Getting Better at Teacher Preparation and State Accountability

Strategies, Innovations, and Challenges Under the Federal Race to the Top Program

Edward Crowe   December 2011

Contents

Introduction and summary

A key focus of the Obama administration's Race to the Top initiative in public education is to support states that implement plans for "recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most." Race to the Top asked states to adopt more vigorous teacher-education accountability mechanisms and to establish or expand programs "that are successful at producing effective teachers." [1] The winners of the competitive grants are required to

- Link student-achievement and student-growth data to the teachers of these students
- Tie this information to the in-state programs that prepare teachers
- Publicly report the data on program effectiveness for each preparation program in the state
- Expand teacher-education programs and teacher-credentialing options that are successful at producing graduates who are effective teachers

Since the Center for American Progress published "Race to the Top and Teacher Preparation: Analyzing State Strategies for Ensuring Real Accountability and Fostering Program Innovation" in March 2011, the 12 states funded by Race to the Top program in 2010 continued to implement their ambitious agendas. This paper discusses new information about the specifics of these states' goals, activities, and challenges as part of our profiles of the commitments made by these states to improve teacher education and to strengthen public disclosure and accountability of program performance.

The pages that follow describe the key findings in separate profiles of the 12 winners: Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Carolina, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and the District of Columbia. Then based on analysis of the winning strategies, this paper makes policy recommendations directed to the U.S. Department of Education, the winners, and others interested in teacher quality. Before getting into the individual profiles, however, this paper offers a sketch of the teacher-preparation account-

ability policies recommended by the author in the Center's July 2010 publication, "Measuring What Matters: A Stronger Accountability Model for Teacher Education," followed by sections on each state that describe and analyze state commitments on teacher quality and suggest improvements.

Profiles for each grant recipient draw on videotaped presentations as part of the Race to the Top selection process made to the U.S. Department of Education by key state leaders, including information gleaned from videotaped question-and-answer sessions between the state teams and proposal reviewers. After the Race to the Top funds were awarded, all 12 winners established dedicated websites housing important policy papers, requests for proposals to contractors and school districts, initial drafts of design work, meeting agendas, and other information relevant to any analysis of their work. These resources have been employed for the analysis that follows.

The descriptions presented in this document are further supported by the winning grant proposals and by reviewer notes—resources used to produce in-depth descriptions of each winner's approach to the "Great Teachers and Great Leaders" component of Race to the Top. In each section, strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and current work are discussed, along with commentary and recommendations targeting policy leaders, federal officials, and others interested in successful implementation of Race to the Top strategies.

Key findings

Through Race to the Top's competitive grant process, states agreed to improve accountability for teacher-education programs by adopting and disclosing new measures of program performance. An overview of their combined efforts shows that

- Persistence in teaching by program graduates will be disclosed publicly by 5 of the 12 winners; two states, Massachusetts and New York, will change their teacher-education accountability regulations and use programwide persistence rates for program accountability.

- Six of the 12 winners will employ data on job placement of teacher-preparation program graduates for public disclosure of program performance. Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island plan to use job placement as an accountability measure.

- Four recipients will report to the public the percentage of each preparation program's graduates who attain advanced licensure. New York will prohibit ineffective teachers (as measured by student-achievement outcomes) from advanced licensure, and Rhode Island will use the rate at which program graduates reach the next licensure step as an accountability measure.

- Student-achievement outcomes will be used by all 12 grantees for public disclosure of the teaching effectiveness of program graduates. Only five of them—the District of Columbia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island—will employ teacher impact on student achievement for program accountability.

The capacity and commitment of states to implement these Race to the Top activities will determine success or failure. These considerations were central to the proposal review and state-selection processes. Points were awarded or withheld on the basis of reader assessments of state capacity "to implement its proposed plans." Other factors playing a role in the federal review process for each applicant included:

- The strength of state data systems
- Infrastructure created or improved to support Race to the Top work
- Use of preparation-program outcomes relevant to the world of schools and students
- Commitment to getting the work done in a way that makes a difference for student learning

While assessing state commitment is a judgment call, this paper cites examples where important changes are promised and seem likely to happen. It also notes weaknesses or areas needing improvement where they are found.

Race to the Top will be a powerful lever to improve teacher quality throughout the United States through the work of funded states.

....

Recommendations

As the author's earlier paper on Race to the Top noted, progress on real accountability for teacher preparation will be seen when the 12 funded winners have met all of their commitments, strengthened their capacity to replace current toothless accountability policies, and taken bold steps to assert their authority to impose real consequences on weak and ineffective programs. Race to the Top will be a powerful lever to improve teacher quality throughout the United States through the work of funded states. The policy recommendations presented here are drawn from the analysis of state promises with the aim of maximizing the potential for change through the Race to the Top program.

Develop high-quality state data and reporting systems

The challenge. All 12 recipients made commitments to develop or improve data systems for public disclosure of preparation-program results. Public disclosure target dates vary widely among the states, and states will have to develop and pilot reliable methods for measuring student-achievement gains and connecting the results to individual teachers.

Policy recommendation. The federal government and interested foundations should support an organized program of technical assistance to enable the states to meet their commitments. The goal should be high-quality systems in each of the states, with uniform reporting mechanisms making comparisons between programs and across states easier for the public and for policymakers to use and understand. The Department of Education, state leaders, and outside funders should encourage cross-state consortia focused on data-system development, teacher-effectiveness research, and application of student-achievement and student-growth measures so that we wind up with rigorous and fair judgments about teacher-education programs.

Pilot stronger measures of preparation-program accountability

The challenge. "Measuring What Matters" urged all states and the District of Columbia to base program accountability on five indicators. No winner has adopted all five, and only 5 of the 12 will use teacher effectiveness for preparation-program accountability. The remaining seven stop at public disclosure.

Policy recommendation. The Department of Education, the National Governors Association, and education-reform groups should support state and cross-state efforts to pilot the full set of accountability indicators that the Center for American Progress recommended in its paper, "Measuring What Matters." Work on these teacher-quality issues in the 12 Race to the Top grant recipients will generate strong pressure on the remaining states to adopt meaningful account-ability standards, creating new opportunities through technical support and policy changes that lead all states to adopt identical policies for program accountability.

In early October, U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan announced draft teacher-preparation program reporting standards under Title II of the Higher Education Amendments. The proposal is for all programs to report on

- The impact of their graduates on student achievement
- Feedback survey findings from graduates and from their school principals
- Job placement and retention rates of graduates

"Measuring What Matters" recommended all three indicators.

Monitor state performance

The challenge. No state has a good record in teacher-education program accountability. Experience with the federal Higher Education Amendments, or HEA, Title II "report card," which is explained in greater detail in "Measuring What Matters," shows how little courage states have had to confront and close weak programs. The 12 winners promise to do better through their Race to the Top proposals but too few of them go beyond promises of public disclosure for preparation-program performance.

Policy recommendation. The federal government, education funders, state governors, and the mayor of Washington, D.C., ought to gauge Race to the Top promises against actual performance over the next few years, particularly since implementation of these initiatives is being assigned to state departments of education—agencies not known for their commitment to high-quality education reform. Healthy skepticism is a reasonable stance until we see concrete evidence of higher standards, including the voluntary or forced closure of many poorly performing teacher-education programs in the 12 funded states.

In the meantime, the public- and education-policy communities should get regular and candid reports on Race to the Top project implementation and its impact on preparation-program oversight from the U.S. Department of Education and from chief executives of the funded states.

Work to close the gaps in a fragmented accountability system

The challenge. A big problem with any strategy for improving teacher quality in the United States is the proportion of public-school teachers whose students are in grades or subject areas that do not require standardized testing for accountability purposes. Estimates put this at about two-thirds of all teachers in the country. While some states are developing new student assessments for grade levels

or subject areas that will give them the capacity to measure learning outcomes for higher percentages of teachers and their kindergarten-through-12th grade students, others have overlooked this significant hole in accountability and school improvement. A related concern is that hundreds of thousands of teachers in the United States are prepared to teach in a different state from the one where they obtain their first teaching job. For 12 states, including four of the Race to the Top grantees, at least 40 percent of newly certified teachers were prepared in another state. State-specific program-accountability strategies have not addressed problems emanating from the weaknesses of programs preparing these teachers.[2]

Policy recommendation. States, the federal government, and other groups interested in improving teacher quality and student performance should "double down" on efforts to develop a much broader array of high-quality student-assessment instruments. And the only solution for our fragmented system of teacher-education accountability is to follow the lead of professions such as medicine, nursing, accountancy, and engineering. Every state employs the same system of accountability indicators in these professions. One set of common standards for teacher preparation programs would ensure that quality is defined the same way no matter where the program is located or where the graduate is employed.[3]

Lessons for the next round of Race to the Top proposals

Thanks to the budget agreement in April between President Barack Obama and Congress, there will be another round of state Race to the Top grants in fiscal year 2012, awarded sometime after October 1, 2011. Based on this assessment of the winners funded in the first and second competitions, proposal reviewers and federal officials should pay more careful attention to how well the next round of state submissions deal with the most productive leveraging points for real change in teacher quality:

- **Student-growth models.** Every one of the 12 winners promises some method for using student achievement to measure teacher effectiveness, but the promises often come with few details or with few mechanisms to ensure that a state will actually make effective use of the data.

- **Preparation-program indicators.** All 12 winners promised to do the minimum, which is to publicly disclose the effectiveness of preparation-program graduates

State-specific program-accountability strategies have not addressed problems emanating from the weaknesses of programs preparing these teachers.

based on student learning outcomes, but real accountability takes more than disclosure, and it requires more than one indicator of performance.

- **State data-system capacity.** The quality and usefulness of state data systems is essential for success under Race to the Top. Indicators of capacity vary widely among the 12 winners, as described in detail in each of their profiles. Proposal reviewers and federal officials should take a hard look at how the state demonstrates its seriousness about improving capacity and using the system for accountability and education reform.

And finally some good news

When President Obama submitted his fiscal year 2012 budget to Congress in March, it included provisions that will make a big difference for the nation's teacher quality and student-achievement goals. The proposal would require all teacher-education programs in the country to report their performance on three of the five indicators advocated in "Measuring What Matters." They are the academic achievement of students taught by program graduates, the job-placement and retention rates of program graduates, and survey results from employers and graduates.[4] As noted above, Secretary Duncan has initiated steps to make this a reality through a set of public hearings and negotiated rule-making, necessary actions before final regulations are promulgated. The Obama administration's proposal also would fund a "presidential teaching fellows" program through competitive grants to the states, with grants linked to requirements for more rigorous preparation-program accountability.

Overview

Race to the Top program and teacher-education programs

A recent paper published by the Center for American Progress described an effective accountability system for preparation programs and showed how weak current policies are in every state.[5] "Measuring What Matters" urged states to adopt five key indicators of program and graduate performance, applied "equally to all programs in a state, whether the program is 'traditional' or 'alternative,' and no matter which organization is responsible for the preparation program."[6]

A careful review of the 12 winning proposals as well as state proposal reviewer notes made available through the U.S. Department of Education shows the commitments and actions that will be taken by the funded states. These commitments are

• Student achievement as a program outcome
• Other program outcomes such as employer feedback survey results
• Public disclosure of program performance

Let's look at each briefly in turn.

Student achievement as a program outcome

All 12 winners promised to use student achievement as an outcome indicator for teacher-education programs with public disclosure of preparation-program teacher-effectiveness findings. Only five, however, will use the teacher effectiveness of program graduates as an accountability measure, both publicly reporting the results and using them to hold programs accountable.

Other program outcomes

Some of the 12 winners profiled in this paper go beyond the minimum requirement of tying student achievement to teachers and to teacher-education programs. State efforts include reporting the persistence in teaching of program graduates,

employer feedback survey results, job-placement rates, and the category of schools (high needs) where program graduates teach and remain in the profession.

While several Race to the Top winners propose changes in their teacher-certification examinations, "Measuring What Matters" recommends a revamping of teacher-licensure tests including significant reductions in the number of tests used by each state, adoption of the same tests in all states, and use of the same passing-rate policies in every state. While no Race to the Top winner goes this far, three of them plan to overhaul pieces of their current testing efforts.

Public disclosure of program performance

Race to the Top expects each grantee to "publicly report" data on the effectiveness of graduates from each preparation program. The 12 winners made commitments to develop or improve reporting systems for public disclosure of these results. Five of the 12 funded winners make clear commitments to use evidence of teacher effectiveness for program accountability, proposing steps to close weak programs unable or unwilling to improve themselves.

The Race to the Top competition and commitments

In two rounds of competitive proposals, in March and August 2010, the secretary of education awarded Race to the Top funds to 11 states and the District of Columbia. This paper profiles the winners on one component of the Race to the Top proposals,[7] namely their plans to promote improvements in teacher quality through enhanced accountability for teacher-preparation programs. Although improving the quality of teacher education ought to be a vital focus of education reform, it presents an enormous challenge. There are few obvious successes that emanate from redesign and reform initiatives over the past three or more decades.[8]

Indeed, the failure by the higher education community to stimulate significant change in the overall quality of teacher education in the United States has led the Race to the Top program to employ a carrot-and-stick approach, offering incentives to programs that embark on serious reform and promoting stronger accountability mechanisms to push the same programs in the right direction.[9]

Although improving the quality of teacher education ought to be a vital focus of education reform, it presents an enormous challenge.

Through the Race to the Top program, states were asked to define effective teaching in terms of student-achievement outcomes, aggregate teacher-effectiveness data to the preparation-program level, and make regular public reports of their findings. Race to the Top state program-accountability actions will be assessed in the context of a recent Center for American Progress publication that called for a radical redesign of teacher-education program accountability in the United States.

Using those recommendations as a jumping-off point, this current paper summarizes the 12 winners' plans, highlights potential strengths, and suggests areas where they fall short. It concludes with some of the challenges funded states will face in making good on their promises.

Strong accountability for teacher-preparation programs

The most disturbing critique of current state accountability mechanisms for teacher education is that states do not even bother to use weak current policies to police programs under their jurisdiction. "Less than 2 percent of all teacher-education programs in the United States have been flagged as low performing by the state in which they operate since Congress required each state to develop and implement a set of criteria to identify low-performing programs in 1998."[10] This obsolete and irrelevant "system" of accountability is a major reason why we need the Race to the Top provisions to ensure that states measure teacher effectiveness of program graduates and link the findings back to each preparation program.

Current state policies mostly ignore the impact of program graduates on their K-12 students—a central feature of the Race to the Top requirements—and they say next to nothing about other key outcomes such as where graduates teach, how long they remain in the profession, and what they or their employers think about the program that prepared them for the classroom.[11] Teacher tests used by most states "don't directly measure what teachers do in the classroom … [and] essentially measure knowledge and skills at levels more appropriate to what eighth graders are expected to know."[12] Teacher test-passing scores are set low enough in many states to ensure that nearly every graduate will pass.

Race to the Top puts the emphasis on the first "Measuring What Matters" indicator, requiring states to disclose program effectiveness (as determined by whether program graduates help their K-12 students to learn) results to the public. Funded states must treat all preparation programs equally, using specific definitions of

student-achievement and student-academic growth to determine both individual teacher effectiveness and overall preparation-program effectiveness. If these steps are implemented fully, the country would see major improvements in the quality of state oversight for teacher education.

The 12 winners funded in this round of the Race to the Top program have adopted a variety of strategies to hold programs accountable for producing effective teachers, with a wide range of tactics and timelines to implement their promised new policies. "Measuring What Matters" and other analyses of preparation-program accountability have faulted the states for failing to impose consequences on teacher-education programs in the face of obvious weaknesses and failures.[13] It will be evident from descriptions of this work that the 12 proposals vary considerably in how clearly their strategies are described, raising some questions about just what a particular state has committed to do and when. A degree of fuzziness also applies to some state commitments to implement high accountability standards.

As we examine the Race to the Top commitments and how they will be implemented, it is best to maintain a healthy skepticism until we see concrete evidence of higher standards, including the forced or voluntary closure of many teacher-education programs in the states and in the District of Columbia.

District of Columbia

The District of Columbia received $74.998 million in federal funds through the second-round Race to the Top competition. Reviewers awarded the proposal 450 of 500 possible points; 5 of the 12 funded winners had higher scores.

Washington, D.C.'s Race to the Top strategy for teacher quality has two main strengths. First, the district is one of the few funded winners (only 5 of the 12) to commit itself to holding teacher preparation programs accountable for whether their graduates improve the academic achievement of their K-12 pupils. The district's proposal also included unique strategies for building new teacher preparation programs from within D.C.'s public charter school network, without any apparent role for institutions of higher education.[14]

These positive features of the Washington, D.C.. proposal suggest a commitment to real accountability and an imaginative approach to teacher education that go beyond the Race to the Top goals of most of the other winners. On the other hand, the District of Columbia has at least two enormous challenges to make good on these commitments. It appears to have the weakest data infrastructure and support system of any funded winner, and recent turnover in key leadership initially raised questions about the future of education reform in the district.

Four D.C. policy leaders instrumental to the design of its Race to the Top agenda were defeated in elections or left office between September 2010 and the beginning of 2011. Nonetheless, all current indications are that the new state superintendent, Hosanna Mahaley, and the new chancellor of the district's public schools, Kaya Henderson, have Mayor Vincent Gray's full support in moving forward with D.C.'s commitments.

Fast facts: D.C. Race to the Top initiative and teacher quality

Grant award: $74,998,962	Reviewer score: 450.0
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2014
Program accountability measures in force*	2016

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the District of Columbia Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

Specifics of the D.C. proposal

The District of Columbia proposed one teacher-quality measure for teacher-education program public disclosure and program accountability, committing to calculate and report teacher effectiveness of graduates of all programs by 2014, and to employ this information for program accountability by 2016. This makes the District one of only five winners to use the impact of teachers on the academic achievement of their pupils as a measure of program quality. When this policy is implemented, real accountability for program quality will have taken a significant step forward.

The author of this paper has written elsewhere that public disclosure alone has limited effect,[15] noting that shaming weak programs to improve or shut down doesn't work when teacher educators feel little or no shame about the poor quality of their institution's professional work.

D.C.'s implementation dates for teacher accountability through Race to the Top are unclear. Proposal reviewers found ambiguity that was not cleared up by the online Q&A session that was part of the proposal-consideration process at the U.S. Department of Education.[16] A look at D.C.'s current capacity to collect, calculate, and report this teacher-effectiveness information suggests the district will not have an easy road. As a reminder, these steps are needed to generate program-specific, teacher-effectiveness results:

• A tested methodology for calculating the teacher effectiveness of individual classroom teachers by measuring changes over time in the achievement of K-12 pupils taught by the teacher

- A state data system with individual-level records for teachers, schools, and K-12 students with sufficient capacity to link files and run the teacher-effectiveness analyses

- Capacity to link each teacher to his or her preparation program, pooling the teacher effectiveness results for all graduates of a specific program

D.C. Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	7
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	3/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multistate assessment consortium from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

According to the Data Quality Campaign—a national nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the quality of state data systems employed to strengthen outcomes in K-12 education—Washington, D.C., has only 7 of the 10 elements needed for a fully functional education data system, the fewest of any funded state. (This paper draws from the Data Quality Campaign's 2010 survey of the states for data system information about all of the grant recipients.) Missing elements for the District of Columbia include information on students in grades and subjects that are not tested using statewide standardized tests, a student-teacher match capacity, and the ability to link student-level K-12 outcomes with institutions where teachers were prepared.

The district has taken the fewest "essential state actions" of any of the 12 winners. Still needed are: linked student-teacher data systems; the ability to use these systems to create reports based on individual student data; and capacity to generate reports with longitudinal statistics about student achievement and teacher quality.

Unlike some of the Race to the Top-funded states, Washington, D.C., appears to have no plans to augment its "Prep [teacher preparation] Program Scorecard" with other important measures such as indicators of classroom teaching performance, persistence rates of program graduates, or feedback surveys from graduates and the

principals who hire them. Nor does it appear poised to strengthen its weak teacher-testing policies—92 percent to 96 percent of all test takers pass the D.C. teacher tests, and testing standards for passing are well below the national median.[17]

On the positive side, the District of Columbia's Race to the Top proposal describes an interesting approach to developing stronger teacher-preparation programs, and commits $5 million in competitive grant funds toward this goal, with $2 million allocated for the 2011-12 school year. Most interesting about this strategy is the plan to create new teacher-education programs based in schools and not affiliated with universities. This is similar to the New York State strategy discussed later in this document.

Through its Race to the Top implementation efforts, D.C. has issued a request for proposals to award one or more "Charter School Teacher Pipelines" grants. Funds "are available only to charter schools participating in Race to the Top" in the District of Columbia. Recipients in the 2011-12 school year will receive between $500,000 and $1 million for projects that

• Recruit "a select group of teacher resident candidates"
• Place them in teacher-residency preparation programs within D.C. public schools
• Evaluate this component of the program
• Develop a mentoring program for the teacher residents

Funds may be used for stipends to the residents and their mentors, and will also be used for continued support of the teacher residents once they are employed in D.C. as teachers of record.

In sum, the district's Race to the Top strategy has several definite strong points. More than most states, D.C. is moving toward real accountability for preparation programs and using innovative levers to stimulate creation of better programs for new teachers. At the same time, observers should watch for signs that D.C.'s new leaders are as committed to education reform as those who crafted the proposal. And finally the District, the U.S. Department of Education, and the group of philanthropic funders working on various D.C. education-reform initiatives ought to target resources and energy on remaining capacity challenges that may stand in the way of successful implementation of the Race to the Top proposal in the District of Columbia.

Delaware

In the first round of the Race to the Top competition, Delaware was awarded $119.1 million for a state proposal that received 438.4 reviewer points out of 500. Delaware was one of only two states (along with Tennessee) to win Race to the Top grants in this first round, although its proposal scored lower than any other state in the two Race to the Top competitions.

For teacher quality and accountability under Race to the Top, Delaware's strategy is limited to public disclosure of teacher effectiveness in enhancing pupil achievement demonstrated by graduates of in-state preparation programs. The state makes no commitment to use any other program-quality indicators for public disclosure, nor does it propose any substantive change to its current weak program-accountability policies. Instead of vigorous outcome-based accountability for preparation programs, the state's Education Reform Plan would use the "NCATE [National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education] recertification process" to stimulate changes in weak programs, a strategy with no evident successes in any state.[18]

Delaware's Race to the Top plan does allocate grant funds to foster innovation in teacher preparation. There are plans to tap the expertise of several nationally recognized organizations to design or redesign its alternative certification and principal-preparation programs.

The state's strategy for improving preparation programs—as well as its Race to the Top initiative on classroom teacher evaluation—is based around work to revise its Delaware Performance Appraisal System II teacher-assessment system. The DPAS II system currently has no student-growth component to gauge teacher effectiveness in the classroom, but Delaware intends to include student growth as one of five assessment categories, and will tie in-state teacher-education programs to DPAS II ratings of program graduates and disclose these findings to the public.

The governor, Jack Markell, and state secretary of education, Lillian Lowery, led the Delaware team presenting the state's Race to the Top proposal in 2010. Both continue in office, suggesting that this aspect of Delaware's commitment to successful implementation is stable.

Specifics of the Delaware proposal

Delaware proposes a single measure of preparation program performance for public disclosure of program quality. By 2012 the state will create measures of student growth, build a reporting system, and publicize findings on the effectiveness of graduates for all in-state preparation programs.

Fast facts: Delaware Race to the Top and teacher quality

Grant award: $119,122,128	Reviewer score: 438.4
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2012
Program accountability measures in force*	No commitment

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the Delaware Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

According to recent documents,[19] Delaware has yet to adopt a definition of student growth, something on which the state's entire Race to the Top strategy hangs. A "collaborative process" among stakeholders is expected to result in an agreed definition of how to measure student growth by July 2011. Measures and data-collection practices built around the state's definition of student growth will drive expansion of the DPAS II teacher-assessment system. This framework is based on the work of Charlotte Danielson, a well-known educational consultant, and it now includes four categories of teacher performance judged by various observers. Student achievement, as measured by growth, will become the fifth component.

As Race to the Top implementation discussions move along, Delaware is taking other steps to create and adopt computer-adaptive exams for K-12 students. The state hopes to have these tests in place shortly for grades 2–10 in language arts and math pupils; for science in grades 5, 8, and 10; and for social studies in grades 4 and 7. In addition, Delaware is field-testing high school end-of-course exams during the 2010-11 school year.

If these pilots are successful and result in adoption of rigorous assessments of pupil knowledge, then Delaware will be positioned with a broader range of achievement outcomes than many other states. The test development activities under the state's Race to the Top proposal (as well as Delaware's involvement in

both multi-state assessment consortia) should give teachers, schools, parents, and policymakers a fuller picture of school and student performance.

One of the complications of value-added accountability for teachers and teacher-education programs is the high proportion of teachers in grades or subject areas that are not tested. Some estimates put this as high as two-thirds of public school teachers. With good measures of student performance across a broader range of subjects and grades, Delaware could abandon its current weak policies and become a leader in teacher-education program accountability.

Delaware Race to the Top capacity and commitment Indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	10
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	5/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

With respect to state capacity, the Data Quality Campaign[20] reports that Delaware has all 10 of the key elements needed for an effective statewide education data system. This should help considerably as the state builds linkages and generates reports to demonstrate the performance of schools, students, teachers, and preparation programs.

The state has already taken 5 of the 10 "essential state actions" to make its state data system useful for policymakers and reform efforts. Still to come are "timely access" to information; capacity to create reports using individual student data; and developing longitudinal statistical reports of key P-12 grade outcomes.

Race to the Top asked states for strategies to increase the number of high-quality teacher- and principal-preparation pathways. To this end, Delaware is working with the New Teacher Project, the New York City Leadership Academy, Teach for America, and the University of Delaware on alternative-certification teacher-preparation programs. The state's plan for expanding effective teacher-preparation programs, including unspecified growth in the number of Teach for America

participants in the state, is budgeted at $150,000 per year.[21]

With these changes underway, Delaware should reconsider its reliance on the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, or NCATE accreditation process to stimulate improvement in weak preparation programs. The state has never cited a single program as low performing or even "at risk" of becoming low performing under the federal HEA Title II reporting guidelines, which require every state to have policies in place for determining whether a preparation program is low performing or "at risk" of becoming low performing. Its teacher test pass rates are in the 92 percent to 94 percent range, hardly evidence of high standards for entering the profession. And its passing scores are well below the national median in each of the testing categories.

The state should use its Race to the Top resources and statewide coalition of stakeholders to go beyond mere public disclosure by implementing a real system of accountability for teacher-preparation programs. With its data system strengths and new test development activities (not to mention its scale as a state), Delaware could easily become a national leader in teacher-preparation reform by employing a cluster of strong program-quality indicators tied to school and pupil outcomes.

Overall, then, Delaware's approach to improving teacher education and holding programs accountable has some factors that work in favor of real accomplishments and plenty of room for improvement.

Florida

With a second-round Race to the Top award of $700 million, Florida received more money than any other state to support its Race to the Top agenda. Florida's proposal earned 452.4 points, ranking fourth of the 12 funded states. Positive aspects of the Florida design under Race to the Top include high capacity to mobilize an already-strong statewide data system; use of relevant and important teacher-education program indicators for public disclosure; and the state's willingness to tackle a weak spot—its current teacher tests.

To improve teacher quality, Florida will implement five new performance indicators for all in-state preparation programs. The state also committed to expend funds to give competitive grants for redesign of teacher-preparation programs.

Still, there is room for improvement. Even though Florida long has had the best K-16 (kindergarten through college) data system in the United States, it has no current plans to use this resource to hold teacher-education programs accountable through Race to the Top-supported performance indicators. Public disclosure of program performance on these indicators is the extent of the state's strategy.

Like many Race to the Top-funded states, important leadership changes took place a few months after Florida won the competition and received federal funds. The state has a new governor, Rick Scott, although party control did not change. The state education commissioner, Eric Smith, appointed in 2007, was forced by the new governor to leave office in March 2011. It is not yet clear whether Gov. Scott will support the goals and strategies proposed in Florida's Race to the Top initiative. Like Gov. John Kasich in Ohio, Florida's new governor chose to accept Race to the Top funds but rejected federal support for high-speed rail.[22]

Specifics of the Florida proposal

Florida will implement five new indicators of teacher-education program performance, more than any state except New York (which also has five). The Florida measures are

- Teacher effectiveness as measured by K-12 student-achievement growth
- Persistence in teaching of program graduates, particularly in shortage subject areas and difficult-to-staff schools
- Production of new teachers employed in difficult-to-staff subjects and schools
- Job placement of program graduates in certain subject areas and schools
- Revision of teacher-certification examinations

In its Race to the Top activities, Florida is working to develop "student-growth models" that will generate information about teacher- and principal-preparation programs. The state's existing data resources certainly provide the capacity to generate good information for the first four indicators. The state of Florida, however, hasn't made much use of its ability to link teacher and student files to measure the impact of teachers on pupil learning, but independent researchers have completed numerous studies using these datasets.[23] Some of this research has targeted the relationship between characteristics of teacher-education programs and the achievement gains of K-12 pupils taught by program graduates.

Fast facts: Florida Race to the Top proposal and teacher quality

Grant award: $700,000,000	Reviewer score: 452.4
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
	Persistence in teaching
	Teacher production—high-need fields
	Job placement—high-need schools
	Revised certification exam
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2013
Program accountability measures in force*	No commitment

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the Florida Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

Florida also plans to improve its teacher-certification exams, claiming that its Race to the Top strategy will "improve the rigor" of these teacher tests. Specific steps have been outlined to revise teacher tests in reading and mathematics for K-6 elementary teachers, and to make changes in unspecified "other examinations in certification areas" that include reading, math, and science.

These revisions would be a positive development for Florida schools and K-12 students, since the state's current testing system is a weak gateway to entry into the teaching profession. The most recent federal report on Florida teacher testing showed that only 12 of 5,745 test takers failed to pass a Florida teacher test.[24]

Like most of the 12 Race to the Top states, Florida's beefed-up program-performance indicators will be used for public disclosure but not for program accountability. The target date for performance-disclosure statistics is 2013. Disclosure without accountability consequences is consistent with the state's track record of neglecting real accountability for in-state teacher-education programs. Since 2002, Florida has identified just one program as low performing and cited another as "at risk" of becoming low performing.[25]

Florida Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	10
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	7/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

Another focus of Florida's work is revision of the state standards for teachers. The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, or FEAP, were first adopted in 1998. FEAP standards identify "essential elements of instruction," and the revised FEAPs will be used to judge each district's teacher-evaluation system, as well as provide the basis for performance indicators. Curricula and candidate assessment in teacher-education programs must be aligned to the FEAPs, and each program will have to submit a FEAP-aligned program evaluation plan sometime after July 2012.[26] It is not yet clear how rigorously the new performance items will be measured, or if the revisions will be significant improvements over the older FEAP structures and processes.

On state capacity to achieve success under Race to the Top, the Data Quality Campaign reports that Florida has all 10 key elements for a robust and successful state education data system. The state has taken seven of the "essential state

actions" to make effective use of the system (see table above). While no other state has adopted more of these essential steps, Florida still needs a strong governance structure for its data system, and it has to implement strategies to raise awareness of available data with relevant audiences like educators, policymakers, and the public.

Other capacity milestones for Florida are its adoption of the Common Core State Standards, and its role as leader of one of the multistate assessment consortia constructing new K-12 assessments to gauge student-learning outcomes. Both of these actions will advance the positive impact of Florida's Race to the Top strategies for schools, teachers, and students.

Despite the large amount of money awarded to Florida for its Race to the Top project, proposal reviewers expressed concern about the vagueness of many proposed action steps, noted the state's weak track record in using data, and had doubts about Florida's commitment to sustain Race to the Top activities beyond the period of federal funding. One reviewer cited lack of detail on specifics, and described "a generic promise to establish guidelines for assessing and reporting results." Another proposal reader commented on "scant information suggesting why [teacher-preparation performance data] will be better utilized" in the future. A third reviewer wrote that "sustainability is of some concern," because the proposal made no mention of ongoing support for work begun under federal auspices.

In sum, the Florida proposal's positive Race to the Top attributes—high data system capacity, five relevant and new program-performance indicators, and willingness to improve a weak teacher-testing system—must be viewed in the context of areas where significant improvements can be made to the state's overall strategy. These include

- Using the state's data infrastructure to move from public disclosure to meaningful accountability of program performance

- Translating some vague commitments into specific action steps that will improve the quality of schooling for Florida children

- Evidence of the intention to sustain these efforts with long-term leadership support that extends beyond the period of federal oversight

Georgia

With 446.4 reviewer points, Georgia was awarded just under $400 million in the second round of Race to the Top funding. It scored eighth out of the 12 winners, receiving more money than seven others.

In the proposal's teacher quality and program improvement category, Georgia's strategy boasts several positive features. The state will implement three new or revised indicators of program performance, each of which is recommended in CAP's 2010 paper, "Measuring What Matters." Georgia has one of the country's strongest state data systems, as well as a history of supporting state-level P-16 (pre-kindergarten-through-college) partnerships linking K-12 and higher education. And from the vantage point of future capacity to meet Race to the Top goals, it is noteworthy that Georgia participates in both of the multistate testing consortia working to develop better assessments of student academic performance.

Even with these strengths to build on, however, Georgia has no plans to improve its state policies on accountability for preparation programs. Its Race to the Top commitment is limited to public disclosure for only a small proportion of its in-state preparation programs. Proposal reviewers wrote that disclosure of graduates' teacher effectiveness would be limited to only 30 percent of in-state programs.[27]

In addition, the state proposal articulated no strategy for promoting innovation in teacher education. But in a videotaped Q&A session, the Georgia team told proposal reviewers that plans would be developed to work on new preparation pathways with Teach for America and the New Teacher Project.[28]

Continuity and sustainability of state Race to the Top initiatives are likely to be affected by leadership turnover in many states as a result of the 2010 election cycle. Georgia is one of them: A new governor, Nathan Deal, was elected in November and took office in January 2011, although this turnover did not alter party control of the governorship. A five-person team—including the state superintendent, the state board chair, two aides to the previous governor, and a rural superintendent—made the state Race to the Top presentation. Only one of the four state-level team members (the state board chair, Wanda Barrs) remains in office.

Specifics of the Georgia proposal

To improve teacher-preparation quality for in-state programs, Georgia intends to implement three outcome-based program-performance indicators:

- Measures of teacher effectiveness for graduates of in-state preparation programs
- Tracking persistence in teaching of all in-state program graduates, and tying persistence rates back to each program
- Revisions to current teacher-certification examinations

The state's Race to the Top initiative proposes to disclose these program-specific performance findings to the public by 2014.[29] There are no plans to hold programs accountable for the quality of their graduates. In one of the oddest provisions of any Race to the Top proposal, Georgia will calculate and report teacher effectiveness data for only 30 percent of its in-state programs by the time federal Race to the Top support has ended.[30]

Fast facts: Georgia Race to the Top initiative and teacher quality

Grant award: $399,952,650	Reviewer score: 446.4
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
	Persistence in teaching
	Revised certification exam
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2014
Program accountability measures in force*	No commitment

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the Georgia Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

Certification exam changes planned in Georgia offer an interesting lesson for other states. Georgia will develop a "data proficiency test" to assess how well teacher candidates understand the analysis, interpretation, and use of student-learning data for classroom instruction. The concept of teachers using student-performance findings to modify their own instruction is widely accepted now as a needed standard practice in classrooms, but few new teachers seem to have been prepared for this work as a component of their training.

Inclusion of "data proficiency" items as a component of certification should drive the content of preparation programs closer to the needs of practicing teachers and their schools. This is a welcome change and ought to be looked at by other states whose program graduates need (but usually don't have) this set of skills.

While it is making these changes, Georgia should add greater rigor to its whole system of teacher tests. According to the most recent HEA Title II report to Congress by U.S. Department of Education Secretary Arne Duncan, teacher test takers in Georgia have a 98 percent overall pass rate, even higher than the 96 percent national pass rate that has led observers to the conclusion that real teacher-education program accountability is a myth. Of 3,454 Georgia teacher candidates who were tested, only 56 failed to pass. K-12 student-learning performance in the state certainly does not mirror these "Lake Woebegon" teacher-testing results.

Georgia Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign-10 Key Elements*	10
Data Quality Campaign-Essential State Actions*	7/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes (2)

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

Like most states, Georgia does little to hold preparation programs accountable. Under its Race to the Top proposal, the state will calculate and disclose teacher-effectiveness ratings for each program but will not use these for accountability purposes. The state's preparation-program oversight system seldom leads to program closure or even a reprimand for a weak program. Since 2002 Georgia has identified just one low-performing program and two "at-risk" programs under the federal HEA Title II regulations. Perhaps this tepid commitment to real accountability helps explain why the University System of Georgia (which oversees all public colleges and universities) recently decided it would not cooperate with a national study of teacher preparation quality co-sponsored by the National Center for Teacher Quality and *U.S. News & World Report*.[31]

One area in which Georgia does take a step in the right direction is tying advanced certification to teacher effectiveness. According to information

provided in the state's Race to the Top Q&A session with proposal reviewers, newly licensed teachers will have three years to become effective as measured by pupil-learning outcomes in order to advance to full licensure status. Georgia's proposal says that advanced licensure status for program graduates will be reported publicly by program. This is a useful step, but Rhode Island's linkage of advanced licensure and teacher effectiveness (see page 52) will also become a program-accountability measure.

Georgia's capacity to use data more effectively is clear from analyses by the Data Quality Campaign. Georgia has all 10 of the key elements for a strong education data system, and it has completed 7 of the 10 essential actions to make the system useful for schools, parents, and policymakers. Like all other Race to the Top states, Georgia has adopted the Common Core State Standards, and it belongs to both of the multi-state assessment consortia funded by the U.S. Department of Education.

Georgia's long-term support of P-16 partnerships[32] involving public higher education and the state K-12 system suggests that the state has high potential to work successfully on changes described in the Race to the Top proposal that will improve outcomes for schools and for students. Summing up the picture as it stands now, Georgia's Race to the Top strategy includes several important positive steps that will raise public awareness about the quality of in-state preparation programs. Much more can and should be done by the state to replace a weak accountability structure with meaningful oversight of programs that prepare teachers for public schools.

Hawaii

For Hawaii, 462.2 reviewer points in the second round of Race to the Top competition earned it $74.9 million in federal funds. Hawaii's proposal scored third-highest of the 12 winners. It is the only state west of the Mississippi to win in the Race to the Top competition. It's also interesting to note that Hawaii is one of four funded states whose proposal was shaped in significant ways by a consulting firm, Education First Consulting, whose partners include former foundation program officers, state policymakers, and lobbyists.[33]

An analysis of Hawaii's teacher-quality and program-improvement proposals shows positive attributes but raises several questions about the breadth and depth of the state's ambitions for real change. On the positive side of the ledger, Hawaii will calculate and report publicly on the teacher effectiveness of graduates from its 11 in-state preparation programs. Hawaii has a good state data system, adopted the Common Core State Standards and has joined with other states to develop better assessments of K-12 student learning.

Fast facts: Hawaii Race to the Top and teacher quality

Grant award: $74,934,761	Reviewer score: 462.2
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2014
Program accountability measures in force*	No commitment

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the Hawaii Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

These strengths are undercut by vague commitments in other important areas. Hawaii will make limited moves to expand or improve alternative preparation pathways to the classroom. It has no plans to develop real accountability standards for teacher education. And it's not clear when measures of teacher effectiveness will be available for any purpose—whether for better teacher-evaluation practices or for public disclosure of preparation-program quality.

Leadership change may also affect the pace and impact of Hawaii's Race to the Top agenda. One of the few states whose governor did not participate in the competition's presentations and discussions at the U.S. Department of Education in August 2010,[34] Hawaii has a new governor, Neil Abercrombie, elected in November 2010, and a change in party control of the governorship. The interim state superintendent, Kathryn Matayoshi, and interim deputy superintendent, Ronn Nozoe, who did make the state's case for Race to the Top, now hold those positions officially.

Specifics of the Hawaii strategy

Though the state's proposal is vague on the actual disclosure date, Hawaii plans to calculate and report teacher-effectiveness ratings for all of its in-state preparation programs, as required by the Race to the Top prospectus. It cites three dates in the proposal when it will make the findings public—2012, 2014, and 2016. After flagging 2012 and 2014 for reporting teacher-effectiveness data, the proposal notes, "Hawaii is unable to provide student growth data until SY 2015-2016, but … HIDOE [the state education department] will establish interim measures using growth models." It's not clear what the interim growth models might be for a state that is unable to calculate student growth, but one reviewer commented, "It will take five years before the state can report its findings."

Hawaii Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	10
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	4/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

The state offers no other measures for gauging the quality or impact of its teacher-education programs. Federal reports show that Hawaii has never designated a program as low performing or "at-risk" of becoming low performing. Its teacher-licensure test pass rate, 89 percent, is the lowest of any state.[35] Hawaii is one of the states that require National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education approval

for in-state preparation programs as part of the state program oversight system. The lack of rigorous evidence-based outcome measures in NCATE's system is consistent with the Hawaii approach to preparation-program accountability.

What will Hawaii's education leaders do with teacher-effectiveness data about their preparation programs? When it is finally disclosed to the public, the state's Race to the Top proposal suggests that may be the end of the matter. State officials say they will "monitor and reaccredit all teacher and administrator preparation programs using outcome-based, data-driven criteria beginning in 2015." But plans for using the data are described as efforts "to encourage programs shown to be ineffective to make needed improvement."

Another possible action step outlined in the proposal is participation by the state Professional Standards Board in the Teacher Preparation Assessment Consortium.[36] While six of the funded Race to the Top states have joined this multistate effort, as of December 2011 there's no mention of Hawaii on the project website's list of state partners, nor does Hawaii's Race to the Top website or Professional Standards Board give any evidence of actual involvement.

Looking at state capacity to improve preparation program accountability policies and practices, the Data Quality Campaign reports that Hawaii has all 10 key data system elements for a strong education data infrastructure. Yet the state has taken only 4 of the 10 "essential steps" to make this system useful and effective for the public and for policymakers. Among the missing steps are linked data systems (tying together student and teacher files, for example), stable support for the data system, and the ability to generate reports using individual-level student data.

Overall, then, it appears that five years after receiving almost $75 million in federal Race to the Top funds, Hawaii will then take one small—but significant—step in the direction of meaningful oversight for teacher-education programs by reporting teaching-effectiveness ratings for in-state programs. If this disclosure does happen, it will be a useful step.

Perhaps Hawaii is a state where targeted technical assistance and stepped-up pressure to do a better job of program accountability would benefit schools, students, and teachers. The improved state data system also funded through Race to the Top would allow Hawaii to calculate, report, and employ for real accountability such preparation-program quality measures as job placement rates, persistence in teaching, and feedback survey findings from program graduates and their employers.

Maryland

Maryland has received just under $250 million in Race to the Top funds for a set of education reform strategies that earned 450 reviewer points from the U.S. Department of Education. This score put the state in the middle of the pack tied with Washington, D.C.: five states had higher scores, and five were lower.

This state's approach to teacher quality includes use of teacher-effectiveness ratings to hold preparation programs accountable as well as efforts to construct a broad array of pupil tests in subject areas and grade levels not covered by current state testing. Maryland's Race to the Top strategies will be helped by leadership continuity at top levels: Gov. Martin O'Malley was reelected in 2010, and state superintendent Nancy Grasmick remained in office until June 30, 2011. Maryland is one of the Race to the Top states whose proposal was shaped in significant ways by an outside consulting firm of former foundation program officers, state policymakers, and lobbyists.

Fast facts: Maryland Race to the Top and teacher quality

Grant award: $249,999,182	Reviewer score: 450.0
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2013
Program accountability measures in force*	2014

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the Maryland Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

Strong points in Maryland's design are offset by a lack of detail in the proposal (and in the videotaped Q&A session with the U.S. Department of Education review team) about how state strategies will be translated into action steps. Schools and students in Maryland also would be helped by use of additional accountability indicators for program quality, something the state could implement quite easily because of its good longitudinal data system.

Specifics of the Maryland proposal

Although Maryland claims to have closed one teacher-education program and put three others on probation in the last 10 years, its current program accountability system is NCATE-heavy and light on real outcomes.[37] Its most recently available teacher test pass rate was 97 percent, with only 77 of 2,379 test takers failing to pass.

This record of weak oversight for teacher education is the jumping-off point for a serious effort to use teacher-effectiveness scores of program graduates as a new accountability measure. Unlike most Race to the Top winners, Maryland will disclose program-performance findings and use them to reform or close weak programs. As the proposal indicates, Maryland "will use performance data to improve programs and close and/or deny program approval to those with consistently poor track records."

Public disclosure is scheduled to begin in 2013, and performance-driven accountability for preparation programs is set for 2014.

In order to move program accountability in a meaningful direction, Maryland intends to link all preparation programs to teacher- and principal-evaluation data by 2012. Individual identification numbers will be assigned to all candidates as they enter a program, making it easier to track them through to program completion and into the profession. Taking this step would enable the state to track and report persistence rates, and to implement feedback surveys whose results could be linked back to specific preparation programs.

These indicators were recommended for all states in the CAP paper, "Measuring What Matters." Maryland should emulate the examples of Massachusetts and New York by using teacher-persistence rates as a program-accountability measure. It can look to non-Race to the Top states such as Texas or California for the use of graduate and employer surveys as a program-quality feedback mechanism.

To support its teacher- and principal-development initiatives, Maryland will create a set of pre- and post-tests for students in grades and subject areas that are not part of the state assessment system. With help from a "Psychometric Council" of outside experts to guide this work, the goal is to create "objective" tests that will support student growth calculations used for instructional improvement and for accountability. This test-development work under Race to the Top goes beyond Maryland's participation in the multistate assessment consortium funded sepa-

rately with Race to the Top money. No other state appears as committed to a test development strategy that will expand the current limited number of teachers (about one-third) whose students are included in state K-12 testing systems.

While stronger accountability and better assessments are positive components of Maryland's Race to the Top strategy, the state says very little about expanding effective-preparation programs to meet student needs. Two federal reviewers commented on the lack of detail in the Maryland proposal on how the state will use pupil-achievement results to identify effective programs that should be expanded because of their performance.

Maryland's capacity to meet its Race to the Top goals is moderately strong. The Data Quality Campaign reports the state has eight key elements of an effective data system, and has taken 6 of 10 essential steps to promote successful use of the system. Still to come are actions leading to individual-level student data reports and support for creating longitudinal statistical analyses. And like all funded states, Maryland adopted the Common Core State Standards and has signed on to a multistate consortium developing newer student assessments that are aligned to the multistate Common Core standards.

Maryland Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	8
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	6/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website

The overall teacher-quality improvement picture for Maryland's Race to the Top initiative shows a state moving in the right direction on preparation-program accountability but not going far enough. An interesting test-development strategy to create a new set of high-quality assessment measures of K-12 learning would be enhanced if teacher-education programs were judged by a broader set of measures. There is capacity in place to adopt additional outcome-focused indicators of program quality.

Still missing, however, is the will to hold programs accountable for the full range of outcomes that matter most to schools, students, and teachers. And finally, observers of Maryland's work should pay attention to the implementation schedule set out in the state's proposal—evidence of significant progress will bolster confidence that the very general language employed in the proposal will soon translate into real progress on education reform in the state.

Massachusetts

The Bay State was awarded $250 million on 471 reviewer points in Race to the Top's second competition round. Massachusetts received the highest score of any state proposal.

Strong points for the state's strategy include a commitment to preparation-program accountability using three important indicators of quality: teacher effectiveness, teacher persistence, and job placement of program graduates in high-need fields. The Massachusetts plan allocates $5 million to stimulate innovative preparation programs through competitive awards to new and existing providers.

Leadership continuity at the state level bodes well for enabling the state to attain its Race to the Top goals: Gov. Deval Patrick was re-elected in 2010 and the other key officials who led the Massachusetts presentation to the U.S. Department of Education are still in office.[38]

Fast facts: Massachusetts Race to the Top and teacher quality

Grant award: $250,000,000	Reviewer score: 471.0
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
	Persistence in teaching
	Job placement of graduates
	in high-need fields
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2013
Program accountability measures in force*	2013

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the Maryland Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

With these advantages, as well as a strong education-reform track record over the last couple of decades, the Massachusetts Race to the Top strategy is nonetheless undercut by a lack of detail about how major commitments will be operationalized and implemented. This is discussed below in greater detail, but these issues

suggest the need for careful attention from the U.S. Department of Education and vigilance from state leaders if their hopes of ongoing reform are to be realized.

Specifics of the Massachusetts proposal

With the best-performing state public school system in the United States,[39] Massachusetts seems to have decided that stronger incentives aimed at in-state preparation programs will be a good way to keep momentum going on improved student outcomes. Through Race to the Top, therefore, Massachusetts will implement three accountability indicators critical to the success of schools and pupils:

• Holding preparation programs accountable for the teacher effectiveness of program graduates, as measured by state achievement tests
• Persistence rates in teaching for program graduates
• Placement of preparation-program graduates as teachers in high-need fields

Through these measures, Massachusetts will be one of only five states using Race to the Top-developed indicators for teacher-education accountability. Other states limit themselves to public disclosure alone, hoping that shame will induce reform of weak programs.

Massachusetts Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	10
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	4/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

By using persistence in teaching as an accountability measure, Massachusetts will be in the company of only one other state—New York—taking action to drive preparation programs to pay attention to what happens to their graduates once they leave the campus.[40]

If Massachusetts follows through on its pledge to judge program quality by whether or not graduates are produced and employed in high-need fields, this step alone could solve an important teacher-quality policy dilemma. Most preparation programs pay no attention to the needs of schools or school systems when it comes to the production of graduates in specific grade levels and subject areas. They admit whoever shows up, graduate whoever survives, and let someone else worry about whether the supply of new teachers has any relationship to employer demand.

As a result, nearly every state has a massive oversupply of newly prepared elementary teachers. Moreover, many universities export large numbers of graduates to other states because they can't find jobs in their home state.[41] Home state taxpayers have little idea of the extent to which they are paying to meet the teacher-supply needs of other states. By linking program output to in-state school needs, Massachusetts may force better alignment between supply and demand. New York and Rhode Island will also use job placement as a program-accountability measure. (see page 43 and 52, respectively)

The three new Massachusetts program-quality indicators represent important steps forward for a state whose current oversight of teacher education is not much different from most other places. Almost every teacher candidate passes all the state tests (97 percent), and Massachusetts has never flagged an in-state program as low performing or at risk of becoming low performing.[42]

Even with the positive changes to the state's accountability system planned through Race to the Top implementation, the state's proposal, as well as its August 2010 presentation to the U.S. Department of Education review team, suggest that Massachusetts intends to use teacher-effectiveness results to reform only 25 of its 73 in-state programs by the time Race to the Top funds have been used up.[43]

The state will disclose program-quality information to the public by 2013, and will begin using the same information for accountability purposes in 2013, but it's not clear how many programs will be affected—100 percent or just 25 out of 73 providers.

Through Race to the Top, Massachusetts will leverage preparation-program innovation and redesign with $5 million in competitive grants. Pilot programs underway in the state prior to Race to the Top are expected to contribute knowledge about successful practices to this endeavor. Individual institutions as well as state-supported regional centers linking K-12 and higher education will be supported

through the grants. Like other states, one option for Massachusetts reformers is the "residency model" of teacher education.[44]

On the capacity side, Massachusetts has all 10 of the Data Quality Campaign's key data system elements, and has accomplished 4 of the 10 essential actions to make good use of this infrastructure. Still to come are linking existing state-level databases, providing timely access to information, and developing reports that tap student-level data. The state has adopted the Common Core State Standards, and works with one of the multistate K-12 assessment consortia.

In light of its overall K-12 system performance—at the top of most comparisons among the 50 states and on par with some high-performing countries—Massachusetts will make further progress through its Race to the Top strategies when they are fully implemented and evaluated. A close reading of the proposal suggests that the state needs to be more direct and open about how these strategies will be translated into specific action steps that have meaningful and positive consequences for schools, teachers, and students. One reviewer's comment captures the essence of the Massachusetts design: "The plan has sound elements but lacks clarity."

North Carolina

North Carolina garnered just under $400 million in Race to the Top funds through 441.6 reader points out of a possible 500 in the second round of the 2010 competition. The state was 10th of 12 grant recipients in points awarded.

In categories of teacher quality and program accountability, North Carolina's proposal is quite weak. The state intends to use student-growth measures for public disclosure of teacher effectiveness ratings only for public university preparation programs. There are no current plans to improve a weak accountability system, and there is only a vague promise to include the 33 in-state nonpublic colleges and universities in the public-disclosure system—sometime in the future.

Fast facts: North Carolina Race to the Top and teacher quality

Grant award: $399,465,769	Reviewer score: 441.6
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2011
Program accountability measures in force*	No commitment

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the North Carolina Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

North Carolina will allocate $5 million in Race to the Top funds to expand alternative preparation programs, focusing its efforts on increasing the participation of Teach for America, which came first in a recent statewide study of teachers' impact on pupil learning outcomes.[45] North Carolina's overall Race to the Top strategy should be helped by leadership continuity. Gov. Bev Perdue continues in office, as do the state superintendent of public instruction (June Atkinson) and the chair of the State Board of Education (William Harrison). All three led the state's Race to the Top presentation at the U.S. Department of Education in August 2010.

Specifics of the North Carolina proposal

For preparation-program accountability, North Carolina met the Race to the Top minimum requirement for disclosing teacher-effectiveness ratings for in-state preparation programs. Disclosure of program performance is predicted to take place in 2011. The state, however, has attached so many conditions and caveats to this promise that the reader may wonder just what North Carolina will do in exchange for $400 million in federal funds. Specifically:

- The proposal exempts "independent colleges" from the reporting system for teacher-education providers. These 33 in-state colleges and universities account for 13 percent of newly licensed teachers.[46] When North Carolina political and educational leaders were asked about the state's plans for these non-public institutions in a videotaped question and answer session with federal reviewers, the response was that "conversations" would take place sometime in the future.

- Teacher-effectiveness analyses will depend on developing measures of student growth—as is the case in all of the Race to the Top states—but the North Carolina proposal only says that, by the 2012-13 school year, the state will adopt a uniform set of "acceptable measures of pre-approved student growth data."

Reviewers apparently never asked the meaning of "acceptable" or "pre-approved," at least not in the videotaped Q&A session noted above. Several federal reviewers did deduct points for exempting the independents from oversight. Like Georgia, however, whose proposal will limit disclosure to 30 percent of in-state programs, North Carolina was funded despite its stated plan to ignore this provision of the Race to the Top prospectus.

It is also of interest to note that a sizeable number of North Carolina teachers are prepared out-of-state. The federal HEA Title II report says that more than 40 percent of initially certified North Carolina teachers were trained in another state, while a 2007-08 analysis pegs the out-of-state group at about 30 percent.

Either way, this exemplifies a glaring weakness of every state's teacher-preparation policies. The quality of programs that prepare tens of thousands of teachers employed in North Carolina (and in other states) will never be disclosed: the state where they work will link teachers back only to in-state programs, while the state where they were trained has no way to access student-achievement information from the employing state to judge the quality of programs that did prepare them.

This disconnect between preparing and employing states for teachers is a loophole in accountability oversight. Closing it requires a single set of accountability standards and uniform measures of performance across all states .[47]

North Carolina Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	10
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	5/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The <u>Data Quality Campaign</u> items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the <u>Common Core State Standards</u> from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on <u>state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium</u> from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

The Race to the Top initiative asks states to implement strategies that will promote expansion or creation of effective teacher-education pathways. In response, North Carolina proposes to allocate $5 million toward a Teacher Corps modeled on Teach for America. This may be the most useful component of the state's teacher-quality improvement agenda. The reason: A recent comprehensive analysis of preparation-program quality by the Carolina Institute for Public Policy at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill found the Teach for America "portal" to have the strongest positive impact on pupil learning of any approach to teacher preparation in North Carolina.[48]

These findings bolster the case for real accountability for all teacher-preparation pathways by North Carolina's policy and education leaders. Independent researchers were able to estimate the impact on pupil achievement of North Carolina teachers trained by the public universities, by out-of-state providers, by the in-state private colleges and universities, and from other pathways like Teach for America. The strongest positive growth for K-12 pupils came from Teach for America teachers, while the out-of-state group (nearly 40 percent of all teachers) performed worst. In-between were teachers trained at public and private colleges and universities.

The findings of this study are interesting in themselves but they deserve attention for something the state of North Carolina has no current plans to do: assess and report the effectiveness of teachers prepared by in-state independent colleges and

universities. If two researchers can pull this off, why has the state decided to leave these programs out of the mix?

Despite relatively weak teacher-accountability plans, North Carolina does have significant capacity to carry out its goals (and to strengthen them considerably). It has all 10 of the Data Quality Campaign's key data system components, and has taken 5 of the 10 essential actions to put the system to good use. Along with the other Race to the Top state winners, North Carolina has adopted the Common Core State Standards and is working alongside other states to develop new student assessments.

In sum, North Carolina has a weak strategy for teacher-quality accountability and preparation-program improvement. With excellent structural capacity to do better, this state can learn lessons from places such as Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island. Perhaps the U.S. Department of Education and other funders who seem to hold North Carolina in high regard can press the case for stronger action and more vigorous program accountability on behalf of the state's children.

New York

The state of New York was awarded just under $700 million in the second round of the Race to the Top competition for a proposal with 464.8 out of 500 reader points. This was the second-highest point total among the 12 winners (behind Massachusetts) as well as the second-largest grant (Florida received exactly $700 million).

New York's Race to the Top strategy for teacher preparation and program account-ability offers an innovative set of program redesign ideas and makes very strong commitments to enhance state accountability for teacher education program qual-ity. Unlike most of the winners, New York plans to combine public disclosure of preparation-program performance on a variety of measures with actual account-ability using multiple measures.

The state's ability to enact these promises into action may be affected by leader-ship changes at the top. New York voters elected a new governor in November 2010, Andrew Cuomo, and two of the key education leaders who shepherded the proposal through the federal review process have left or will leave office.[49] Three of the five team members will continue—Meryl Tisch, who leads the state board of regents; John King, commissioner of education; and Michael Mulgrew, president of the New York City teachers' union.

The New York City education chancellor Joel Klein had been a participant, but his replacement resigned in early April; and Dennis Walcott, who previously served as deputy mayor for education, will join the team. New York's lame duck governor, David Paterson, did not participate in the 2010 Race to the Top hearing; Georgia and Hawaii are the only other states whose chief executive skipped this phase of the Race to the Top competition.

Fast facts: New York Race to the Top and teacher quality

Grant award: $696,646,000	Reviewer score: 464.8
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
	Persistence in teaching
	Teacher production—high-need fields
	Job placement—high-need fields
	Revised teacher tests
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2012
Program accountability measures in force*	2012

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the New York Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

Specifics of the New York proposal

New York will implement five measures of teacher education program accountability through its work under Race to the Top. Four are entirely new indicators, and one revises current practice. These measures will drive public disclosure of program performance by 2012, and will be employed by 2012 to hold programs accountable for the performance their graduates. The measures are

- The student achievement of pupils taught by program graduates
- Persistence in teaching of in-state program graduates
- Production of teachers for high-need fields
- Job placement of preparation-program graduates in high-need fields
- A revised—and presumably stronger—battery of teacher tests

New York also intends to implement new steps that tie advanced licensure to teacher effectiveness. Unlike Rhode Island, however, New York will not use rates of advancement to professional licensure by a program's graduates as a program-quality indicator.

Two of the five New York accountability measures match up well with recommendations made in "Measuring What Matters." That document also called for massive redesign of our nation's teacher-testing system. While the New York strategy doesn't meet this objective, the state does intend to revise its content area tests to

improve their ability to assess how well teacher candidates know the subject matter content areas they are assigned to teach.

In fact, this teacher-testing redesign may be more far reaching than any other state. Deploying $22 million in Race to the Top funds and $8 million from the Gates Foundation, New York wants to construct a set of teaching-performance indicators that apparently will be used for everyone preparing to become a teacher through any in-state program. The state education commissioner said that all prospective teachers would be "measured against explicit rubrics of performance."[50]

Beyond this step, the state education commissioner and the board of regents will propose, by 2012, regulations that would allow only institutions producing a minimum percentage of teachers and principals rated highly effective to open new programs or continue to operate existing ones. New York's proposal goes beyond even these changes with the statement that the regents will implement "further [but unspecified] accountability measures after 2012."

New York is one of the jurisdictions with a two-tiered system of teacher licensure. Current policy requires earning a master's degree plus a few years of teaching experience to reach the advanced level. Starting with a 2012-13 school year pilot, state regulations will be changed so that "teacher applicants who have not raised student achievement over multiple years will not be able to receive professional certificates and continue teaching in New York."

New York Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	10
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	4/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

Once enacted and in full operation, the proposed changes described in New York's Race to the Top agenda are likely to strengthen a state oversight system characterized by high pass rates on teacher tests, and relatively few actions against

weak programs. According to federal Higher Education Amendments Title II data, 22,808 of 24,588 "traditional route" teacher candidates passed all their tests, a 95 percent pass rate. The professional knowledge test for teachers saw 99 percent pass.

While New York has been more aggressive than other states in flagging weak programs, its record looks good only in comparison to those that do virtually nothing to discipline or close bad programs. In 2007 New York reported eight low-performing programs, more than any other state. From 2002 through 2007 it identified one or more programs as low performing or "at risk" each year. It should be noted, however, that New York State has 116 teacher preparation programs.[51]

Other states are very likely to look to New York for ideas about expanding innovative teacher-preparation pathways. When New York submitted its Race to the Top proposal, the board of regents had already sought public comment on a plan to approve STEM, or science, technology, engineering and math, teacher-education master's degree programs by non-university providers. This concept was described in the proposal and discussed during the state's federal Question and Answer session. Within six months, by February 2011, the regents authorized "Teacher U" (now called Relay School of Education) to offer such a program. Like D.C., therefore, the state of New York is stimulating preparation-program innovation by going outside the orbit of higher education to support programs developed through and in K-12 schools.

The significance of the New York effort is two-fold: a unique program design approved by the state board of regents in the face of concerted opposition from many traditional providers, Relay is the first independent masters' degree-granting institution in New York State (that is, not affiliated with any accredited college or university).[52] Like the D.C. effort to build new preparation programs within its charter school networks, Relay will have to demonstrate its value through objective external measures that include student-learning outcomes.

When it comes to state capacity to achieve Race to the Top aims, particularly the challenge of obtaining and using sophisticated data, New York has all 10 of the Data Quality Campaign's key state data system elements. The state, however, has completed only four of the Campaign's "essential state actions" that characterize an effective system. For some time, researchers who study teacher effectiveness in New York have been forced to construct their own linkages across data sets, taking on the task of cleaning the data for accuracy.[53] Still unfinished in late 2011 are steps to:

- Link different data systems such as student and teacher files
- Build state data depositories (something already completed by 10 other Race to the Top winners)
- Create reports using individual-level student data
- Develop the capacity for generating longitudinal statistical reports

Without significant and relatively rapid progress on these data-system deficiencies, New York will have difficulty meeting its Race to the Top commitments. In other capacity dimensions, New York is positioned well. Like every one of the 12 winners, it has adopted the Common Core State Standards. New York tied the standards to its other reform efforts in curriculum development, new state assessments, and planned teacher professional development. New York also participates in one of the federally funded assessment consortiums.

In sum, New York has an aggressive Race to the Top agenda for teacher-education accountability and interesting policies to stimulate the production of new teacher-preparation pathways. It is not clear at this point how its plans for "teacher residency" programs will pan out, or whether its redesigned teacher certification tests will be more rigorous and more relevant than current versions. Observers should also pay attention to the data-system capacity challenges described in this profile.

Ohio

The U.S. Department of Education awarded Ohio $400 million in Race to the Top funds on the basis of a proposal that earned 440.8 reviewer points out of 500. Ohio's was the fourth-largest grant and had the second-lowest point total from federal readers. Only Delaware, a first-round winner, had fewer points. Ohio's proposal is one of four developed by an outside consulting firm.

In the Great Teachers and Great Leaders category of the Race to the Top program (described in the Race to the Top proposal solicitation referenced in the endnotes), Ohio proposed to improve the quality of teacher-preparation programs through public disclosure of program performance on three indicators. The state also described an innovative funding mechanism for advancing the quality of public university programs—performance-based state funding increases for programs whose graduates are effective, and state budget cuts for universities with weak programs.

Fast facts: Ohio Race to the Top and teacher quality

Grant award: $400,000,000	Reviewer score: 440.8
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
	Job placement—high-need fields
	Advancement to higher licensure
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2014
Program accountability measures in force*	No Commitment

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the Ohio Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

Key leadership turnover at the state level may affect Ohio's ability to keep its Race to the Top promises. Two of the five Ohio team members who represented the state in August 2010 are no longer in office. Gov. Ted Strickland was defeated at the polls in November. The new governor, John Kasich, forced the state education superintendent from office in March 2011.[54] An important leadership change in the state higher education system also took place when the governor named a new

chancellor, Jim Petro, in late March. Under Race to the Top, the higher education board of regents will be responsible for preparation-program accountability.

Specifics of the Ohio proposal

Ohio's improved system of disclosure for in-state teacher education programs is built on four main indicators. According to its Race to the Top proposal, these are

- Measuring teacher effectiveness of program graduates through K-12 student growth metrics and tying the results back to the in-state programs that produced teachers

- Using an improved state data system to report on job placement of preparation-program graduates in hard-to-staff urban and rural schools

- Reporting publicly on the extent to which new teachers advance to "professional" licensure as a result of their effectiveness in the classroom

- Surveying the employers of program graduates

Two of these indicators—teacher effectiveness and employer surveys—were recommended for enhanced preparation-program accountability by the CAP publication "Measuring What Matters," but Ohio will only use these data for public information, not program accountability. The state's Race to the Top proposal envisions a "system of performance metrics," but there is no indication (from the document itself, from reviewer comments, or from the Ohio Race to the Top Q&A session last summer) that the state has real accountability in mind for its revised oversight system.

In fact, Ohio only promises to use program-specific data from its new program-quality indicators to "facilitate continuous dialogue" with in-state preparation programs. The state has never identified a program as low performing since the federal HEA Title II guidelines were adopted. There is no hint in Ohio's proposal how or when talk might turn to action against weak programs.

Ohio Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	9
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	5/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes (2)

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

Stronger accountability for Ohio preparation programs would be a welcome change from past practice. While nine in-state programs have been flagged as "at risk" of becoming low performing (in 2002, 2003, 2006, and 2007), high teacher-test pass rates and the apparent lack of public pressure on weak programs suggest that more can be done. Nearly all teacher candidates pass the current battery of Ohio teacher tests. There was a 95 percent passing rate (7,407 of 7,761 test takers) for traditional route students, 97 percent passed the professional knowledge tests, and 98 percent passed all academic-content tests. As noted in "Measuring What Matters," similarly high passing rates in other states and nationwide are not reflected in student-achievement results for public school pupils taught by program graduates who pass teacher tests with flying colors.

The most interesting component of Ohio's effort to improve the quality of teacher education is its proposal to use performance-based funding for programs at public colleges and universities. Race to the Top documents contain no details about this policy innovation, except to say that programs whose graduates are found to be effective on student growth and other measures will see increased state support. Funding would be cut "for those programs that are not producing results."

No other state has suggested a policy using a state-based funding mechanism to create positive and negative incentives for program improvement. Because this policy was advanced by the state university system chancellor who left office in early 2011, and with the Ohio board of regents under new leadership, it is not clear at this time whether Ohio will move forward with performance-based funding in teacher preparation.

State capacity in Ohio to achieve its limited commitments for program improvement and enhanced quality oversight is a mixed story. While Ohio has 9 of 10

Data Quality Campaign elements in place for a strong data system, proposal reviewers were not sure whether important benchmarks will be reached. They could not determine, for example, when student-performance data will be linked to teachers for teacher education program accountability.

Since the state has taken only 5 of the 10 essential actions to make its data system a useful partner in education reform, reviewer caution is understandable. As of spring 2011, data systems have not been linked and processes are not in place to provide timely access to information. Work to develop viable measures of student growth is just getting underway, but it is not clear yet what weight will be given to student-growth calculations in teacher, principal, and preparation-program evaluations.

Summing up, the Ohio plan for teacher quality and program accountability under the Race to the Top program appears to stop at public disclosure of in-state preparation program performance. Leadership change in key positions may limit (or change in a more positive direction) the extent to which the state meets its Race to the Top commitments. There are no plans right now to use teacher effectiveness findings as an accountability measure for in-state preparation programs. More details—and more reforms—are needed before we know for sure that program accountability will replace Ohio's reliance on NCATE's process indicators with relevant measures of program outcomes.

Rhode Island

Rhode Island's Race to the Top proposal earned $75 million in second-round funding on the basis of 451.2 points out of 500 awarded by federal reviewers. Rhode Island was one of four in the small tier category for funding (others are D.C., Delaware, and Hawaii). The smallest of these in population size is Delaware, which has received more Race to the Top funding and earned fewer reader points than any other state in this tier.

Teacher-quality commitments from Rhode Island include public disclosure of preparation-program performance using a set of new indicators. The state also plans on holding programs accountable through the same set of measures. The state is one of only five funded through Race to the Top to propose real account-ability for teacher education, joined in the small state grouping only by the District of Columbia. Rhode Island also put forward an innovative approach that links advanced teacher licensure back to the preparation programs that prepared the state's teaching force.

Fast facts: Rhode Island Race to the Top and teacher quality

Grant award: $75,000,000	Reviewer score: 451.2
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
	Job placement—high-need fields
	Teacher effectiveness and advanced licensure
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2012
Program accountability measures in force*	2012

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the Rhode Island Race to the Top competitive grant proposal.

State capacity and commitment for Race to the Top performance in Rhode Island are somewhat mixed, similar to every other funded state. At the top, Rhode Island changed governors in the 2010 elections. Party control of that office also switched, but other key officials on the state Race to the Top

leadership team are still in place. The governor who supported Rhode Island's application, Donald Carcieri, left office after eight years (not through defeat at the polls) and was replaced by Gov. Lincoln Chaffee.

Specifics of the Rhode Island proposal

Unlike most Race to the Top winners, Rhode Island is quite clear about its plan to improve accountability for in-state teacher-preparation programs. Report cards developed for each teacher-education program will include three new indicators:

- The teacher effectiveness of program graduates, as captured by a new student growth measure.

- The number of program graduates who work in Rhode Island public schools, disaggregated by school districts employing them, and by school-level poverty and ethnicity categories within the districts.

- The rate at which program graduates earn advanced professional certification. Their advancement as individual teachers will be based on the impact teachers have on student growth in the classroom. Rhode Island then plans to use the advancement rate for graduates of each program as a program-accountability measure.

In describing this strategy for teacher-quality improvements, Rhode Island's proposal says the state "will use these data to hold preparation programs accountable, support continuous program improvement, and when necessary, close programs that do not produce effective teachers." Only three other states and the District of Columbia are as forthright in linking impact on students and schools to preparation-program oversight.

Rhode Island's strengthened approach to program accountability will be a big step forward. According to federal reports, the state has never identified a teacher-education program as low performing or even "at risk" of becoming low performing. And teacher licensure pass rates are as stratospherically high in Rhode Island as elsewhere in the country. In the most recent HEA Title II report, only 40 students from traditional preparation programs (of 931 test takers) failed a test—for a 96 percent pass rate. Rhode Island did not report results for its academic content teacher tests, but 96 percent of Rhode Island teacher candidates also passed its professional-knowledge tests. Perhaps the new Race to the Top-inspired

accountability system will show the extent to which these teacher-testing results are justified by pupil achievement outcomes of students taught by Rhode Island teacher-education program graduates.

By addressing public disclosure and real program accountability in its design, Rhode Island is providing new tools for several important audiences. As the state's team noted in its videotaped Q&A session with reviewers, disclosure of program performance will help prospective teachers make better-informed decisions about where to enroll. Program-performance disclosure will also help districts and schools to hire graduates from strong programs. In addition, the Rhode Island accountability commitment is aimed at fostering "more direct working relationships" between the state department of education and teacher-education programs. State officials see this as a way to push teacher quality improvement.

Rhode Island Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	9
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	6/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

On the capacity side of the equation, the Data Quality Campaign reports that Rhode Island has a strong data system. The state has 9 of the 10 key elements for a solid data infrastructure, but has taken only six steps deemed essential to make effective use of the system. Still to come are actions that link existing data systems, work to produce reports based on individual-level student data, and systems that support timely access to relevant information. Strategies for dealing with these steps are described elsewhere in Rhode Island's Race to the Top proposal, but there is some confusion about just when the new indicators and accountability measures will come on line.

The proposal sets 2012 as the benchmark date for public disclosure and accountability using the new measures. But it will be 2013-14 before "student growth metrics" based on value-added data are developed. Reviewers were puzzled by the

differing trajectories for full implementation, noting that the proposal had too few specifics on this issue. The state has established a technical advisory panel to assist with the student growth-related tasks, and according to exchanges between state team members and the reviewers during the Q&A session at the U.S. Department of Education, Rhode Island will phase in growth measures over three years until the Race to the Top-funded Common Core assessment is ready for statewide use.

While there is clearly a need for clarification on the timeline for deploying strong measures of student growth in Rhode Island, the state's Race to the Top proposal demonstrates a solid commitment to real accountability for in-state teacher-preparation programs. One new Rhode Island accountability indicator is an innovative combination of teacher effectiveness and advanced licensure as a measure of program quality. Even so, the somewhat mixed picture on state capacity and implementation suggests that Rhode Island's work be monitored by the federal government with an eye to intervening with appropriate technical support to help the state realize its goals under its Race to the Top proposal.

Tennessee

Tennessee's first-round Race to the Top proposal obtained 443.4 of a possible 500 points, and the state was awarded slightly more than $500 million from the U.S. Department of Education. This was the third-largest Race to the Top award, for a proposal that scored ninth of the 12 winners profiled in this paper (the lower-scoring states were North Carolina, Ohio, and Delaware). With three other successful applicants, Tennessee developed its proposal with the services of Education First Consulting—whose partners include former foundation program officers, state policy makers, and lobbyists.

Positive aspects of the Volunteer State's strategy for improving teacher quality and preparation-program accountability include a commitment to public disclosure of three program-performance measures, and future use of the state's treasure trove of teacher-effectiveness information developed over decades by the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System, or TVAAS. Less appealing is failure to use TVAAS and other measures for real program accountability. From a reading of the proposal, federal readers' notes, and information gleaned from the state's Race to the Top implementation website, Tennessee is not making any meaningful changes to preparation-program accountability policies first adopted in 1988.

Fast facts: Tennessee Race to the Top and teacher quality

Grant award: $500,741,220	Reviewer score: 443.4
Outcome-based performance indicators*	Student achievement
	Persistence in teaching
	Job placement in high-needs fields
Public disclosure of program effectiveness*	2010
Program accountability measures in force*	No commitment

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: Grant award amounts from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Fund website; reviewer scores from the same source; outcome-based performance indicators, as well as dates for public disclosure and program accountability measures in force from the Tennessee Race to the Top competitive grant proposal

Many of the 12 Race to the Top winners entered 2011 with state government and education system leaders who were not at the helm when proposals were developed and defended in the spring and summer of 2010. Tennessee is one of them. Gov. Phil Bredesen retired after eight years in office. His successor, Bill Haslam, appointed a new chief state school officer, Kevin Huffman, as commissioner of education. Their attitude toward the state's Race to the Top agenda may be different from the supportive position of their predecessors and bears watching.

Specifics of the Tennessee proposal

Tennessee proposes to develop three new performance indicators of in-state preparation programs.[55] They are

- The academic achievement of K-12 pupils taught by the graduates of preparation programs
- Persistence in teaching by the graduates of these programs
- Job-placement rates for program graduates in high-need fields across the state

These indicators will be part of a revised report card for teacher education. An early 2011 update from the state noted that the contributions of program graduates to "student achievement growth" would be one of the report card elements.

Tennessee Race to the Top capacity and commitment indicators

Data Quality Campaign—10 Key Elements*	10
Data Quality Campaign—Essential State Actions*	5/10
Common Core State Standards*	Yes
Multistate assessment consortium*	Yes

*See Appendix for definitions

Sources: The Data Quality Campaign items from the 2010 version of the DQC survey of states to catalogue the status of their K-12 data systems; information on adoption of the Common Core State Standards from the website of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (http://www.corestandards.org/) and on state membership in either or both multi-state assessment consortium from the US Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment website.

Use of Tennessee's revised report card will be limited to public disclosure of program performance. The Race to the Top timeline calls for disclosure to begin in 2010. It should be noted that the state department of education report published in December 2010 did include teacher-effectiveness ratings for all public and private

preparation programs in the state, as well as persistence rates in teaching for graduates.[56] Comparing this document with reports produced in previous years does not show that Race to the Top implementation has influenced changes in structure or content. As a result, it's not clear just what the state will do through Race to the Top funds to modify its previous public disclosure reports on teacher education.

Unlike Louisiana, whose published teacher-education effectiveness ratings are used for program accountability, the Tennessee report card is informational.[57] Tennessee says that its reports "will inform program adjustments" but those adjustments are at the discretion of the preparation programs themselves. In fact, a more recent update from the Tennessee Higher Education Commission in March 2011 says that preparation-program feedback reports constructed through Race to the Top activities will be distributed in January 2012, "to assist in program improvement."

From the most recent Tennessee State Board of Education informational report across all public and private institutions on teacher effectiveness and preparation programs, "adjustments" and "program improvement" may well be in order. The December 2010 report found eight institutions whose graduates made a "statistically significant positive difference" to the academic achievement of the pupils they taught. The same report described 11 institutions whose preparation-program graduates had a "statistically significant negative difference" on their students' performance in the classroom, with 20 more programs making no difference to student outcomes one way or the other.

TVAAS, which analyzes student-achievement data for all tested public school students in the state, could be a very useful resource to improve program oversight in Tennessee. Current regulations and teacher-testing results are weak incentives for improvement. The state's NCATE-based program-approval policies have been in place since 1988. Licensure test results are disconnected from the conditions and the performance of schools and their students: 97 percent of traditional preparation route test takers passed all their tests; 98 percent passed their professional-knowledge exams; and 99 percent of all teacher candidates in Tennessee sailed through the state's academic-content tests.

In the realm of program sanctions, Tennessee identified one low-performing program in 2002. Since that year, a few more programs have been flagged as "at risk" of being low performing. It is noteworthy that preparation programs with a "negative impact" on student learning—that is, K-12 students lose ground during

the year when they are taught by a teacher produced by the program—are not held accountable by the state for this record.

Regarding capacity to implement its Race to the Top plans successfully, Tennessee has a strong state data system. The Data Quality Campaign reports that it has all 10 key elements of an effective education data system. On the other hand, Tennessee has taken only 5 of the 10 "essential state actions" to put its system to good use. Missing links at this point are

- Efforts to create stable and sustained support for a statewide system
- Establishing data systems linking information about teachers, schools, and students
- Providing timely access to relevant information

Like all 12 Race to the Top winners, Tennessee has adopted the Common Core State Standards, and participates in one of the consortia working with the states to develop new aligned student assessments. On balance, then, Tennessee has great—but unrealized—potential to bring rigorous accountability to in-state preparation programs. A report card is not useful as a form of accountability unless responsible state leaders make effective and aggressive use of the report card's findings to force changes on weak programs or close them down.

Given the potential of TVAAS as one of the anchors in Tennessee of a stronger system of real accountability, state education and other policy leaders in the state should take decisive steps to put a strong system of program oversight to work. Drawing on resources already in place, they ought to start by:

- Flagging, improving, or closing weak programs such as those already highlighted in its annual reports
- Including surveys of graduates and their employers in the state accountability system
- Getting away from reliance on weak and irrelevant teacher tests such as Praxis II

States like Tennessee, where more than 40 percent of its initially licensed teachers are prepared in other states have work to do in making progress toward accountability systems that don't exempt large proportions of the teacher workforce.[58]

Conclusion

The federal Race to the Top initiative created incentives to make important policy changes in teacher quality and preparation-program accountability. Proposals from 11 states and the District of Columbia were funded in 2010 to implement a broad range of commitments responsive to those Race to the Top incentives. This paper has provided detailed profiles of how the 12 funded states are working to improve teacher quality and accountability for in-state teacher-preparation programs.

As required by Race to the Top, these 12 grant recipients promised to provide public disclosure of teacher-preparation program performance through data on the teaching effectiveness of program graduates who teach in the state. This step—public disclosure based on the impact teachers have on the students they teach—goes well beyond where we are now in every state: little real accountability and limited public disclosure about weak or strong programs, with adverse consequences for K-12 students and schools.

Disclosure, however, is not enough by itself to ensure widespread improvement in teacher education across the United States. Recognizing this, 5 of the 12 funded Race to the Top recipients committed themselves to use federal and state funds to hold preparation programs accountable for the effectiveness of their graduates. These five states will use one or more of the preparation-program accountability indicators recommended by CAP's paper "Measuring What Matters."

In October 2011 the U.S. Department of Education announced a proposal to revamp the current federal teacher-education program-accountability system, replacing it with the requirement that all teacher-education programs in the United States

- Report on the impact their graduates have on K-12 student achievement
- Provide results from regular feedback surveys to program graduates and to the principals who employ them
- Supply data on the hiring and persistence in teaching of their graduates

These three accountability indicators were recommended as standard nationwide measures of preparation program quality in "Measuring What Matters."

Race to the Top also asked states for new initiatives to build or expand high-quality teacher-preparation pathways. Only 8 of the 12 winners took up this challenge, suggesting that more pressure (and perhaps targeted technical support) is needed to break the inertia created by traditional thinking about how to prepare teachers for the nation's schools.

These uneven responses across the 12 funded winners bear careful watching by those who believe in real accountability as a source for change in teacher quality. Variations in how states are implementing Race to the Top open the door for technical-assistance strategies to improve state performance in implementing Race to the Top from cross-state, foundation-supported, and U.S. Department of Education sources.

With all of its strengths and limitations in the realm of teacher quality and preparation-program accountability, Race to the Top is still likely to promote major steps in the right direction. States that have not received these funds, and whose accountability systems are weak and ineffective, can learn from these efforts. They, too, should set about the work of improving teacher quality by using rigorous performance measures to step up accountability for teacher education.

Appendix

Definition of Race to the Top program terminology in the charts of this report

For "fast facts" charts

Outcome-based performance indicators: Every state promised to use student achievement of public school students taught by preparation program graduates as an outcome indicator for teacher-education programs.

Public disclosure of program effectiveness: Every state committed to public disclosure of preparation program teacher effectiveness findings through a reporting system for performance results.

Program accountability measures in force: Only five states say they will use the teacher effectiveness of program graduates as an accountability measure, publicly reporting the results and using them to hold programs accountable. The other seven states limit themselves to public disclosure of these findings.

Source: Edward Crowe, "Race to the Top and Teacher Preparation: Analyzing State Strategies for Ensuring Real Accountability and Fostering Program Innovation" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2011), available at http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/03/pdf/teacher_preparation.pdf.

Data Quality Campaign charts

Ten key elements of a longitudinal data system

Element 1: Statewide Student Identifier
Element 2: Student-Level Enrollment Data
Element 3: Student-Level Test Data
Element 4: Information on Untested Students
Element 5: Statewide Teacher Identifier with a Teacher-Student Match
Element 6: Student-Level Course Completion (Transcript) Data
Element 7: Student-Level SAT, ACT, and Advanced Placement Exam Data
Element 8: Student-Level Graduation and Dropout Data
Element 9: Ability to Match Student-Level P-12 and Higher Education Data
Element 10: A State Data Audit System

Ten essential state actions for Race to the Top grant recipients

1: Link data systems.

2: Create stable, sustained support.

3: Develop governance structures.

4: Build state data repositories.

5: Implement systems to provide timely access to information.

6: Create progress reports using individual student data to improve student performance.

7: Create reports using longitudinal statistics to guide systemwide improvement efforts.

8: Develop a P-20/workforce research agenda.

9: Promote educator professional development and credentialing.

10: Promote strategies to raise awareness of available data.

Common Core State Standards Initiative

The Common Core State Standards Initiative is a state-led effort coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers. The mathematics and English Language Arts standards were developed in collaboration with teachers, school administrators, and experts, to provide a clear and consistent framework clear understanding of what students are expected to learn. The standards are designed to incorporate the knowledge and skills that our young people need for success in college and careers. Forty-four states and the District of Columbia have formally adopted the Common Core State Standards. (The Common Core State Standards Initiative. http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards.)

Multistate assessment consortium

Through federal funds awarded under the Race to the Top program, two consortia of states and other organizations were awarded grants to develop new student assessments in mathematics and English Language Arts linked to the Common Core State Standards. The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, or SBAC, received $170 million and the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, or PARCC, was awarded $160 million, both grants coming from the U.S. Department of Education in September 2010.

About the author

Edward Crowe is a consultant on teacher quality policy for several organizations and projects, including the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. He previously worked as senior consultant for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future on teacher preparation projects, and on research about the cost of teacher turnover, and as an adviser to the Hunter Foundation of Scotland and to the Scottish National Executive on teacher quality. He currently serves on the Advisory Council for the Texas Center for Research, Evaluation and Advancement of Teacher Education.

Crowe served as an evaluator for the New York City Partnership for Teacher Excellence, and wrote a commissioned paper for the Committee on Teacher Preparation Programs for the National Research Council. From 2002–2010 he was an advisor to the Carnegie Corporation of New York on implementation of the Teachers for a New Era initiative.

Crowe was the first director of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Program forthe U.S. Department of Education. He has experience in state higher education policy as well, having worked for the University of North Carolina system, with the Arkansas state higher education coordinating board, and as senior manager of a National Science Foundation-funded statewide math and science education reform project.

Crowe is co-editor (with Dr. Rena Subotnik) of the forthcoming book series *Levers of Change in Education*, and recently published a chapter on "Teaching as a Profession" in the 2008 *Handbook of Research in Teacher Education*. In 2010 the Center for American Progress published his paper on teacher education accountability, "Measuring What Matters: A Stronger Accountability Model for Teacher Education." He is a graduate of Boston College and holds master's and doctoral degrees in political science from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Endnotes

1   U.S. Department of Education, *Race to the Top Executive Summary*. (Department of Education, 2009), p. 2-10, available at http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf.

2   A recent North Carolina study—where between 30 percent and 40 percent of new teachers are prepared elsewhere—found that these teachers were the weakest of any "pathway" in terms of their positive impact on student learning. For more on this, see: Gary Henry and others, "Portal Report: Teacher Preparation and Student Test Scores in North Carolina" (Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Institute for Public Policy, 2010).

3   For more on this, see: Edward Crowe, "Measuring What Matters: A Stronger Accountability Model for Teacher Education" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2010).

4   "New Rules for Ed. Prep Are Mulled," *Education Week*, March 9, 2011, p. 1, 14.

5   Crowe, "Measuring What Matters.".

6   Ibid, p. 11.

7   For ease of reference, all 12 awardees are referred to as states throughout the paper.

8   The many examples of reform initiatives that appear to have had limited impact include the Holmes Partnership; the Teacher Quality Enhancement grants funded through the 1998 Higher Education Act; Teachers for a New Era; the National Network for Educational Renewal, and similar efforts.

9   First combination like this was 1998 Higher Education Amendments.

10 Crowe, "Measuring What Matters."

11 Ibid, p. 1.

12 Ibid, p. 7.

13 "2009 State Teacher Quality Yearbook," available at http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/; Suzanne Wilson and Peter Youngs, "Research on Accountability Processes in Teacher Education." In M. Cochran-Smith and K. Zeichner, eds., *Studying Teacher Education* (Washington: American Education Research Association, 2005); Education Trust, "Not Good Enough: A Content Analysis of Teaching Licensing Examinations" (1999), available at http://www.edtrust.org/dc/resources/archive/publications/1999.

14 New York has since authorized a nonuniversity provider to develop master's degree programs for teacher preparation, the first in that state's history. This policy innovation was described in the New York Race to the Top proposal but the provider(s) were not identified because necessary regulatory changes had not yet occurred. As discussed later in the paper, new regulations were adopted in early 2011 and authorization granted to a new program whose partners include several charter school networks.

15 Edward Crowe, "Race to the Top and Teacher Preparation: Analyzing State Strategies for Ensuring Real Accountability and Fostering Program Innovation" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2011).

16 "Washington DC Race to the Top, Phase 2 Q&A," available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TdPpT9BQWb8.

17 "Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality, 2010," available at https://title2.ed.gov/secReport10.asp, p. 23-28.

18 "Delaware Education Reform Plan," available at http://www.doe.k12.de.us/rttt/De_Ed_ReformPlanOverview.pdf .

19 "DEDOE Race to the Top Information," available at http://www.doe.k12.de.us/rttt/default.shtml.

20 The Data Quality Campaign is a voluntary group working with states and others to improve the quality of state data systems for P-16 education and higher education. More information is available at http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/.

21 See the Delaware Department of Education report, "Delaware Education Plan Overview," p. 3 available at http://www.doe.k12.de.us/rttt/RTTTFAQFinal.pdf

22 Funds authorized and appropriated through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, or ARRA, are the source for both Race to the Top and high-speed rail projects. Governors in Florida, Ohio, and Wisconsin rejected ARRA money for high-speed rail projects.

23 For example, see: Douglas Harris and Tim Sass, "The Effects of Teacher Training on Teacher Value Added." Working Paper 2006-03-01 (Florida State University, Department of Economics, 2006); Douglas Harris and Tim Sass, "Teacher Training, Teacher Quality and Student Achievement" Retrieved from the National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research web site: http://www.caldercenter.org/PDF/1001059_Teacher_Training.pdf; Dan Goldhaber and Jane Hannaway, eds., *Creating a New Teaching Profession* (Washington: The Urban Institute Press, 2010). More generally, see the numerous studies conducted through and published by the Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, or CALDER, at: "Publications," available at http://www.caldercenter.org/publications.cfm.

24 "Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality, 2010," available at https://title2.ed.gov/secReport10.asp, p. 23-28

25 Ibid., p. 23–28, 89–91.

26 As currently envisioned, the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices include 21 specific items under Quality of Instruction; and five items clustered as Continuous Improvement. More information can be found at: "Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention," available at http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/approval.asp.

27 All four of the Georgia proposal readers cited this 30 percent implementation ceiling by 2014 as a deficiency. One called it "quite low and unambitious," while another wrote that the state's plan "provides for collecting the right data but only for 30 percent of preparers."

28 The written proposal made no reference to strategies for expanding or creating effective teacher-education programs; one reviewer commented, "this element of the criterion is not fully addressed." Another wrote that "the budget shows no projects supporting improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs." It is a sign of the transparency of the proposal review process that all submitted proposals, reviewer notes, videotaped presentations, and videotaped Q&A sessions with state teams can be accessed through the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top website. The videotaped sessions also are available via YouTube.

29 The proposal cites an earlier date but reviewers pointed out that specific language in the proposal about calculation and disclosure of program-focused teacher effectiveness data will not occur until 2014.

30 This surprisingly limited approach even to public disclosure is contained in the Georgia proposal and in written reviewer notes.

31 Georgia public universities are not alone in refusing to cooperate with the NCTQ/*U.S. News & World Report* national study. See: Stephen Sawchuk, "States' Ed. Schools Backing Out of NCTQ Review," Teacher Beat Blog, *Education Week*, April 19, 2001, available at http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2011/04/states_ed_schools_peel_off_nct.html.

32 P-16 is the shorthand term for a comprehensive and integrated system that links all education levels from preschool (P) through post-secondary.

33 The other states are Maryland, Ohio, and Tennessee. For more information, see: "Who We Are | Education First Consulting," available at http://www.educationfirstconsulting.com/whoweare.

34 For more information, see: "Hawaii's Application for Race to the Top (RTTT) grant funds," available at http://doe.k12.hi.us/arra/index.htm.

35 Information on low-performing programs and on licensure test pass rates comes from: "Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality, 2010."

36 Six of the 12 state winners (Massachusetts, Maryland, North Carolina, New York, Ohio, and Tennessee) are members of the Teacher Performance Assessment, or TPA, Consortium. This initiative of three organizations (the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and Stanford University) has partners from 19 state-education agencies and about 70 teacher-preparation programs. Through a three-year pilot now in the design stage, its goal is "to support the connection between teacher performance and student outcomes with valid and reliable data that can also be used to guide pre-service and in-service training." The TPA has potential to add to the knowledge base about effective-teacher practices. If consortium states set high standards and use results to close weak programs, the effort will contribute value to Race to the Top's teacher-quality goals.

37 The state's proposal cites this record of program closure and probationary status for teacher-education programs. The federal Title II report card indicates that Maryland flagged one program in 2003 as low performing, and another was described in 2006 as at risk of becoming low performing.

38 The team included Gov. Patrick, his secretary of education, the commissioner and deputy commissioner of K-12 education, and the Boston school superintendent.

39 Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, "For 3rd Consecutive Time, Massachusetts Students Top Nation on NAEP Math," News release, October 14, 2009, available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/news/news.aspx?id=5090.

40 Three other states—Florida, Georgia, and Tennessee—aim to use persistence rates of program graduates for public disclosure about program performance. These states do not have any program-accountability indicators developed through Race to the Top.

41 This pattern is not a reflection of bad economic times. Predictable patterns of oversupply and out-migration have existed for years in states like Michigan and Pennsylvania.

42 Information on low-performing programs and on licensure test pass rates come from: "Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality, 2010."

43 This observation is based on language in section four of the Massachusetts Race to the Top proposal and on a review by the author of the videotaped Q&A between the Massachusetts team and the Department of Education's reviewers.

44 As with everything else in education, there is no "model" for the cluster of practices and goals lumped under the "residency" heading. The test will be evidence of effectiveness, not a set of new practices alone. Moreover, a daunting challenge is going to scale from the few strong programs like the Boston and Chicago residency programs without diluting the ability of the residency approach to produce worthwhile results.

45 The full 2010 study, "Teacher Portals: Teacher Preparation and Student Test Scores in North Carolina" (June 2010), and a related technical report, "Technical Report: The Impact of Teacher Preparation on Student Learning in North Carolina Public Schools" (May 2010), can be found at http://publicpolicy.unc.edu/?q=node/266.

46 Gary Henry and others, "Portal Report: Teacher Preparation and Student Test Scores in North Carolina."

47 This recommendation of "Measuring What Matters" was published by the Center for American Progress in July 2010. Closing the accountability loophole also depends on improved data systems in every state and data sharing across states.

48 Gary Henry and others, "Portal Report: Teacher Preparation and Student Test Scores in North Carolina."

49 In April 2011 the New York City schools chancellor resigned and the state education commissioner announced he would leave office in August 2011.

50 Comment by Commissioner David Steiner in the videotaped Q&A with federal proposal reviewers.

51 The state proposal says that New York has "4,897 registered programs" but this must count multiple subject area and specialty tracks within institutions as well as programs registered and regulated by the regents in occupation fields other than teacher education.

52 "Relay Graduate School of Education," available at http://relayschool.org/.

53 For the work of the New York Pathways Project, now known as the Teacher Pathways Project, see: "Teacher Policy Research," available at http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/.

54 Catherine Candisky, "Ohio's Schools Chief Is Forced to Resign," The Columbus Dispatch, March 15, 2011, available at http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2011/03/15/state-school-superintendent-forced-out.html; Zach Meisel, "Kasich Appoints Fingerhut's Replacement for Chancellor," The Lantern, February 28, 2011, available at http://www.thelantern.com/campus/kasich-appoints-fingerhut-s-replacement-for-chancellor-1.2021736#.TsQ6lmAlGQo.

55 Even though proposal language implies these are major steps forward, at least two of the three are already part of an annual report from the Tennessee state department of education available at http://www.tn.gov/thec/Divisions/fttt/documents/Report%20 Card%20on%20the%20Effectiveness%20of%20Teacher%20Preparation%20Programs.pdf.

56 "2010 Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs," available at http://www.tn.gov/sbe/teacherreportcard2010.htm.

57 As of April 2011, when this report was being drafted, only three states have published program performance data based on calculations of teacher effectiveness: Florida, Louisiana, and Tennessee. And of the three, only Louisiana—which is alone in not receiving Race to the Top funds—uses the findings for accountability.

58 Tennessee borders eight states: North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Missouri, some of which also import large numbers of new teachers from elsewhere in the country.

The Center for American Progress is a nonpartisan research and educational institute dedicated to promoting a strong, just, and free America that ensures opportunity for all. We believe that Americans are bound together by a common commitment to these values and we aspire to ensure that our national policies reflect these values. We work to find progressive and pragmatic solutions to significant domestic and international problems and develop policy proposals that foster a government that is "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Center for American Progress