

Workshop on Teacher/Educator Preparation

Presented to the Maryland State Board of Education
May 23, 2016

Presenters:

University Representatives:

Nancy Shapiro, Ph.D., Associate Vice Chancellor for Education and Outreach, University System of Maryland

Donna Wiseman, Ph.D., Dean, College of Education, University of Maryland

Laurie Mullen, Ph.D., Dean, College of Education, Towson University

Kathy Angeletti, Ph.D., Assistant Dean & Executive Director of Teacher Education, College of Education, University of Maryland

Karen Robertson, Associate Dean, College of Education, Towson University

MSDE Staff:

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D., Interim Deputy State Superintendent for School Effectiveness

Sarah Spross, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Educator Effectiveness

Task Force Charge

- **Examine Maryland policies and regulations on teacher education in the context of the new Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards to identify gaps and alignment needs;**
- **Building on the outcomes of the October 11, 2013 Teacher Education Summit, review pertinent research on global best practices in teacher education; and,**
- **Make recommendations to the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council for appropriate changes in:**
 - (a) policy and regulations,
 - (b) curriculum and instruction,
 - (c) induction and internship programs, and
 - (d) resource allocations in order to advance the quality of teacher education programs in Maryland.

P-20 Task Force Membership

Shared Leadership

- ◆ Co-Chaired by Acting State Superintendent, and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at USM

Inclusive Membership

- ◆ Teachers, Principals, Superintendents, Teacher Unions, Parents, College and University Provosts and Presidents, Education Deans, Faculty, Alternative Providers, & Other State Policy Leaders

Open Meetings

- ◆ Widely distributed calendar of meeting dates & actively encouraged attendance of all stakeholders

High-Performing International Systems

What do high-performing systems include?	How are they funded and actualized?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Competitive entry to programs• Longer course of study, longer practicum• University-school partnerships• Sustained mentorships• Devoted time for collaboration and professional learning• Action research• Teacher-led problem solving• Training institutions• Time and resources devoted to professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Subsidized undergraduate education• Professional development (PD) providers compete for contracts• Some mentor programs are voluntary• Mix of training institutes in local government-run locations as well as universities• High- and low-achieving schools are paired

Key Recommendations

- **Pre-Service Teachers: Induction and Clinical Experience**
 - Revise current program approval requirements
 - Alignment with international best practices
- **Professional development for current teachers: Raising the status of teaching and teachers**
 - Ensure teachers are fully supported to teach MCCRS
 - Opportunities for teacher-leadership (hybrid teaching roles)
 - Career ladders for teachers that include joint appointments in both schools and higher education
- **Continuous improvement through shared accountability**
 - Sharing data between schools and higher education to bolster student achievement and inform professional development

Pre-Service Teachers: Induction and Clinical Experience

- Revise current program approval requirements for teacher education to incorporate national and international best practices
- Reinvent of teacher induction that builds bridges between higher ed and schools across multiple years
- Revise PDS criteria to incorporate flexibility to respond to local contexts

Raising the Status of Teaching and Teachers

- **Establish career-long professional development programs that reward excellence.**
 - Tenure decisions should be high stakes/high reward decisions.
- **Establish professional linkages between teachers and faculty.**
 - Professional ladders for teachers should crossover to higher education, so that master teachers can seamlessly become faculty in educator preparation programs, reinvigorating those programs.
 - Teacher education faculty should be expected to have frequent and high quality experiences in K-12 classrooms as part of workload.

Continuous Improvement through Shared Accountability

- **All teacher preparation programs should be assessed by the quality of the the teachers they produce—and both traditional and alternative programs should have equal flexibility to create highest quality programs.**
- **All teacher education programs must have access to all data necessary for continuous improvement research.**

Innovation and Rigor

- **Donna Wiseman: Innovation**
 - **Avatars**
- **Laurie Mullen: Rigor**
 - **High Impact Practices**
- **Kathy Angeletti: Assessment**
 - **edTPA**

Teacher Preparation Program Reform Efforts

Beginning in 2013 with the work of the P-20 council, The Maryland State Department of Education, the University of Maryland System, and MHEC have worked collaboratively to address the growing need for teacher preparation reform. Recruitment, preparation, induction, and retention have been the ongoing focus. Significant momentum the past year has positioned Maryland to begin to implement a variety of pilot programs aimed at increasing the teacher pipeline, providing more support to beginning teachers, and increasing the number of leadership opportunities for teachers. All work is aimed at putting high quality teachers in front of Maryland's children.

Recruitment

2015: P-20 Council and Quality Teacher Incentive Reports to the General Assembly

2015: Formation of P-20 Workgroup

2016: SB 493: Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act

+ Link Loan forgiveness to teaching in high needs school

2016 MSDE Initiatives

+ Examine certification options for individuals with specialized training for hard to fill positions (COMAR 13A.12.02.27)

+ Alternative Certification Programs Workgroup (MSAR 10533)

Preparation

2015: P-20 Council and Quality Teacher Incentive Reports to the General Assembly

+ Improve Teacher Quality State Grants

+ Transition to Professional Learning Networks built on a model of internships and residencies

+ Increase the number and variety of Field Placements

2015 Formation of P-20 Workgroup

2016: SB 493 Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act

+ Interweave NBC, APC, M.Ed., and teacher prep

+ Changes to the Teacher Quality State Grant

2016 MSDE Initiatives

+ NCATE to CAEP MOU & Workgroups

Induction

2015: P-20 Council and Quality Teacher Incentive Reports to the General Assembly

+ Professional Development to include collaboration with Higher Education

+ Establish a 3-year residency model

+ Establish Collaboratively supported teaching Innovation Centers

2015 Formation of P-20 Workgroup

2016: SB 493 Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act

+ Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Pilot

MSDE Initiatives

+ Teach to Lead Grant

+ NT3 Grant

+ Teachers of Promise

Retention

2015: P-20 Council and Quality Teacher Incentive Reports to the General Assembly

+ Create career ladder incentives

+ Reward teachers for NBC teaching in lowest performing schools

+ Restructure Quality Teacher Incentive Funds

2015 Formation of P-20 Workgroup

2016: SB 493 Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act

+ Increase NBC stipend for teachers in comprehensive needs

+ Utilize NBC teachers in leadership roles

+ Examine teacher recertification

+ Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Pilot

MSDE Initiatives:

+ Examine the requirements of the conditional certificate (MSAR 10533)

***Paradigm Shift 2016:
Bringing Maryland's Teacher Preparation Policies into the 21st Century***

Submitted to

Interim Superintendent Jack Smith
Maryland State Department of Education

From

Deans and Directors of Maryland Schools of Education

Eugene Schaffer, UMBC, and Phyllis Sunshine, Goucher College, Co-Chairs of D&D

Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges

Colleen Eisenbeiser, Anne Arundel Community College, Chair of MADTECC

Maryland Association of Colleges of Teacher Education

Joshua Smith, Loyola University Maryland, President of MACTE

February 2016

Abstract: This working paper was developed at the request of Interim Superintendent Dr. Jack Smith to provide an historic overview of the policy framework under which teacher preparation programs currently operate, suggest strengths and weaknesses of the current framework, offer guidelines for review and revision of the framework, and make recommendations for next steps.

Overview

In 1995, MSDE and MHEC, in collaboration with stakeholder groups, developed the Redesign of Education (*Redesign*) to establish a framework for teacher education in the State of Maryland. In the ensuing years the *Redesign* has placed Maryland in the forefront of educational policy. However many changes in the society and the field of education support a review of the framework and policies to assure Maryland retains its efficacy and preeminence in the development of an effective teaching force.

The success of the *Redesign* can be seen in the large number of effective Professional Development Schools developed and sustained by districts and universities over the years. Other improvements identified by leadership in higher education and school systems in on-going discussions and reports include the strengthening of mentoring skills, increased time in classroom by teacher candidates, the diversity of experiences available to students in well-structured programs and increased collaboration among schools and higher education.

But much has changed since 1995. The children of the schools in 1995 are now the parents of the next generation: the world has turned and with it the role of education. The concerns of the 1980s have turned into the expectations of the 21st century. Schools must now educate all students to a degree of competence unparalleled in the history of schooling. Competition is not among neighboring schools and towns, but comparisons are drawn across states and among countries. The vision of an international competition among educational systems has emerged from both the immediate access to events worldwide and the level of comparative data. The context of schooling then is very different from the original *Redesign* and moved more toward the worldwide vision as explicated in Maryland's Race to The Top grant. It is now time to align policy with this expanded vision of education by framing a new, concise, comprehensive and coherent policy framework.

The sheer volume and complexity of data available to school systems, schools and individual teachers has grown exponentially in the last ten years. Teachers are now faced with a wealth of data, but limited capacity to analyze and determine the essential elements that will lead to success for the students. But technology has gone far beyond data richness. Collaboration among higher education and P-12 institutions envisioned in the *Redesign* are now possible among schools and across the spectrum of educational institutions through Facebook type mentoring programs or blogs, webinars, SKYPE or online forums. Technology has changed forever both the demands and resources for schools and teacher education programs from hardware such as mobile devices to

websites, data sources and platforms that have changed teaching from providing knowledge to fostering learning. This has been promulgated through Maryland's commitment to the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards and represents a shift in perspective as to the purpose of schools. Reviewing the *Redesign* in the light of major changes in curriculum and technology seems essential.

Other external forces have also influenced the schools in Maryland since 1995. At the national level The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, ED Recovery Act as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 have altered curriculum, assessment of students, accountability of schools and school systems, teachers and principal evaluations and commitments to our lowest performing schools. All of these major legislative efforts were initiated after the implementation of the *Redesign*. Likewise, in the field of teacher education major changes took place in the assessment of teacher education programs with a major shift from examining the inputs of teacher education programs to the assessment of the performance of the graduates of the programs. The reconstitution of National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) into the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) not only recognized the change, but moved from teacher education to educator preparation in part to recognize the many additional pathways to teaching.¹ However prescient the authors of the *Redesign* were in 1995, it would be difficult to suggest all of these changes and many not mentioned in this quick overview have been addressed in the current legislation and its related regulations. A review seems overdue.

The 1995 *Redesign*² has been implemented through the Maryland Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC).³ The IPC lists the four essential elements of all initial teacher preparation programs. These four elements and emerging areas of concern are noted below:

Strong Academic Background: Each cohort (e.g., 2007-2008 graduates) meets state qualifying scores on basic skills (Praxis I, Praxis Core, SAT, GRE or ACT scores) and content and pedagogy tests (e.g., Educational Testing Service, ETS) or American Council on Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) tests.

- Concern: These “academic background” standards are not aligned with CAEP accreditation standards; CAEP does not require pedagogy tests.

Extensive Internship: Teacher candidates have extensive field-based preparation in PreK-12 schools with diverse populations, which include an

¹ See Appendix 1

² See appendix 2

³ See Appendix 3

internship within two consecutive semesters that at a minimum has 100 full days in a school.

- Concern: 100-day internship models are “input” models, which are not based on performance or outcomes. The CAEP standards are less restrictive and align better with best practice.

Performance Assessment: The educator preparation provider (EPP) unit uses a performance assessment system that is based on the Interstate Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), national Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards and/or the Essential Dimensions of Teaching, (EDoTs) and is assessed by a standards-based rubric.

- Concern: This standard does not address edTPA or ETS PPAT directly, and after all this time (20 years) standards will be more valuable and more relevant if they align with the measures that schools use to assess their teachers.

Linkage with PreK-12 Priorities: Programs prepare professional educators for assessment and accountability in Maryland, through focusing on the following reform elements: • Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (MCCRS) • Ready for Kindergarten (R4K) (Early Childhood) • Student Learning Objectives (SLO) • PARCC Assessments (PARCC)

- Concern: The priorities stated above are high level MSDE priorities, but may or may not reflect all the LEA priorities. They are necessary but not sufficient. MSDE and LEA priorities may overlap, but new language should incorporate LEA partnerships as well as state goals. This standard requires real collaborations with LEAs (data sharing, cost-sharing, etc.) in order to be fully implemented, and currently this is not universally the case.

Looking for Evidence

Although teacher educators, school personnel and teacher candidates have attested, anecdotally, to the value of many aspects of the *Redesign* standards, between 1995 and 2016 there have been few, if any, research studies of the *Redesign* and the IPC that offer grounded evidence of the success of this model. At a time when teacher preparation programs (university-based and alternative training programs) are coming under scrutiny with respect to best practice, it is imperative that policies and regulations be grounded in evidence-based findings.

The P-20 Task Force on Teacher Education (2014-2015) offers compelling evidence from national and international comparisons that the following elements need to be included in a new framework:

- high quality mentoring;
- sustained K-12 and higher education involvement with the intention of support student growth in the schools and extended;
- multiple field experience and internship with diverse populations;
- residency induction model for all pre-tenured teachers that engages higher education teacher preparation programs in collaborative partnerships with school districts; and,
- career-long professional development programs and career ladders for educators that are aligned with the high expectations of Maryland College and Career Ready Standards.

Limitations of the IPC-Redesign

The IPC-Redesign, like most policy, was written broadly to permit changes over time; however, the time has come to rewrite this important set of policies. Illustrative limitations are listed below:

1. **The IPC-Redesign language is too limiting.** In some cases specificity is a limitation in the *Redesign*. For example, the explicit inclusion of 100 days over two semesters for the internship does not convey the purpose of that requirement. The focus should be on the outcomes, ensuring that the candidate's successful performance in the internship contributes to student learning. In the 2000 revisions of NCATE, and now CAEP, the field has moved away from an input model of requirements to a performance-based assessment of the internship. Likewise, the requirement of an internship over two semesters no longer fits with models of extended internships that might match a block schedule in a K-12 school, or Pre-K programs, or a summer program in a public school.
1. **IPC-Redesign discourages innovation.** At the present there is no mechanism for proposing and validating innovation. It would seem reasonable for a university in collaboration with a school district to propose an innovation to MSDE for review, then create an agreement for a pilot that includes a review period and an independent research component to determine the efficacy of the innovation. Likewise programs offered by educator providers through alternative models or out-of-state universities do not currently have independent assessment of the performance of the teachers nor are they required to meet standards such as CAEP. To maintain quality of the teaching force in the state, regulations should strive for consistency across all providers.

2. **Under current policy, LEAs are not held responsible for participating in the IPC-Redesign. That creates an unworkable situation for implementation of the standards.** The *Redesign* has no requirement for K-12 schools or school districts to participate in the *Redesign*. School districts have been willing collaborators for the most part, but have the option to walk away or alter agreements without accountability to the State or to higher education (IHE) partners. A more balanced policy would structure a fully integrated teacher education process from pre-service through experienced teachers, with accountability on both sides of the partnership.

This a particularly important point, and will be discussed at length later in this paper. The revised policy needs to ensure that LEAs have an equal share of responsibility for implementing the internship components (PDS) of the Redesign. P-12 officers who have authority over the budget and access to data should be held accountable for school-based aspects of the implementation of the IPC-Redesign, including induction. Gaining access to the schools to do research and collect data (an essential part of assessing the effectiveness of our preparation efforts) continues to be a challenge, but is a solvable problem.

Guidelines for revising the IPC-Redesign

1. **The IPC-Redesign should incorporate all essential Maryland partners in the development of policy, programs and assessments, and hold all partners accountable for the teacher preparation continuum.** Currently, MSDE serves as the state approval agency for teacher preparation programs. A model that incorporates IHEs (two-year and four-year) and the Local Educational Agencies in all areas of the process with shared decision-making on the development of policies would increase the likelihood of an integrated teaching profession from pre-service teaching through advanced professional certification.⁴
2. **Maryland's IPC-Redesign should be fully aligned with the CAEP accreditation and SPA standards such that fulfilling one fulfills the other.** The recent changes in national accreditation with greater emphasis on outcomes and an increased emphasis on clinical practice bring the CAEP and SPA requirements more in line with Maryland's model. Separate or additional standards in the IPC should be eliminated in favor of the national standards, accreditation and SPA recognition.

⁴ An example of the disconnect: The new CAEP Accreditation Handbook indicates that Standard 3.2, all of Standard 4, and Standard 5.3 and 5.4 must be met for full accreditation. Previously, CAEP had only listed Standard 4 and 5.3/5.4. To meet standards 4 and 5.3/5.4 higher ed institutions will need instruments demonstrating impact on student learning and teacher effectiveness, along with other highly robust data sharing agreements with LEA's that do not currently exist. Thus, the IPC-Redesign needs to be modified to include a modified LEA/higher education relationship structure, in order to incorporate the required CAEP standards.

3. **All changes to IPC-Redesign should be informed by evidence-based research. IPC-Redesign should be reviewed every 5 years by collaborative review team (MSDE, IHEs, LEAs)** Evidence-based decisions should inform changes in the IPC where possible. When best practice is used then a research and evaluation effort should be put in place to address the practice with the purpose of review and possible revision after five years.

4. **IPC-Redesign should incorporate AAT program standards recognizing the critical contributions community colleges make to the teacher pipeline in Maryland.** Alignment and linkage of AAT programs with state and CAEP standards so that CAEP, the State of Maryland and community college form alliances that both verify and recognize the quality of AAT programs, including but not limited to the field experiences, measurement of dispositions, contributions to diversity, and alignment for certification.

5. **IPC-Redesign should incorporate explicit provisions and incentives for innovations for schools and universities to continue to enhance the accreditation process.** These might include: online observations, multiple IHE's to work within a single PDS site, international settings or integrated onsite instruction/teaching/feedback teacher education programs.

Next Steps

This paper outlines the opportunities that exist to dramatically improve a teacher pipeline that has served us well in the past, but is in need of urgent reform and revision. In order to reach our goals of recruiting the highest quality teachers, reaching higher teacher retention goals, aligning teacher education programs with the direct needs of school districts, and ultimately preparing Maryland's students for college and careers, we recommend that the Interim State Superintendent appoint a Statewide Task Force on Teacher Preparation to rewrite the current policies addressing the concerns raised in this paper, using the guidelines suggested here, and the charge to the task force should specifically incorporate the development of the Maryland MOU with CAEP, since a goal of the new IPC-Redesign will be to align Maryland standards with national accreditation.

The Task Force should be comprised of representatives from MSDE, LEAs and all segments of higher education (USM, MICUA, MACC, Morgan/St Mary's). Each segment head should be invited to nominate up to two members of the task force. The task force should be co-chaired by MSDE, an LEA Superintendent, and a Higher Education Chief Academic Officer, and should be directed to complete its work by April 30, 2016. The recommendations from the task force should be put before the State Board of Education in May, 2016, for implementation beginning July 1, 2016