lessons learned from NTEP initiatives, and summaries of the impressive success stories from the states. We hope what we learned will inform continuing state efforts to improve educator preparation, particularly as much work remains.

This important work was made possible by our funders: the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation, Joyce Foundation, and S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation. We are deeply grateful for their support.

I want to thank the members of NTEP, the facilitators who guided the work, and the national partners who lent their expertise. Together, they modeled the power of collaboration and vision. Generations of students will benefit from their committed efforts.

Chris Minnich  
Executive Director  
Council of Chief State School Officers
Introduction
Support for State Innovation

Background

*Our Responsibility, Our Promise*, issued in 2012 by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), called on state leaders to make educator preparation a top state priority. The report did not shy away from specifics, reminding chiefs of their authority over licensure, approving programs to operate in their states, and data collection in addition to detailing 10 policy recommendations to pursue with those policy levers.

States needed support in this important and complex work. They required information, technical assistance, and most importantly, a space to share ideas, challenge conventional wisdom, and learn from others.

The Network’s Purpose

The Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP) was launched to provide an effective structure and routines for participating states, which were invited to join because of their proven commitment to innovative and aggressive reform of educator preparation. The network’s mission was to work with states to ensure new teachers are ready to teach each learner from the first day they enter the classroom as the teacher of record. This was the promise of the network’s members to future teachers: Those who invest their time, money, and dreams into becoming a teacher will be prepared in programs that will shape them into effective educators.

NTEP launched in October 2013 with a cohort of seven states that were taking steps toward reforming educator preparation or had the strong relationships in place necessary to move forward. Two years later, an additional cohort of eight states signed on. Together, these 15 states became visible and credible national leaders in reshaping the landscape of teacher preparation policy. The network’s overarching goal was that these states would produce model policies, program designs, lessons, tools, and resources to share with all states, so that by June 2017, a majority of states in the U.S. would have taken action on at least one of the 10 policy recommendations.

Early Challenges

Even under the best of conditions, making real and lasting change to teacher preparation was going to be messy. Overlapping agencies, appointed and elected leaders, and often complex layers of regulation govern the field. NTEP paved the way to success in spite of this tricky landscape by creating and facilitating a structure that required collaboration.

Not surprisingly, state officials can find it easier to work internally with colleagues they know. It’s much harder to build roles for outside partners or those with whom you disagree. However, NTEP required state teams to break down silos and build bridges across agencies and personnel. Participants often had to take steps to acknowledge and work through political differences, overcome concerns about turf, and share information or authority.

As their work progressed, state teams often found it difficult to meet one of the main requirements of NTEP participation, which was to agree to a definition of what it meant for a teacher to be “learner-ready” in their respective state. Creating this definition was so essential to guiding state work that it was part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that each state signed to join the network. While coming up with this definition was more difficult than anticipated, it was an essential first step to bringing each state team together around a shared vision of what a beginning teacher should know and be able to do.

NTEP State Cohorts

Cohort 1:
Connecticut • Idaho • Georgia • Kentucky • Louisiana • Massachusetts • Washington

Cohort 2:
California • Delaware • Missouri • New Hampshire • Oklahoma • South Carolina • Tennessee • Utah
Data collection and sharing presented another early challenge. All NTEP states agreed that they needed reliable and accessible data to make decisions about program effectiveness and to inform actions around teacher supply and demand. Less anticipated, however, were the many challenges to building such systems. For one, states quickly realized that they did not have adequate data to evaluate past and present performance of educator preparation programs. Other states realized that they did not know exactly what information was available because although it was being gathered, it was not being shared. A delay in federal regulations that influence state data collection also slowed progress while states waited for clarity around reporting requirements. Ultimately, the biggest obstacle for states was determining a clear theory of action for building their data systems. While this proved to be one of NTEP’s biggest challenges, it was also an area where several states made the most progress.

Choosing an Outcomes-Focused Approach

For NTEP to be a success, CCSSO was clear that progress could not be glacial; NTEP had to demonstrate that meaningful progress could be made in two to three years. In order to manage this change, CCSSO very deliberately evaluated several models for scaling impact and chose the Aligned Action Network model, which provides step-by-step guidance to build, grow, and support a long-term, action- and outcomes-based network (see Page 5). Aligned Action Network addresses the same issue in multiple locations, aiming for impact and scale. The work in the first two years focused on engaging state and national partners, creating “proof points” of policy innovation, and advocacy to accelerate – not impede – state policy innovation.

NTEP’s work was managed by the U.S. Education Delivery Institute under the leadership of Kathy Cox, the former Georgia state superintendent of schools. This leadership was essential in setting expectations and organizing regular meetings, holding participants accountable, and facilitating the critical relationships between each state and the technical assistance provider assigned to it as part of NTEP.

States were accountable and supported. For example, each state’s MOU, in addition to calling for a definition of “learner-ready,” required the state to agree to regular participation, drafting an action plan to address the three targeted policy levers and submitting regular progress reports. The MOUs helped NTEP guarantee ongoing participation and collaboration toward achieving measurable policy outcomes.

At the same time, each state was assigned a facilitator to keep it on track while also providing technical assistance. Each facilitator was selected with the needs and context of each state in mind. For example, some states asked for a strong leader, while others wanted a facilitator skilled in building relationships. All experts in teacher preparation and policy, the facilitators were given license to “nudge” as necessary to move state participants along. Sub-grants also were provided to each state to secure targeted assistance in their particular areas of need, such as convening local partner meetings or auditing state data systems. Cohort 2 states also learned from the lessons and examples of Cohort 1 states – with some second-round states even “shadowing” the work of their peers by joining meetings and calls, and checking in regularly on their work and progress.

Moving the Needle

The combination of an Aligned Action Network structure with routines, clear goals, and facilitated technical support made it possible for states to make significant progress in a relatively short time. As a result, teacher licensure assessments are far more likely today to measure the classroom performance of aspiring teachers in addition to their content knowledge. More educator preparation programs are meeting rigorous standards based on the effectiveness of their graduates. And it’s increasingly likely that data systems are providing meaningful and timely information to help programs make continuous improvements and to help meet educator supply-and-demand needs. Just as important, these systems are giving the public transparent and regular information about how well teachers are being prepared.

While more work needs to be done, NTEP showed that states can move quickly to strengthen educator preparation. Not only did each NTEP state make progress toward the 10 goals outlined for them, but every state in the nation has accomplished at least two of the goals since NTEP launched in 2013.

NTEP showed that states can move quickly to strengthen educator preparation.
Building an Aligned Action Network

CCSSO chose the Aligned Action Network model for NTEP’s work because it provided step-by-step guidance to help teams in each state reach their goals for impact and scale.

Know the Network
- Map the issues, the stakeholders, and existing connections.

Knit the Network
- Connect and engage stakeholders.
- Nurture network stewards and leaders.
- Define and create different entry points into network activity, reflecting range of interests.

Organize the Network
- Begin to work together to support pilot state strategies and pursue collaborative work.
- Establish shared structures and processes (e.g. norms of engagement).
- Develop systems for ongoing learning and adaptation.

Grow the Network
- Grow and diversify network participation.
- Build enduring trust and connectivity.
- Decentralize network functions over time.
- Spread, deepen, diversify network strategies.

Transform or Transition the Network
- Evaluate network effectiveness and impact.
- If transforming: Refine/redefine network value proposition.
- If transitioning: Distribute reusable assets (including knowledge).
Reforming educator preparation is complex and difficult. But it can be done. States in NTEP learned that taking deliberate steps along a planned roadmap produced results. Key ingredients were organizing work with a clear goal in mind, consistent routines, facilitation, accountability measures, and having the right people at the table, including critical friends who provided necessary and sometimes difficult feedback. These steps are part of the playbook that led to progress in a time period that, for many states, was extremely short by state policy standards.

Understand your policy landscape and make sure to involve all of the agencies and actors involved in educator preparation. The policy and regulatory environment around educator preparation can be complex. Authority over licensure, program approval, and data can reside in different agencies and departments, all of which need a seat at the table. Public, private, and alternative programs that prepare educators also need to be involved. Understanding the state landscape and engaging all the necessary stakeholders is an essential early step that makes long-term success more likely.

Use a “guiding document” to set clear goals for action. Your guiding document will help you build a shared vision for desired outcomes and avoid drifting away from your intended purpose. Clear goals will help ensure your work is focused and stays aligned with the shared vision established by your guiding document. NTEP used the report Our Responsibility, Our Promise as its guiding document. The report laid out clear goals and an urgent call to action that kept NTEP work focused and on track, and provided the common lens through which states evaluated and supported one another.

Provide funding. Funding for technical assistance from experts can be extremely useful to introduce new tools, help address complex problems, and provide outside perspective on what is achievable. Funding is often most helpful later in the process, after specific needs for technical assistance and other challenges are identified.

Establish a process for managing your work. Participants need a process that guides this work. That process should include regular routines, accountability measures, and clear expectations for end products. While there are many approaches, NTEP followed the Aligned Action Network format for launching and sustaining a network. Each state also signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing to several actions, such as creating a plan to develop and implement policy and a plan to engage local stakeholders. States were held accountable, in part, by contributing regular written updates on progress through “stock-takes” that were shared across the network.

Designate a facilitator. Experts and facilitators can play an invaluable role to help tailor ideas, recommendations, and resources and to keep progress on track. They can “nudge” stakeholders and partners when necessary. In fact, NTEP learned that some state teams wanted a facilitator to actively push members and hold them accountable. Other states decided that they needed a facilitator who could be more of a supportive coach to help members work toward their goals.

Keep students’ needs front and center. Tie your work to students. Ask yourselves, “What do teachers need to do to advance learning from Day 1 in the classroom?” “How will you know if new teachers are ready?” One of the most important questions states can ask is: “Have we done everything we can with our policy levers to get a learner-ready teacher in front of students and provide a pathway to continued learning?”

Understand where you are and where you want to go with data. Changing and updating systems requires first knowing where you are in order to get to where you want to go. States in NTEP took two essential steps that moved them toward being able to update data systems. First, states often had to determine what data was collected, by whom, and how it was used. Some states discovered that important data was already collected, but, because of prohibitive policies or issues related to turf, was not shared with preparation programs and others who needed it most. Another early step that states took was to determine what data should be collected in new systems. To guide that effort, states used a process of self-analysis called A Guide to Key Effectiveness Indicators, by Teacher Preparation Analytics, to set new outcomes-based indicators for educator preparation and to identify exactly what data to collect.

Involve partners, but give them clear roles. Be clear and specific about the role that partners can play and tasks they can take on. Some partners might be better at the start to help inform the process and support initial meetings, while others might be more useful later, when participants know exactly what they need from outside partners, such as technical assistance. For partners to be effective, they should not be involved until their roles are clear.

Don’t go at this alone. States that embark on this essential work will find that it is rich with potential for improvement but also challenging. The good news is that others have pioneered this work. They have identified and revised conflicting policies, reorganized governance structures, identified effective vendors, and built support for controversial changes. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the NTEP states are great resources for lessons and guidance. Whatever you are trying to do, chances are others have been there and would be eager to share their experiences.
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: If You Want to Go Far, Bring Others Along

Given its clear and relatively aggressive vision for progress by participating states, NTEP recognized the need to get input and build support around difficult and often-controversial changes in educator preparation. Each state’s MOU required the state to create a policy development and implementation plan that included a strategy for communicating with and engaging stakeholders to advance its agenda. States did not get their sub-grants until they had prepared this plan and provided evidence that they had involved key stakeholders.

The MOU asked states to spell out how they would build momentum, inform implementation, and win public and political will to support policy change. The target audiences included P-12 leadership, educator preparation faculty and administrators, education governance and policymakers, advocacy groups, business and philanthropic leaders, and most importantly, teachers. CCSSO created a similar plan with national partners and organizations to shape a national dialogue to build on the NTEP state work to transform educator preparation.

State Examples

**Connecticut** state leaders knew they needed to bring together a broad range of stakeholders to help guide and inform educator preparation reforms for the process to succeed. Connecticut grounded its efforts in the work of the Education Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC). EPAC began meeting regularly in 2012 and was tasked with conducting research, shaping future policies, and planning for statewide implementation. EPAC identified six teacher and leader preparation principles to guide its work, which included raising program entry and completion standards, improving clinical experience requirements, building supports and partnerships, and ensuring providers receive data needed to inform continuous improvement. State officials believe the approach will help meet the needs of the state’s districts and schools, strengthen the quality of Connecticut’s teaching force, and improve student learning in the classroom.

**Georgia** was a model state for effective stakeholder engagement strategies to support NTEP-related work. The Georgia Department of Education collaborated with the Georgia Professional Standards Commission and the University System of Georgia to create regional P-20 collaboratives. They were charged with helping promote continuous program improvement and student achievement through the preparation of teacher candidates and the professional development of P-20 educators. The collaboratives were essential to facilitating improvements statewide in clinical experiences and residencies in teacher preparation. They also helped build understanding and support for major policy changes, such as a new performance assessment required for licensure.

**Louisiana** built on the leadership and collaboration between P-12 and higher education officials to advance changes to preparation program approval and accountability regulations. Much of the vision and foundation for the changes grew out of an accountability working group led by the Louisiana Department of Education, Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Board of Regents. New regulations call for a yearlong classroom residency alongside an experienced mentor teacher, coupled with a competency-based curriculum that will provide candidates with the knowledge and skills needed to be prepared for their first day of teaching. The changes were informed by Louisiana’s teacher preparation pilot program, Believe and Prepare, and two years of public discussion, input from a survey of 6,000 educators, and more than 50 meetings and focus groups. Teacher candidates admitted to programs in the 2018-19 school year will be the first to experience the required yearlong residency and new competency-based curricula.

**Missouri** is one of an increasing number of states that have sought input from teachers in the field to help inform and guide changes in preparation policies and practices. Representatives of university teacher preparation programs and staff from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education held a series of half-day forums across the state last year as part of a state effort to change how teachers are prepared for the classroom and supported once they get there. Veteran teachers as well as new teachers advised the department on issues ranging from the soft skills teacher candidates need, to keeping professional development useful and relevant once they’re on the job. Of particular interest during the forums was getting input from those who mentor new teachers, to help the state education department improve training for preservice teachers.
POLICY LEVER: Raising the Bar for Teachers Through Licensure Reform

NTEP chose teacher licensure as one of its three main policy levers because it is a critical area over which states have control. Licensure also is a gateway to the profession that exerts tremendous influence over the readiness of new teachers. Initial licensure requirements communicate to preparation programs the expectations for new teachers, which in turn drives how programs create and organize curriculum and clinical experiences that are relevant for today’s classrooms.

When Our Responsibility, Our Promise came out, it urged state leaders to ask themselves, “What do we want licensure to do?” The traditional answer had been a “do no harm” policy of minimum qualifications for educators prior to practicing in a classroom or school. The result was tremendous variability from program to program, across states, within states, and even within the same institution or preparation provider. These variations in educator preparation played out negatively in the field. School districts found that some new teachers were prepared to be effective, while others needed immediate professional development. Similarly, states were uncertain about the level of readiness of teachers coming from other states, making reciprocity much more difficult.

The network’s launch coincided with a heightened national focus on how teachers are recruited, prepared, and licensed. Participating states not only harnessed that momentum, but have led the way to use licensure to determine whether a candidate recommended for licensure is capable of advancing learning for each student on Day 1. They are answering that question through new policies and practices, such as:

- Requiring prospective teachers to pass assessments based on teaching in classrooms. These performance-based assessments complement long-standing subject-matter tests and represent one of the most influential shifts in licensure policy. Aspiring teachers must demonstrate they have the skills needed to effectively teach what they know. The performance assessments being used by states include the Stanford University-developed edTPA, the Educational Testing Service-developed PPAT, and state-developed performance assessments, such as the one developed by Massachusetts.

- Setting higher minimum GPA requirements for entry into educator preparation programs as a way to attract more academically capable students. States also are looking at and updating how preparation programs use school-based, clinical experiences to prepare new teachers.

- Requiring programs to build in additional time, variety, and closer supervision for the clinical experiences they require of candidates for program completion.

Despite this progress, NTEP states found two licensure policy areas particularly challenging: reciprocity of licenses across states and tiered licensure.

Reciprocity was envisioned as the mutual agreement between states to recognize and accept the licenses of teachers from other states. Conversations in NTEP instead led to a new vision for reciprocity built on a shared agreement about what constitutes a learner-ready teacher. Common agreements around rigorous standards, program quality, and the ability to share data could replace the need for formal reciprocity among states around initial licenses. Many states regarded as a higher priority easing the mobility of veteran teachers across state lines — and grade levels — which would not require reciprocity agreements.

States in NTEP also made little collective progress toward the goal to “create multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a coherent developmental continuum that reflects new performance expectations …” States found that more work must be done to better understand and create tiered licensure systems that connect initial licensure, professional development, and advancement opportunities through all stages of a teacher’s career. Network states also had different views on what advancement, evaluation, and licensure should look like for mid-career teachers.
State Examples

**Delaware** now sets minimum statewide entry requirements for educator preparation programs. Teacher candidates must have a 3.0 grade-point average, be in the top 50th percentile in grades, or score at the college-ready level on a test of general knowledge, such as the SAT.

**Georgia** created a multi-tiered licensure system that offers more opportunities for teachers who remain in the classroom to grow professionally. Students and teachers benefit because the new structure recognizes the developmental needs of teachers at each stage of their career. As a result, preservice teachers and veterans are more likely to get the right support — and opportunities — at the right times. The four categories of licensure are Preservice, Induction, Professional, and Advanced & Lead Professional.

Preservice certification is for educator candidates completing field experiences or student teaching in Georgia schools. They must pass a criminal record check as well as the Georgia Educator Ethics Assessment. The Induction certificate is for teachers with fewer than three years of experience within the last five years. Designed to last three years, it is meant to ensure that early-career teachers are fully prepared for the profession while providing opportunities for professional growth. To get an Induction certification, graduates of Georgia preparation programs must earn passing scores on the edTPA performance-based assessment and state-approved content assessments. The playing field is the same for Georgia’s new teachers who come from outside the state. To get an Induction certificate to teach, they also must earn passing scores on edTPA and the Georgia Educator Ethics Assessment.

**Massachusetts** revamped its performance assessment system for teacher candidates by aligning it to the standards that are used to evaluate Massachusetts teachers. The shift created aligned expectations for teacher candidates statewide. New teachers are now more familiar with those standards and better prepared for what’s expected of them beginning on Day 1 in a school.

Higher education officials in Massachusetts say that the change in the performance assessment has had profound effects on preparation programs. Some programs have revised field experiences so that candidates spend more time in classrooms in their pre-practicum period. As a result, they are ready to conduct more lessons for K-12 students during their practicum. Faculty members and mentors can work with candidates who are struggling early in their practicum, giving them more feedback earlier rather than trying to fix problems in later years.

**POLICY LEVER: Rigorous Preparation**

**Program Standards, Evaluation, and Approval**

The evaluation process that determines whether a program meets state standards and can be approved to operate is another critical lever for change in educator preparation. To ensure that an educator preparation program continues to meet the requirements set by the state, two stages of program approval are required: initial and reauthorization.

Building aligned systems of initial approval and reauthorization around clear and rigorous standards elevates the quality of all programs while supporting their ongoing improvement. When effective, these systems can be used to rate individual programs, target support for those that are struggling, and help align standards for future teachers with what their students are expected to learn.

States in NTEP have used this lever to raise both the standards and requirements for program approval and to strengthen the review process so that it is more helpful to preparation programs. The states have based this work on research that identifies the key factors in strong teacher preparation and models for supporting teachers during their initial years on the job and throughout their careers. In the process, states are creating the conditions that can help preparation programs move beyond criticism that their coursework is out of sync with the demands of the job or that they fail to develop effective relationships with the school communities that they serve.

Many of the first cohort of NTEP states already had been developing baselines for their preparation standards by auditing their state standards for K-12 students and comparing them with the content requirement for teachers, particularly in English, language arts, and mathematics. States often had to bring together K-12 and higher education officials for these reviews, and then again to make subsequent adjustments in the content required for preparation programs.

Taking this initial step helped NTEP states move closer to a vision of continuous program improvement based on transparent and rigorous criteria for program completion. No longer would it be enough for candidates to complete a series of courses, without knowing what skills and knowledge they had acquired and whether they could apply them in classroom settings. Progress in this area by NTEP states included:

- Updating the standards that are used to review and approve programs. As they do this, NTEP states are shifting away from looking primarily at “inputs,” such as faculty qualifications and program resources. Instead, they are focusing much more on how a prospective teacher actually performs in the program.
Leading the Way

These examples illustrate the changes institutions have made to transform educator preparation.

California State University

As part of the California State University system’s mission to continuously improve the preparation of future teachers across its 22 campuses, the Center for Teacher Quality conducts evaluation and reports evidence on teacher preparation outcomes. By administering surveys to recent program completers or employers and supervisors, the center’s work provides a detailed picture of program quality and highlights opportunities for focused improvement.

Southern Connecticut State University

Before Southern Connecticut State University could advance plans to improve program outcomes, teacher educators sought input from local superintendents. The first meeting, a breakfast with leaders from surrounding districts, soon transformed into a quarterly gathering of university and district leadership and cemented their growing partnership. The collaboration has improved clinical field experiences and is working to meet the needs of local schools and students.

Wilmington University

Wilmington University built a fully integrated preparation experience that positions candidates as co-teachers alongside mentors for a sustained period of time. The university supported this new model by implementing cost reductions that maintained the credit value of its clinical program and allowed candidates as much class time as possible, all while achieving the same programmatic goals.

Mercer University

Mercer University’s Tift College of Education and Ingram-Pye Elementary School in Macon, Ga., set out in 2012 to create a collaborative learning environment that would contribute to candidate and faculty development while meeting the needs of all learners. The resulting professional development school has been credited with transforming the work of the university and the achievement of students at Ingram-Pye.

Louisiana Tech University

The faculty at LA Tech transformed the traditional student-teaching triad into a team approach with partners across the university and surrounding parish schools. The collaborative TEaM model (Teacher Educators and Mentors) helped connect staff supporting teacher candidates at their clinical sites, and created a clinical liaison position responsible for ongoing, onsite professional development and communication.

Endicott College

With support from the state Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Endicott College took steps to increase its use of data to drive program improvement and meet the needs of future educators. With this pivot, faculty were able to set targeted goals, such as improving elementary candidates’ preparedness to teach math, and measure impact on students in the classroom.
Missouri State University
The Missouri State University College of Education established a year-long internship program to replace traditional student teaching. Instead of student teachers spending 12 weeks with a cooperating teacher and a supervisor, interns co-teach from August through May with master teachers and under the careful guidance of a teacher-in-residence, in partnership with a university director of interns.

Institutions of Higher Education Network
The New Hampshire IHE Network was created in 2011 to influence policymakers and engage practitioners to promote innovative programs and policies that link initial educator preparation, new educator induction, and ongoing professional development. The network includes educational professionals from all public and private higher education educator preparation programs in the state, and remains focused on the shared aim of program accountability.

University of Central Oklahoma
New partnership agreements with local schools allowed the University of Central Oklahoma to codify shared authority in teacher candidate placements and to guarantee its teacher candidates were placed with high-quality co-teachers willing and capable of scaffolding and supporting novice teachers. To further this commitment to high-quality mentoring relationships, the university has trained more than 1,100 teachers in partner schools as co-teachers and has developed an online training module that can be completed during one planning period.

Clemson University
To prepare the next generation of learner-ready teachers, faculty and leadership at Clemson University are proposing important changes to their programs to better ensure the quality of their graduates. The College of Education plans to start offering undergraduate majors a combined bachelor’s-master’s degree path with an embedded teacher residency program. The changes would represent a truly innovative way to better prepare their candidates for the classroom.

Lipscomb University
Lipscomb University uses data from local and state partners to focus on local district needs. To address the gap between the diversity of area students and that of their teachers, Lipscomb partnered with a local foundation and school district to found the Pionero Scholars program. The partnership provides a scholarship and outreach program that aims to increase the number of local minority students who enroll at Lipscomb and the number who envision themselves as future educators.

Utah Valley University
Utah Valley University’s School of Education recently embarked on a yearlong planning process to develop a clinically based teacher preparation program. The resulting pilots were developed in partnership with the Alpine, Nebo and Park City school districts and reflect a broad consensus on beneficial program designs, embedded academic preparation and 21st century teaching and learning.

Northwest University
Northwest University’s College of Education is committed to helping local districts develop innovative pathways to certification that help address local workforce needs. As part of the university’s Grow-Your-Own alternative route program, paraprofessionals or those employed with conditional certifications can access online coursework and participate in guided field experiences while working in their current roles.
• Adapting the national accreditation standards set by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Some states are supplementing CAEP standards with their own standards that respond to local needs. Others are piloting the Inspectorate model, in which a team of four to five trained, experienced P-12 educators and teacher educators work for three to four days to gather evidence and provide feedback on key aspects of the teacher preparation experience.

• Supplementing CAEP reviews with their own state-level reviews, reports, or report cards. Reviews by CAEP for voluntary, national accreditation are done every seven years. Increasingly, states want more frequent reviews. The supplemental reviews provide information to guide programs in continuous improvement, signal where performance is weak, and identify successes.

• Developing clear and fair ratings systems that provide feedback to programs and the public on where programs stand on important components of preparation. These can be used to guide improvement efforts. States are also moving to provide the support and resources to help programs with these efforts.

• Expecting preparation programs to meet the supply-and-demand challenges in local school communities, both for a diverse teacher workforce and for specific subject-matter expertise. Some states are building these requirements into their program approval and review standards.

Some NTEP states overcame resistance and other challenges to even discussing more rigorous approval and review policies. That was particularly true when policies proposed rating preparation programs or calling to close down programs that are chronically low-performing. The reasons for the resistance varied and often made sense. States facing severe teacher shortages, for example, said they could not afford to lose a program and the teachers it produces. Other states were caught up in the backlash against P-12 teacher evaluation and school accountability systems that were seen as shaming — rather than supporting — low performers. States responded differently to these concerns, though all have moved toward higher expectations for new teachers coupled with giving programs better information and support to help them improve, before taking more drastic actions that could include closure.

Second, NTEP was launched at the same time that the two national accreditation bodies for teacher preparation programs combined to form CAEP. Though the merger was widely supported in the field, the transition to new national accreditation standards and processes for accreditation simply has not kept pace with the aggressive visions for reform in the NTEP states; while many adopted the CAEP process to approve the programs that will operate in the state, others developed standards they believe are more relevant and are conducting their own, more frequent program reviews.

**State Examples**

**California** completely redesigned its accreditation process to focus on outcomes. In the future, the state’s 250 programs that prepare educators will be required to focus on the results they are achieving, rather than on student coursework or other more administrative inputs. At the core of this work are new expectations for beginning teachers’ performance, which were adopted in June 2016. The Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) are a marked departure from the state’s previous standards and are aligned with the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards, which have been adopted in California. Both sets of standards emphasize developing critical, analytical, and creative thinking in students.

The TPEs also are directly and purposely aligned to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession that guide California teacher induction programs and ongoing teacher development in California. This alignment helps connect new teachers to a progression of support for all stages of a teacher’s career. The TPEs are organized by six domains, or detailed descriptions of expectations that beginning teachers must meet for licensure:

- Engaging and supporting all students in learning
- Creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning
- Understanding and organizing subject matter for student learning
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for all students
- Assessing student learning
- Developing as a professional educator

**Connecticut** seized an opportunity to streamline its program approval process by adopting national CAEP standards. The Educator Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC), which was formed by Connecticut in 2012 to evaluate statewide educator preparation practices, viewed the state’s system as expensive and cumbersome for institutions of higher education and time-consuming for State Board of Education administrators. By linking state approval processes to a process sponsored by a national organization, institutions would be able to provide the same documentation they need for CAEP accreditation to the state to be approved.

An additional benefit of this new approach is that much of the data that institutions must provide for CAEP accreditation...
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Kentucky began transforming education in the state with the passage of Senate Bill 1 in 2009. Kentucky has taken several steps since then to revamp its educator preparation system to produce teachers who can teach to the higher standards for students. The state has revised its licensure exam for teacher candidates to align with the standards that are used for evaluating practicing teachers. These revisions will help prospective teachers understand the standards they are expected to meet in the classroom and prepare for them even before they take on teaching positions.

To improve the information about the quality of preparation programs, Kentucky developed the Kentucky Educator Preparation Accountability System (KEPAS). It includes data on the selectivity of programs, the performance of candidates on licensure exams, placement rates of completers, the satisfaction of completers and their employers with the preparation programs, scores on evaluations of practicing teachers, and more. The system helps programs identify strengths and weaknesses, and make improvements by learning from others who excel in particular areas.

Louisiana’s Board of Regents led a statewide initiative to align the content standards for preparing teachers to the new college-and-career standards for students in grades P-12. The state created Campus Leadership Teams at each institution to engage higher education faculty and leaders in discussions and decisions about the standards and related assessments adopted in Louisiana. Faculty members in teacher preparation programs received professional development about the standards and the state’s teacher evaluation system. Finally, they aligned the curriculum in the educator preparation programs with the expectations for PK-12 students.

Massachusetts created a system to review teacher education programs that holds programs accountable for outcomes and promotes continuous improvement through the use of data to evaluate their results and make adjustments. All programs are required to provide evidence that they are meeting state standards based on outcomes, rather than on complying with requirements for the design of the programs. Massachusetts also recognizes programs of particularly high quality with diversified ratings like approved “with distinction,” in support of elevating and encouraging best practices in educator preparation. Programs with zero or very low enrollments complete a “needs assessment” and must demonstrate a state-specific need for the program and demonstrate their capacity to meet the demand. Under this system, institutions have — on their own — closed dozens of programs. Because of shortages, this requirement doesn’t apply to programs in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM).

Missouri developed and implemented its annual performance report (APR) in order to grade institutions and help them see where they are on the continuum toward excellence. Each institution is graded on factors such as the grade-point averages and test scores of its graduates. That report, which state officials now call APR 1.0, indicated whether the programs met, or did not meet, state goals. For the next version, APR 1.5, the state used the same indicators, but graded the programs on a five-point scale on each indicator to help institutions see where they were on the continuum toward excellence and strengthen areas that needed it. Additional metrics may be added to future versions of APR. Officials are looking at potential measures around partnerships between preparation programs and school districts for clinical placements, for example. The state currently requires a minimum of 12 weeks of student teaching; some institutions provide longer placements. Measures of teacher effectiveness may also be added. In the past, Missouri officials reviewed programs only every seven years, so the APR represents a strong step toward continuous improvement.

New Hampshire has embraced a plan to align higher education and P-12 learning systems to better meet the needs of all students. To get there, the state formed extensive and sustained partnerships across policy and education communities. Both NTEP and the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR), for instance, made developing strong district-preparation program partnerships a priority, which state leaders say built momentum for changes. As a result, state teams were able to take a major step forward by auditing and updating 2013 educator preparation program rule changes that were never fully implemented. The Department of Education presented new rules for legislative approval in 2017.

The new rules sought to close gaps around guidance on clinical experiences, a key focus area for improving educator preparation programs in New Hampshire. Not only do the rules seek to institutionalize robust on-the-job experience in policy, but the Department will work with colleges and universities to design and test models that boost the time and quality of clinical experience. The team also made sure that the proposed state-based accreditation standards met all of the national requirements of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). And instead of site visits by the department, programs going through the approval process will have to make rigorous presentations to the department’s Council for Teacher Education.
POLICY LEVER: Using Data to Measure Success and Continuous Improvement

The success and public perception of the nation’s educator-effectiveness agenda depends in large part on states’ ability to collect and report information in ways that are meaningful to multiple stakeholders. States are making significant progress in this area, though data systems continue to be works in progress and states are at very different stages in developing the systems they need.

The NTEP work launched amid a growing consensus in states that the effectiveness of new teachers at advancing learning should be a central metric for assessing the success of graduates and the programs that prepared them. However, these systems were far from fully developed. Shortcomings included gaps in data being collected, the quality and relevance of data, the connectivity of various data systems, the ability to analyze data, and the political will of state leaders. As a result, the absence of common data and indicators had led to a lack of consistency in the data that was collected and shared in states.

States in NTEP have made progress in this area, beginning with a common vision for data systems for educator preparation. They agreed that improving the quality, frequency, and usefulness of data is essential to determining whether programs are graduating teachers who are effective in the classroom with all students. Effective data systems make it possible to give preparation programs information to understand how well they and their candidates are performing, making it easier for programs to adjust and improve quickly and continuously. Such data systems give state officials information to review and approve programs, identify exemplars, assist where there are ongoing problems, and close ineffective programs. Increasingly, states also want data systems that help determine whether institutions, and the preparation programs they offer, are helping local school communities meet the needs for educator diversity and subject-matter expertise.

Educator preparation programs have worked through many challenges to make this progress. The early NTEP states launched with a backdrop of concerns over data privacy during the transition to statewide assessments aligned with the Common Core State Standards. Federal policymakers also began discussing changes to the Higher Education Act and reporting requirements for educator preparation programs.

As they negotiated in these often highly charged environments, a more basic concern arose: What data could and should be collected to support program approval and improvement? As a starting point, CCSSO and Teacher Preparation Analytics created the Key Effectiveness Indicators (KEI) for educator preparation. The KEI framework includes 12 measurable outcomes, or “indicators” of program performance, and suggests 20 measures that operationalize them. CCSSO then supported most NTEP states to use the tool to measure whether they were collecting that data and, if so, how frequently and by whom.

By working together to create goals for data systems and then sharing lessons and resources, NTEP states made significant progress toward updating data systems to support the transformation of educator preparation. That progress included:

- Reviewing data-collecting efforts already underway in their states. This included auditing the data being gathered and how it was being shared and used. It was not unusual to find data being collected, but not shared beyond the agency that gathered it.
• Developing state-level governance structures that align and clarify the roles within states for gathering, analyzing, and disseminating data more efficiently to state agencies and boards, preparation programs, and the public.

• Building and implementing data systems that are operating to inform preparation programs, hiring practices, and professional learning.

• Providing data-related training to state- and institution-level staff to help them understand, share, and use data for continuous program improvement.

• Creating data-based report cards of core indicators around preparation effectiveness and sharing the report cards with programs and the public.

• Building data-based rating systems of educator preparation programs. The ratings are publicly available and are used to guide program improvement and to help the public — including school districts and prospective teacher candidates — see which programs are the most effective.

The state progress around data systems came with challenges and lessons. One of the most important lessons is that building new data systems requires baseline research and understanding. The early NTEP states began, in part, by examining their own governance structures to determine who held needed data. It was not unusual for them to find that while data was being collected, it was held by different agencies and vendors. Often, those agencies and vendors were prevented by state policy from sharing the data. In other cases, it was protected as part of an agency’s turf. The bottom line, though, was that important data and information often were not getting to those who were in the best position to use it.

Another challenge for states was determining exactly what data should be collected and how it should be gathered, particularly to support an intensified, outcomes-based focus on how well programs prepare their graduates. While several efforts emerged to help states, one approach in particular was used by all the initial NTEP states. Working with CCSSO and Teacher Preparation Analytics, which provides technical assistance to improve educator preparation programs, states used the KEI tool to analyze the ability of their data systems to collect and report on more outcome-oriented data. This baseline gave the states a roadmap to use with their state agencies to begin building out new, more robust systems.

While some states are further along than others, lead states have shared what they have learned to help other states catch up and build even stronger systems. This work remains an ongoing priority in all NTEP states.

State Examples

California taps its statewide educator preparation data system to create public dashboards that include a wide range of indicators. The information ranges from how a program’s graduates score on the revised Teaching Performance Assessments to surveys of school districts about the performance of newly hired educators. The data also will be used to help California identify and meet teacher workforce demands: One of the data dashboards will focus specifically on supply-and-demand information for the educator workforce in the state. Gov. Jerry Brown and the legislature also approved $5 million to create a Center for Teaching Careers that will use the data to support statewide and regional recruitment and collaboration between employers and preparation programs.

Delaware set new standards for teacher licensure and educator preparation programs in 2013. The law also instituted new program approval and renewal mechanisms that would be based on a data-driven system led by the state, in lieu of solely relying on national accreditation.

The Delaware Department of Education released a preliminary “scorecard” in 2015. The second, and consequential, scorecard came out in 2016. It evaluates programs on recruitment, including the diversity of candidates; candidate performance and assessment results; placement, including teaching in high-needs schools; how well candidates do as teachers and how long they stay on the job; and the perceptions of graduates and supervisors.

Programs earn an overall performance rating based on data, which places them into one of four tiers. Tier 1 programs earn the highest rating, while Tier 4 programs are subject to intervention. The primary goal of the scorecards is to create public transparency, determine where programs are excelling or need supports to foster continuous improvement, and make program renewal decisions based on results.

Oklahoma is building a centralized education preparation data system and the rules to govern its operation. Such a system has long been sought by educator preparation programs to help track the success of their graduates and to support program improvement. The work began with the formation of a data governance committee and then continued with the help of the state’s NTEP team, which mapped the data needs of preparation programs. The elements included basic demographic information; the schools where their graduates teach; their subjects, and grades; where teachers move in the profession; how well teachers manage a classroom; and qualitative measures of a teacher’s impact on student achievement.

Data sharing will be facilitated by the Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability, but the team was able
to utilize a statewide data-management system to house the information. The first round of data, including the rudimentary demographics, was collected and uploaded during the 2016-17 school year. In the next round, the more performance-based measures will be incorporated. The goal is to give programs timely and relevant feedback on what’s happening in the classroom, and the ability to determine where they need to make changes in their curriculum. Data can be used to identify the preservice supports provided in programs that result in teacher effectiveness in the classroom. This data should be in one place, in an easy-to-understand format.

**South Carolina** has worked to develop a detailed understanding of the educator preparation data it has been collecting, the gaps in data that preparation programs need to guide improvement, and how best to protect the privacy of candidates as part of data collection and dissemination. To help get a baseline, South Carolina’s NTEP team worked with Teacher Preparation Analytics to perform a teacher preparation data system audit.

As part of the audit, Teacher Preparation Analytics work with participants from South Carolina to rate their perceptions of the Key Effectiveness Indicators. These measures and data can provide states and preparation programs with information to assess performance and identify important program strengths and weaknesses. Areas rated include how candidates are selected and their completion rates, their knowledge and skills for teaching, and how they perform as classroom teachers. South Carolina has provided performance evaluation data on program graduates for more than 10 years, though the data has not covered the performance of students in the graduates’ classrooms. The state also has a well-regarded annual report on teacher supply and demand. This year’s report contains projections of demand for teachers by subject areas, which will allow for more targeted recruitment and training to staff the state’s schools.

**Tennessee** set its wheels in motion for a new educator preparation program approval process in 2014, when the State Board of Education streamlined data-collection requirements and clarified expectations for accountability while grounding them more in data. Historically, the approval process lacked a tight focus on program outcomes and data about impact. Today, rigorous standards, review processes, and measures of outcomes will inform program design and approval decisions. This year, the state began sharing new data with new annual reports and an updated version of report cards.

The annual reports provide candidate-level data for each preparation program. Disaggregated by program area, the data will be used for program approval and continuous improvement. Programs that repeatedly perform below standards will be subject to state-level review. Outcome data cover recruitment of candidates, their placement in schools, employer satisfaction, and impact on students. The state will produce report cards later in the year on each educator preparation program. The report cards will aggregate the data from the annual reports. They will be used by school districts to guide employment strategies and by prospective candidates as they consider teacher preparation programs.

**Utah’s** NTEP team helped design a data-driven approach to recruiting and retaining the best teachers. Three policy reports about teacher turnover and retention, released in January 2017 by the State Board of Education and the Utah Education Policy Center (UEPC), represent a major milestone on this front. The reports, which the NTEP team supported, provide data that help advance the state’s understanding of teacher shortages from anecdotal to factual.

The team also made headway on the next major step: determining what keeps good teachers in the classroom. Data on why teachers choose to leave has not proven to be as useful as information on why they stay. Utah is in the process of getting more qualitative data on what those factors may be.

**Washington** is nearly finished with a new data system that will include multiple indicators to guide ongoing improvement and help the state and local communities identify and meet supply-and-demand needs. The system will help the state meet its goal for greater transparency and public accountability for preparation, program quality, and program approval. Washington began piloting indicators of program effectiveness in 2015. Eventually, the system will reflect program selectivity, candidate completion rates by race and ethnicity, exam scores of candidates, perceptions of first-year teachers, student perceptions of the teachers, retention rates, and effects on student learning.

The data also will indicate whether programs are graduating students in high-need subject areas and placing new teachers in communities with large populations of low-income students. But some questions remain, particularly around the use of data on how new teachers perform in the classroom and how that information should reflect on the programs that prepared the teachers.
State Audit Tool Used by the Network for Transforming Educator Preparation

The following tool was used by states prior to beginning their work with the network. The State Audit Tool allowed a state to determine where their current policies fit within the framework for reform laid out by *Our Responsibility, Our Promise*. The tool provided states a clear baseline from which to build and shape their goals moving forward.

Instructions: At this moment in time, tell us your state’s status by answering “yes” or “no” for each item. If your answer is “yes,” indicate where we can find this regulation/statute/policy (i.e. state board rule). If your answer is “no,” indicate whether the NTEP team will be working on this — describing in the notes section reasons for the “no” or the work plan and trajectory for the “yes.”

State:  _________________________________________________________________  
NTEP State Lead:  _______________________________________________________  
NTEP Team Members:  _____________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Will NTEP team work on this?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the state have a written definition of a learner-ready teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do licensure standards require initially certified teachers to demonstrate competency in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• College- and career-ready content?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Differentiation of instruction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment literacy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching students with special needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching English language learners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does initial licensure require multiple performance-based measures of knowledge and demonstrated skill?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do candidates for re-licensure have to demonstrate effectiveness in improving student achievement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do licensure assessments generate data that can be used by the candidates for improvement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the state have enough qualified assessors to carry out the assessments with fidelity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the licensure system have multiple tiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the state require that teachers are paid differentially based on licensure tiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the requirements for each tier include multiple performance-based measures of effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the first tier of licensure linked to induction and mentoring?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are candidates from traditional and alternative programs required to meet the same standards for initial licensure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have reciprocity agreements with other states that do NOT require a candidate to re-assess in your state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Will NTEP team work on this?</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do programs have a minimum GPA of 3.0 or higher for admission?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Schools of Education recruit candidates based on supply-and-demand needs of districts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do standards for program approval require:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• College- and career-ready content?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Differentiation of instruction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment literacy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of technology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching students with special needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching English language learners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clinical practice that includes the responsibilities of a full school year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program approval process completely aligned to the “learner ready” definition and expectations for initial licensure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a robust process for conducting reviews of alignment as part of initial program approval and reauthorization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this process state-specific?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the program approval process include or connect to a national accreditation process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a performance rating system for programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are performance ratings for programs made public?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there rewards and consequences for program ratings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the state make assistance available to programs that are underperforming?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND REPORTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Will NTEP team work on this?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is each candidate given a unique identifier that allows different systems to link information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the licensure system collect and house information of teacher performance and effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can both PK-12 employers and EPPs access information about the performance of candidates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a set of policies that govern how data about candidates is used in the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is data about preparation program graduates, including effectiveness of graduates, available to potential educator prep candidates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMUNICATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Will NTEP team work on this?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have any stakeholder groups (i.e. unions, IHEs, etc.) in your state begun work on any of these reforms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the various stakeholder groups been meaningfully engaged with each other about any of these reforms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations from Our Responsibility, Our Promise

**LICENSURE**

#1: States will revise and enforce their licensure standards for teachers and principals to support the teaching of more demanding content aligned to college- and career-readiness and critical thinking skills to a diverse range of students.

#2: States will work together to influence the development of innovative licensure performance assessments that are aligned to the revised licensure standards and include multiple measures of educators’ ability to perform, including the potential to impact student achievement and growth.

#3: States will create multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a coherent developmental continuum that reflects new performance expectations for educators and their implementation in the learning environment and to assessments that are linked to evidence of student achievement and growth.

#4: States will reform licensure systems so they are more efficient, have true reciprocity across states, and so that their credentialing structures support effective teaching leading toward student college- and career-readiness.

**PROGRAM APPROVAL**

#5: States will hold preparation programs accountable by exercising the state’s authority to determine which programs should operate and recommend candidates for licensure, including establishing a clear and fair performance ratings system to guide continuous improvement. States will act to close programs that continually receive the lowest rating and will provide incentives for programs whose ratings indicate exemplary performance.

#6: States will adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards to assure that educator preparation programs recruit candidates based on supply-and-demand data, have highly selective admissions and exit criteria including mastery of content, provide high-quality clinical practice throughout a candidate’s preparation that includes experiences with the responsibilities of a school year from beginning to end, and that produce quality candidates capable of positively impacting student achievement.

#7: States will require alignment of preparation content standards to PK-12 college- and career-ready standards for all licensure areas.

#8: States will provide feedback, data, support, and resources to preparation programs to assist them with continuous improvement and to act on any program approval or national accreditation recommendations.

**DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND REPORTING**

#9: States will develop and support state-level governance structures to guide confidential and secure data collection, analysis, and reporting of PK-20 data and how it informs educator preparation programs, hiring practices, and professional learning. Using stakeholder input, states will address and take appropriate action on the need for unique educator identifiers, links to non-traditional preparation providers, and the sharing of candidate data among organizations and across states.

#10: States will use data collection, analysis, and reporting of multiple measures for continuous improvement and accountability of preparation programs.
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• Oklahoma:
  Robyn Miller (Robyn.Miller@sde.ok.gov)
  Renee Launey-Rodolf (Renee.Launey-Rodolf@oeqa.ok.gov)

• South Carolina:
  Rachel Burns (rburns@ed.sc.gov)
  Jennifer Morrison (jmorrison@ed.sc.gov)

• Tennessee:
  Amy Wooten (amy.wooten@tn.gov)

• Utah:
  Diana Suddreth (Diana.Suddreth@schools.utah.gov)

• Washington:
  Jennifer Wallace (Jennifer.Wallace@k12.wa.us)

CONSULTANTS

Karen Butterfield
Tim Dove
Joann Ericson
Lisa Katz
Monica Martinez
Christian Michael
Janice Poda
Irv Richardson
Lynne Weisenbach