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4 National Waves In Teacher Reform

- NCTAF 1996
- NCLB 2001
- RTTT 2009
- InTASC 2011
NCTAF: What Matters Most: Teaching & America's Future

1. Get serious about standards, for both students and teachers.
2. Reinvent teacher preparation and professional development.
3. Fix teacher recruitment and put qualified teachers in every classroom.
4. Encourage and reward teacher knowledge and skill.
5. Create schools that are organized for student and teacher success.
In 1996, these data were devastating.

- 56% percent of high school students taking physical science are taught by out-of-field teachers, as are 27% of those taking mathematics and 21% of those taking English. The proportions are much higher in high-poverty schools and in lower track classes.

- In schools with the highest minority enrollments, students have less than a 50% chance of getting a science or mathematics teacher who holds a license and a degree in the field he or she teaches.
NCLB focused ensuring that students in core subjects were taught by highly qualified teachers (HQT). NCLB’s definition of HQT was extensive, but focused heavily on requiring teachers to demonstrate “competency” in the academic areas they were teaching.

http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg2.html#sec1119
Selection Criteria
A. State Success Factors (125 points)
   (A)(1) Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it (65 points)
   (A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans (30 points)
   (A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps (30 points)

B. Standards and Assessments (70 points)
   (B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards (40 points)
   (B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (10 points)
   (B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments (20 points)

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction (47 points)
   (C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points)
   (C)(2) Accessing and using State data (5 points)
   (C)(3) Using data to improve instruction (18 points)

D. Great Teachers and Leaders (138 points)
   (D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 points)
   (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)
   (D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 points)
   (D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)
   (D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals (20 points)

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (50 points)
   (E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 points)
   (E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools (40 points)

F. General Selection Criteria (55 points)
   (F)(1) Making education funding a priority (10 points)
   (F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charters and other innovative schools (40 points)
   (F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions (5 points)

Priorities
Priority 1: Absolute Priority – Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform
Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority – Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) (15 points, all or nothing)
Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes
Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems
Priority 5: Invitational Priority – P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment
Priority 6: Invitational Priority – School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning


The RTT stress the importance of effective teachers and principals
Effective teacher means a teacher whose students achieve acceptable rates (e.g., at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance.
## CCSSO’s Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Categories</th>
<th>Teaching Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE LEARNER AND LEARNING</td>
<td>Standard #1: Learner Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard #2: Learning Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard #3: Learning Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>Standard #4: Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard #5: Application of Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE</td>
<td>Standard #6: Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard #7: Planning For Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard #8: Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Lessons

- Teaching Quality Matters
- A Full System of Support
- Content Knowledge
- Student Outcomes
- Balanced Teacher Standards
California’s Context
California NAEP Data Grade 4 Mathematics Percent Proficient and Above

American Indian/Alaska Native data is not reported in all years because NAEP reporting standards have not been met.
American Indian/Alaska Native data is not reported in all years because NAEP reporting standards have not been met.
American Indian/Alaska Native data is not reported in all years because NAEP reporting standards have not been met.
California NAEP Grade 4 Reading Percent Proficient and Above

American Indian/Alaska Native data is not reported in all years because NAEP reporting standards have not been met.
## California’s General Education Teaching Credentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Subject</th>
<th>Single Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary, Middle School In Core Settings, Self-Contained classes Pre-K-12, classes for adults</td>
<td>Teach specific content area in departmentalized settings - Pre-K -12, and adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of individuals holding multiple subject credentials teach in elementary schools</td>
<td>Primarily secondary schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California’s Learning to Teach System

Preliminary Credential Preparation

Blended Program
- Subject Matter Preparation
- Professional Preparation
- Support and Supervision
- Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

Post-Baccalaureate Program
- Subject Matter Preparation
- Professional Preparation
- Support and Supervision
- Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

Intern Program
- Subject Matter Preparation
- Professional Preparation
- Support and Supervision
- Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

Professional Credential Preparation

Induction Program
- Application of prior knowledge
- Advanced Curriculum Demonstration
- Formative Assessment and Support
- Frequent Reflection on Practice
- Individual Induction

Credential Renewal

- A Clear Credential is valid for the life of the holder as long as renewal fees and evidence of meeting professional fitness are submitted every 5 years.
- Professional growth and successful service verification are not required for credential renewal. School districts are directed to encourage teachers to participate in professional growth activities at the local level.

System Qualities

Multiple Entry Routes for Teaching From Differing Backgrounds

Alignment
- California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)
- State-Adopted Academic Content and Performance Standards for Students
- Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)

Accountability
- Candidate Assessment
- Credential Program Approval/Accreditation
- Participant Completion of Approved Induction Program
- Induction Program Approval/Accreditation

Collaboration
- Schools/Universities
- State Agencies
- BTSA Induction Programs
- Practitioner Teamwork

3/2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InTASC</th>
<th>CSTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard #1: Learner Development</td>
<td>Standard 1: Engaging and Support All Students in Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #2: Learning Differences</td>
<td>Standard 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments For Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #3: Learning Environments</td>
<td>Standard 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter For Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #4: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Standard 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences For All Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #5: Application of Content</td>
<td>Standard 5: Assessing Students For Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #6: Assessment</td>
<td>Standard 6: Developing as a Professional Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #7: Planning For Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #8: Instructional Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# The CSTP (2009) Compared To The Ca TPEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSTP</th>
<th>Ca TPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1: Engaging and Support All Students in Learning</td>
<td>Engaging And Supporting Students in Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments For Student Learning</td>
<td>Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments For Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter For Student Learning</td>
<td>Making Subject Matter Comprehensible To Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences For All Students</td>
<td>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5: Assessing Students For Learning</td>
<td>Assessing Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6: Developing as a Professional Educator</td>
<td>Developing As A Professional Educator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key TAP Policy-Level Work

1. Whether California’s current credential structure and authorizations are still best suited to preparing general education teachers to meet the instructional needs of students.

2. Whether the thirteen single subject credential areas currently specified in state law are still best suited to preparing general education teachers to meet state and/or national priorities for improved K-12 instruction, especially with respect to the science, technology, engineering, math (STEM) areas and Linked Learning.

3. Whether pedagogical preparation to teach specific content areas is both sufficiently robust and up to date for all teacher candidates in California, and if not, in what ways can we ensure that every candidate receives sufficient and robust subject specific pedagogy.

4. Alignment of the Commission standards and examinations with the Common Core standards.

5. Whether the approach to alternative certification meets state and local needs for multiple entry points into the profession and whether California’s approach to alternative certification sufficiently reflects an “alternative” to traditional teacher preparation while maintaining high standards.
Key TAP Policy-Level Work (Continued)

6. Whether the preparation for general education teachers and special education teachers is appropriately aligned, including whether Response to Intervention (RtI) should be included within the scope of the preliminary teacher preparation for all general education teacher candidates.

7. Whether the unit cap continues to serve the needs of general education teacher candidates.

8. Whether general education teacher preparation programs are sufficiently robust in preparing data literate general education teachers.

9. Whether the clinical practice model and/or other national reform models should be addressed within the general education teacher preparation program standards.

10. Whether online teaching should be incorporated into the set of knowledge, skills, and abilities that preliminary general education teacher preparation programs should develop in candidates.
Where Does Teacher Licensure Fit Into The System?
InTASC’s Key Components Of A Teacher Effectiveness System

• Standards;
• Preparation;
• Licensing and certification;
• Induction and mentoring;
• Growth opportunities and supports;
• Evaluation and high stakes levers;
• Working conditions and system accountability.

My Thoughts

1. Any data on the effectiveness of the current system?
2. What does your experience in high-need schools tell you about teacher certification and the other elements of the system?
3. How will changes to teacher certification impact the rest of the teacher recruitment, preparation, support, and evaluation system?
4. Are teachers sufficiently prepared to work in the area of Early Childhood?
5. Are teachers sufficiently prepared to work in middle School?
6. What are the most effective ways to use the policy lever of teacher certification?
7. How will you measure the impact of any changes to teacher certification?
8. Specifically, how are the curriculum, evaluation and accreditation systems used in California’s teaching preparation program linked to or impacted by the certification system?
9. How effective is California’s current approach to continuing professional development for teachers?
10. What kind of training and support do principals get as instructional leaders?
11. Where are teachers and principals leaving the system and why?