

Teacher Preparation and Development

Appendices and Bibliography

**Edie Harding
Barbara McLain
with
Sue Anderson**

August 1999



*Washington State
Institute for
Public Policy*

Teacher Preparation and Development

**Edie Harding
Barbara McLain
with
Sue Anderson**

August 1999

Washington State Institute for Public Policy
110 East Fifth Avenue, Suite 214
Post Office Box 40999
Olympia, Washington 98504-0999
Telephone: (360) 586-2677
FAX: (360) 586-2793
URL: <http://www.wa.gov/wsipp>
Document No. 99-08-2901A

WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Mission

The Washington Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs the Institute, hires the director, and guides the development of all activities.

The Institute's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State. The Institute conducts research activities using its own policy analysts, academic specialists from universities, and consultants. New activities grow out of requests from the Washington legislature and executive branch agencies, often directed through legislation. Institute staff work closely with legislators, as well as legislative, executive, and state agency staff to define and conduct research on appropriate state public policy topics.

Current assignments include projects in welfare reform, criminal justice, education, youth violence, and social services.

Board of Directors

Senator Karen Fraser
Services
Senator Jeanine Long
Senator Valoria Loveland
Senator James West
Representative Ida Ballasiotes
Representative Jeff Gombosky
Representative Helen Sommers
Representative Steve Van Luven

Lyle Quasim, Department of Social and Health
Dick Thompson, Office of Financial Management
David Dauwalder, Central Washington University
Jane Jervis, The Evergreen State College
Marsha Landolt, University of Washington
Thomas L. "Les" Purce, Washington State University
Ken Conte, House Office of Program Research
Stan Pynch, Senate Committee Services

Staff

Roxanne Lieb, Director
Steve Aos, Associate Director

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Teacher Admission and Certification Standards
- Appendix B: Responsible Entities for Teacher Preparation and Development
- Appendix C: National Standards Boards for Teacher Education
- Appendix D: State Policy Tools to Influence Teacher Quality
- Appendix E: Literature Review on Teacher Quality
- Appendix F: Washington State Standards for Teacher Preparation and Development
- Appendix G: New Pre-service Program Standards
- Appendix H: Summaries of Case Studies on Teacher Preparation Programs
- Appendix I: Endorsements
- Appendix J: Type of Teacher Preparation Program by Institution
- Appendix K: Nationally Available Teacher Assessments
- Appendix L: Teacher Assessments in Other States
- Appendix M: States' Beginning Teacher Assistance Programs
- Appendix N: Case Studies of Four Beginning Teacher Assistance Programs in Washington
- Appendix O: Beginning Teacher Assistance Programs in California
- Appendix P: Performance-Based Teacher Certification in Other States
- Appendix Q: Beginning Educator Support and Training in Connecticut
- Appendix R: Alignment of Washington State Teacher Preparation and Development With Strategies to Implement Education Reform
- Appendix S: Assessment Options for Washington
- Bibliography

APPENDIX A: TEACHER ADMISSION AND CERTIFICATION STANDARDS

MAJOR CHANGES	PREVIOUS STANDARDS	NEW STANDARDS
Admission into teacher preparation program	Admission into teacher preparation program (1988 teacher education program approval standards) (WAC 180-78-160):	Admission into teacher preparation program 1997 teacher education program standards (all programs must be re-approved by August 31, 2000) (WAC 180-78A-200):
<i>GPA requirement has been dropped.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimum 2.5 college GPA for most recent 45 quarter (30 semester) credits 2. Evidence of competency in basic skills (oral/written communication, reading, computation) demonstrated by one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Success on a basic skills exam • BA • Graduate degree • 2+ years of college-level course work and written essay • Greater than statewide median score for previous year on SAT/Reasoning or ACT 	Evidence of competency in basic skills (oral/written communication, reading, computation) demonstrated by one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Success on a basic skills exam • BA • Graduate degree • 2+ years of college-level course work and written essay • Greater than statewide median score for previous year on SAT/Reasoning or ACT
Initial Teaching certificate	Initial Teaching certificate (WAC 180-79A-150 and 415):	Residency certificate – after August 31, 2000 (WAC 180-79A-515):
<p><i>Title changed to “Residency certificate.”</i></p> <p><i>Valid for an additional year (5 years instead of 4).</i></p> <p><i>Must seek next level of certification (professional) through enrollment in a program; can no longer “string together” a series of initial certification periods by taking course work.</i></p> <p><i>May renew once for 5 years if not employed as a teacher, once for 2 years if enrolled in valid professional certificate program.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 years old • Good moral character (affidavits in RCW 79A-122) • Appropriate degrees and course work as described under teacher preparation programs • Completed state-approved preparation program • BA from regionally-accredited college/university (if degree is in education, must have 30 quarter/20 semester hours in academic field listed as endorsement area) <p>Valid for 4 years</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 years old • Good moral character (affidavits in RCW 79A-155) • Appropriate degrees and course work as described in WAC 180-79A and 180-77, or qualified under WAC 180-79A-257 • Completed state-approved preparation program • BA from regionally-accredited college/university (if degree is in education, 30 quarter/20 semester hours in an academic field listed as endorsement area.) (WAC180-79A-206) <p>Valid for 5 years (WAC 180-79A-145)</p>

MAJOR CHANGES	PREVIOUS STANDARDS	NEW STANDARDS
<p>Initial Teaching certificate, <i>continued</i></p>	<p>Initial Teaching certificate (WAC 180-79A-150 & 415), <i>continued</i></p> <p>May be renewed for three-year period if have completed course work for continuing certificate or at least 15 quarter hours (10 semester) from regionally-accredited college since the certificate was issued (WAC 180-79A-405)</p> <p>If have initial certificate granted under previous standards, can renew once after August 31, 2000, and still qualify for continuing certificate (WAC 180-79A-160)</p>	<p>Residency certificate – after August 31, 2000 (WAC 180-79A-150 & 515), <i>continued</i></p> <p>May be renewed for an additional two years if enrolled in professional certificate program and making progress</p> <p>If not enrolled in a program and not employed as teacher, can be renewed for additional five years by completing 15 quarter (10 semester) credits from regionally-accredited college since certificate was issued (WAC 180-79A-250)</p> <p>Anyone else must appeal to the SBE for renewal</p>
<p>Continuing certificate</p> <p><i>Name changed to “Professional” certificate.</i></p> <p><i>Must complete approved program with demonstration of positive impact on student learning rather than accumulate a certain number of upper-division credit hours.</i></p>	<p>Continuing certificate (WAC 180-79A-415):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45 quarter (30 semester) hours upper division/graduate work post BA at regionally-accredited college (but if in a new subject, will accept lower division if leads to endorsement in that area) • 2 subject-area endorsements • 10 clock hours on issues of abuse (unless already completed) • 180 days of teaching experience and 30 days employment with the same employer (WAC 180-79A-417) <p>Must complete 150 credit hours (10 semester/15 quarter credits) of continuing education prior to each lapse date (WAC 180-85-075)</p> <p>If have initial certificate granted under previous standards, can get continuing certificate under previous standards as well (WAC 180-79A-160)</p>	<p>Professional certificate (WAC 180-79A-515):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete approved certificate program (see WAC 180-78A-500-540) • 10 clock hours on issues of abuse (unless already completed) • One subject-area endorsement • Completed provisional status (defined in RCW 28A.405.220 as two years) to get into program (WAC 180-79A-517) <p>Valid for five years and renewable for additional five years by process in WAC 180-85-150 continuing education credit hours (WAC 180-79A-510)</p>

APPENDIX B: RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT

RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES	RESIDENCY CERTIFICATE (PRE-SERVICE)	BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE (YEAR 1)	EMPLOYMENT EVALUATION - PROVISIONAL STATUS (YEARS 1-2)	PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE (YEARS 3 - 5)	ONGOING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CAREER-LONG)	EMPLOYMENT EVALUATION - PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OPTION (4 SUCCESSFUL EVALUATIONS)
LEGISLATURE	Minimum entrance requirements in statute Authority for certification delegated to SBE	TAP program description in statute Funding for TAP	Minimum evaluation criteria in statute	Authority for certification delegated to SBE	Funding for various types of programs Salary schedule incentive for education Criteria for credit on salary schedule in statute	Option mandated in statute
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (SBE)	Standards for program approval and performance by teacher candidates	No role	No role	Standards for program approval and performance by teacher candidates	Criteria for credits to maintain certification	No role
OSPI	SBE supported by OSPI staff	Administer funding for TAP	Expansion of evaluation criteria in WAC	SBE supported by OSPI staff	Administer funding for various programs and monitor salary schedule compliance	Expansion of evaluation criteria in WAC
COLLEGE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS*	Design programs and evaluate candidate performance	Informal role in very few local programs	No role	Design programs and evaluate candidate performance	Offer courses and degrees	No role
LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS	Advise colleges of education through PEAB	Design and administer programs	Additional criteria negotiable through collective bargaining Make employment decisions	Collaborate with colleges to offer certificate programs Serve on evaluation team	Offer courses and plan professional development with teachers Approve credit for salary schedule and certification	Additional criteria negotiable through collective bargaining Plan professional growth with teachers

*Responsibility for teacher preparation is shared in undergraduate programs between colleges of education and colleges of arts and sciences.

APPENDIX C: NATIONAL STANDARDS BOARDS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

A number of national organizations have established teacher education standards, including:

- NCATE: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
- INTASC: Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium
- NCTAF: National Commission on Teaching for America's Future
- NBPTS: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

NCATE is a non-governmental, professional accrediting body for schools, colleges, and departments of education. It is the only national accrediting agency for teacher preparation that is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. NCATE is a coalition of 30 national education organizations, focused on both pedagogical and subject content. Support is received from membership fees, accrediting fees, and grants. NCATE standards were developed in 1987 and refined in 1994. Its focus is on *pre-service program* accreditation. Some states, including Washington, conduct joint reviews with NCATE for teacher preparation program approval, either as one team or as two separate teams. Washington State has incorporated NCATE standards into its teacher preparation program review process.

INTASC is a consortium formed to promote standards-based reform of teacher preparation, focusing on standards that pre-service or beginning teachers should meet. Good preparation programs are defined as those that help teachers reach specified standards, but the standards are not used for accrediting unless a state chooses to do so. Washington State has incorporated INTASC standards into its teacher preparation program review process. In cooperation with a number of states, INTASC is developing teacher tests: one is related to generic teaching skills and others focus on subject areas.

NCTAF is a commission formed to make recommendations and provide support to states that wish to address those recommendations. NCTAF focuses on teacher quality, including selection, preparation, professional development, and school structure. NCTAF was formed in 1994 and is funded by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation to provide an action agenda for meeting America's educational challenges and connecting higher student achievement with the need for quality teachers. NCTAF is dedicated to "helping develop policies and practices aimed at ensuring powerful teaching and learning in all communities as America's schools and children enter the 21st century." It consists of teachers, college deans and presidents, government officials, and association and industry representatives. In 1999, Washington State received a grant from the Stuart Foundation to begin a partnership with NCTAF.

NBPTS focuses on standards for accomplished teachers and tests teachers to see if the standards are met. NBPTS offers national certification in areas that combine developmental level and subject matter. NBPTS was created in 1987, and its mission is to

establish high and rigorous standards for what *accomplished* teachers should know and be able to do, to develop and operate a national voluntary system to assess and certify teachers who meet these standards, and to advance education reform. To be certified (\$2,000 fee), candidates submit a portfolio completed in the classroom and take pencil and paper tests at an assessment center. Financial support comes from foundation grants, federal funds, and certification fees. NBPTS's work is endorsed by 15 education (no subject area) associations. A majority of the Board of Directors are teachers. The 1999 Legislature provided funding for up to 45 Washington State teachers to receive a 15 percent salary bonus if they obtain NBPTS certification.

APPENDIX D: STATE POLICY TOOLS TO INFLUENCE TEACHER QUALITY¹

POLICY TOOL	DESCRIPTIONS	CURRENT STATUS IN WASHINGTON
STANDARDS FOR KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR RESIDENCY CERTIFICATION	States can use national (e.g., NCATE, INTASC) and/or state standards for knowledge and skills prior to a teacher’s first certificate.	<p>Washington uses a combination of national and state standards to address the knowledge and skills needed by teacher candidates for residency certification.</p> <p>In addition, Washington requires teacher candidates to show a positive impact on student learning.</p>
STANDARDS FOR KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS AFTER RESIDENCY CERTIFICATION	<p>States have standards for the knowledge and skills teachers need in the classroom. States may have standards for different stages in a teacher’s career.</p> <p>47 states provide some fee support, and 19 states provide a salary supplement incentive to meet standards for NBPTS certification</p>	<p>Washington has no standards for beginning teachers.</p> <p>Washington has new knowledge and skills standards for professional certification. In addition, Washington requires professional certificate candidates to show positive impact on student learning.</p> <p>Washington has provided fee support for NBPTS certification for 39 experienced teachers and a 15% salary increase for the 1999-2001 biennium for those who obtain certification.²</p>

¹ For individual studies and citations, see the extended discussion on “State Policies to Assure Teacher Quality” in the expanded version. There is also a paper by Eric Hirsch et al., “What States Are Doing to Improve the Quality of Teaching,” (Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy at the University of Washington, November 1998), which addresses some of these policy issues.

² <http://www.nbpts.org>.

POLICY TOOL	DESCRIPTIONS	CURRENT STATUS IN WASHINGTON
ASSESSMENT FOR RESIDENCY CERTIFICATE	<p>Written Tests/Assessments fall into three general categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic skills tests at entry to or exit from a preparation program to assess competencies in reading, writing, and mathematics. • Content knowledge for a variety of different subject areas. • Pedagogy tests where candidates must complete a written test of their teaching knowledge.³ <p>43 states use one or all of these categories of assessments statewide.⁴</p>	<p>Washington does not use any statewide assessments, although SBE and members of the legislature have proposed such assessments for the last 15 years.</p>
ASSESSMENT AFTER RESIDENCY CERTIFICATE	<p>Performance Assessments: A “performance assessment” may range from observation by a principal or a complex measurement of how a teacher’s knowledge and skills compare to a set of standards.</p> <p>At least 24 states are considering, developing, or implementing performance assessments for state certification.⁵</p>	<p>Washington will require performance assessment for its professional certificate, conducted through certificate programs.</p>
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ASSURING TEACHER QUALITY: NATIONAL OVERSIGHT	<p>National accreditation may be required or optional for teacher preparation programs by a national organization such as NCATE.</p> <p>Five states require NCATE accreditation for their teacher preparation programs.</p>	<p>In Washington, NCATE accreditation is optional. Ten of the 22 programs undergo NCATE review.</p>

³ See Appendices K and S for additional information on basic skills, content, and pedagogy assessments, and nationally available teacher assessments.

⁴ See Appendix L for information on what states are doing for assessments.

⁵ See Appendix P for information on performance-based certification in other states.

POLICY TOOL	DESCRIPTIONS	CURRENT STATUS IN WASHINGTON
<p>ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ASSURING TEACHER QUALITY:</p> <p>STATE OVERSIGHT</p>	<p>States approve teacher preparation programs and conduct periodic reviews of program compliance.</p> <p>States review candidates' ability to meet knowledge and skills standards in teacher preparation programs through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing (see above); • Samples of student work; and • Student teaching. <p>Five states monitor the pass rates of candidates on teacher tests for teacher preparation program probation.</p> <p>States can monitor placement and retention rates of teachers in public schools.</p>	<p>In Washington, SBE approves teacher preparation programs. Ongoing periodic review of programs under revised SBE standards is unclear.</p> <p>Washington does not review candidates' abilities at the state level.</p> <p>Washington does not conduct teacher tests.</p> <p>Washington keeps track of initial placements of teachers. There is no follow-up on retention rates, although the data is available.</p>
<p>ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ASSURING TEACHER QUALITY:</p> <p>LOCAL OVERSIGHT</p>	<p>Local committees may be required to review local programs.</p> <p>Teacher preparation programs can conduct graduate follow-up surveys.</p>	<p>Washington's 22 teacher preparation programs have oversight committees (PEABs) comprised of teachers and school district staff as well as higher education faculty.</p> <p>Washington's 22 teacher preparation programs are required to survey their graduates and their employers.</p>
<p>SUPPORT FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS</p>	<p>Programs are provided to help new teachers build their skills.</p> <p>27 states have beginning teacher assistance programs.</p>	<p>Washington has a beginning teacher assistance program.</p>

POLICY TOOL	DESCRIPTIONS	CURRENT STATUS IN WASHINGTON
RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION	<p>In states that do not have an adequate supply of teachers, a number of different tools are used to recruit teachers for school districts, such as alternative certification and teacher bonuses. 41 states have alternative routes to certification.</p> <p>Efforts to attract teachers for science and math have used loans and scholarship programs.</p> <p>Efforts to attract minorities into teaching include scholarships, teacher aide, and mentor programs.</p>	<p>Washington has had several programs for alternative certification. None of them have recruited large numbers of new teachers.⁶</p> <p>Washington had a science and math incentive loan program in the 1980s. The 1999 Legislature provided funds to help teachers obtain their master's degrees, with a preference for those teaching science and math.</p> <p>Washington has had minority recruitment programs, such as Future Teachers Conditional Scholarships and a minority teacher recruitment program. No funding is currently appropriated for these programs.</p>
TEACHER EVALUATION	<p>Teacher evaluation policies may include establishing criteria for measuring the performance of teachers, peer review programs, abolishment of tenure.</p>	<p>Washington has not updated its teacher evaluation criteria for continued employment to reflect education reform.</p>
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	<p>States provide funds for classroom teachers for training needs. Advanced training, such as National Board for Professional Certification, may also receive limited state support.</p>	<p>Washington's statewide salary allocation schedule provides increases for teachers who take a certain number of hours of additional training. Washington also provides funding for three days of staff development each year for education reform training.</p>
TEACHER SALARIES	<p>States have used salary increases as a way to attract and retain teachers.</p>	<p>Washington has a statewide salary allocation schedule. In the 1999 legislative session, all teachers were provided a 3 percent increase, and additional salary increases were provided for beginning teachers and senior teachers.</p>

⁶ See the Institute's report on Alternative Certification.

APPENDIX E: LITERATURE REVIEW ON TEACHER QUALITY¹

INDICATOR OF TEACHER QUALITY	RESEARCH FINDINGS: IMPACT ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	CURRENT STATUS IN WASHINGTON
DEGREE LEVEL	<p>Mixed results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some studies have found that a master's degree makes a difference (Goldhaber and Brewer 1996,² Ladd and Ferguson 1996,³ Greenwald et al., 1996⁴). Other studies have found that a master's degree does not make a difference (Monk 1994,⁵ Rivkin et al., 1998⁶). 	<p>Washington's statewide salary allocation schedule provides a salary increase for teachers who obtain a master's degree. Teachers are not required to obtain a master's degree.⁷</p> <p>In 1999, the Legislature provided \$2 million to provide for one year of a teacher's master's degree (highest priority was given to teachers in science and math).</p>
SUBJECT EXPERTISE	<p>Mostly favorable results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers who majored in math and science and teach those subjects may have some effect on student achievement (Lucas 1997,⁸ Hawley 1992,⁹ Monk 1994,¹⁰ Goldhaber and Brewer 1996¹¹). Teachers' majors did not make a difference on student achievement (Ferguson and Womack 1993¹²). 	<p>Teachers are not required to have an academic major for Washington certification but must have one or more endorsements in the subjects they plan to teach.</p>

¹ For individual studies and citations, see extended discussion on "State Policies to Assure Teacher Quality" in the expanded version.

² Dan Goldhaber and Dominic Brewer, *Evaluating the Effect of Teacher Degree Level on Educational Performance*, (Rockville, MD: Westat, 1996).

³ Helen Ladd and Ronald Ferguson, Chapter 8 in "Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-based Reform in Education," ed. Helen Ladd (Washington, DC: Brookings, 1996), 284 and 288.

⁴ Robert Greenwald, Larry Hedges, and Richard Laine, "The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement," *Review of Educational Research* 66(3) (Fall 1996): 381-396.

⁵ David Monk, "Subject Area Preparation of Secondary Mathematics and Science Teachers and Student Achievement," *Economics of Education Review* 13(2) (1994): 125-145.

⁶ Steve Rivkin, Eric Hanushek, and John Kain, "Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement," (July 1998), Paper presented at the APPAM conference in New York Fall 1998, 26.

⁷ ESSB 5180, the 1999-2001 Appropriations Act, provides \$2 million to provide for one year of a teacher's master's degree at an accredited Washington State college.

⁸ Christopher Lucas, *Teacher Education in America*, (NY: St Martin's Press, 1997), 118.

⁹ Willis Hawley, "Chapter 16: United States" in *Issues and Problems in Teacher Education*, ed. Howard Leavitt, (New York, NY: Greenwood Press, 1992), 251.

¹⁰ Monk, "Subject Area Preparation," 125-145.

¹¹ Goldhaber and Brewer, *Evaluating the Effect of Teacher Degree Level.*"

¹² Patrick Ferguson and Sid Womack, "The Impact of Subject Matter and Education Coursework on Teaching Performance," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(1) (January-February 1993): 56.

INDICATOR OF TEACHER QUALITY	RESEARCH FINDINGS: IMPACT ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	CURRENT STATUS IN WASHINGTON
LENGTH OF EXPERIENCE	<p>Mixed results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers affect student achievement based on their number of years of experience (Verstegen and King 1998,¹³ Greenwald et al., 1996¹⁴). Teacher experience impact on student achievement increases in first few years but then tapers off (Rivkin et al., 1998¹⁵). 	<p>The Washington state salary allocation schedule provides an automatic salary increase for each year of experience up to the 16th year.</p>
PERFORMANCE ON TESTS	<p>Mixed results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In a study on Texas teachers, the single most important indicator of teachers' impact on student achievement was teachers' performance on a statewide re-certification exam, which tested basic literacy skills.¹⁶ There is limited positive correlation between test scores and teaching performance. Minorities may encounter test bias or have poor education preparation resulting in poor test scores.¹⁷ Teachers' high performance on verbal tests was a predictor of student achievement (Verstegen and King 1998,¹⁸ Ferguson 1991¹⁹). Teachers with education majors had lower test scores than teachers who had majors other than education (e.g., history, English, etc). Minority candidates had lower scores than other candidates (Gitomer et al., 1999²⁰). 	<p>No statewide tests are required for entry to or graduation from teacher preparation programs in Washington.</p>

¹³ Deborah Verstegen and Richard King, "The Relationship Between School Spending and Student Achievement: A Review and Analysis of 35 Years of Production Function Research," *Journal of Education Finance* (Fall 1998): 250 and 253.

¹⁴ Greenwald et al., "The Effect of School Resources," 381-396.

¹⁵ Rivkin et al., "Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement," 26.

¹⁶ Ronald Ferguson, "Paying for Public Education: New Evidence on How and Why Money Matters," *Harvard Journal on Legislation* 28 (Summer 1991): 466.

¹⁷ Walter Haney, et al., "Charms Talismanic: Testing Teachers for the Improvement of American Education," ed. Ernst Rothkopf, *Review of Research in Education* 14, (Washington, DC: AERA, 1987).

¹⁸ Verstegen and King, "The Relationship Between School Spending," 250 and 253.

INDICATOR OF TEACHER QUALITY	RESEARCH FINDINGS: IMPACT ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	CURRENT STATUS IN WASHINGTON
EFFECTIVE TEACHING PRACTICE	<p>Positive results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studies in Texas and Tennessee found that the single largest factor affecting academic growth of students was individual classroom teachers (Sanders 1996,²¹ Jordan et al., 1997,²² and Rivkin 1998²³). Targeted and extended training over time for teachers leads to changes in teacher practice and affects student achievement (Cohen and Hill 1998²⁴). 	Washington's pre-service candidates and teachers applying for their professional certificate will be required to show through their teaching practice a positive impact on student learning.

¹⁹ Ferguson, "Paying for Public Education," 466.

²⁰ Andy Gitomer, et al, "*The Academic Preparedness of Prospective Teachers*," Draft presentation to the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, (Washington, DC, February 1999), 15.

²¹ William L. Sanders and June Rivers, *Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement*, (The University of Tennessee, Value-Added Research and Assessment Center, 1996).

²² Heather Jordan, Robert Mendro, and Dash Weerasinghe, *Teacher Effects on Longitudinal Student Achievement in Dallas Texas*, (Dallas, TX, 1997).

²³ Rivkin et al., "Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement," 15.

²⁴ David Cohen and Heather Hill, *State Policy and Classroom Performance: Mathematics Reform in California*, (CPRE Policy Briefs, January 1998).

APPENDIX F: WASHINGTON STATE STANDARDS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT

PRE-SERVICE (RESIDENCY CERTIFICATE)*	BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE	EVALUATION**	PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE***
<p><u>Foundational Knowledge</u></p> <p><i>State goals and essential academic learning requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Subject matter content for the area(s) taught, including the essential areas of study for each endorsement area.</i></p> <p>Social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education, including an understanding of the moral, social, and political dimensions of classrooms, teaching, and schools.</p> <p>Impact of technological and societal changes on schools.</p> <p>Theories of human development and learning.</p> <p>Inquiry and research.</p> <p>School law and educational policy.</p> <p>Professional ethics.</p> <p>Responsibilities, structure, and activities of the profession.</p> <p><i>Issues related to abuse (identification, impact, responsibilities, and methods of teaching about prevention). (abbreviated)</i></p> <p><i>Standards, criteria, and other requirements for obtaining the professional certificate.</i></p> <p><u>Effective Teaching</u></p> <p>Research and experience-based principles of effective practice for encouraging intellectual, social, and personal development of students.</p> <p>Different student approaches to learning for creating instructional opportunities adapted to learners from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p><i>Knowledge of subject matter:</i> Depth and breadth of knowledge of theory and content in general education and subject matter specialization appropriate to the elementary and/or secondary levels.</p> <p><i>Professional preparation and scholarship:</i> Evidence of having a theoretical background and knowledge of the principles and methods of teaching and a commitment to education as a profession.</p> <p><i>Instructional skill:</i> A competent level of knowledge and skill in designing and conducting an instructional experience.</p>	<p><u>Effective Teaching</u></p> <p>Using effective teaching practices.</p> <p>Using assessment to monitor and improve instruction.</p> <p>Establishing and maintaining a positive, student – focused learning environment.</p>

* Italics denote standards unique to Washington. The remainder are based on national INTASC and NCATE standards. WAC 180-78A-270

**Italicized: RCW 28A.405.100. Non-italicized: WAC 392-191-010.

***All standards unique to Washington. WAC 180-78A-540.

PRE-SERVICE (RESIDENCY CERTIFICATE)*	BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE	EVALUATION**	PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE***
<p><u>Effective Teaching (continued)</u></p> <p>Areas of exceptionality and learning—including, but not limited to, learning disabilities, visual and perceptual difficulties, and special physical or mental challenges.</p> <p><i>Effective instructional strategies for students at all levels of academic abilities and talents.</i></p> <p>Instructional strategies for developing reading, writing, critical thinking, and problem solving skills.</p> <p><i>The prevention and diagnosis of reading difficulties and research-based intervention strategies.</i></p> <p>Classroom management and discipline, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual and group motivation for encouraging positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. • Effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication for fostering active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interactions in the classroom. <p>Planning and management of instruction based on knowledge of the content area, the community, and curriculum goals.</p> <p>Formal and informal assessment strategies for evaluating and ensuring the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.</p> <p>Collaboration with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community for supporting students' learning and well-being.</p> <p>Effective interactions with parents to support students' learning and well-being.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p><i>Interest in teaching pupils:</i> An understanding of and commitment to each student, taking into account each individual's unique background and characteristics. Enthusiasm for or enjoyment in working with students.</p> <p><i>Classroom management:</i> A competent level of knowledge and skill in organizing the physical and human elements in the educational setting.</p> <p><i>Handling of student discipline and attendant problems:</i> Ability to manage the non-instructional, human dynamics in the educational setting.</p>	<p><u>Effective Teaching (continued)</u></p> <p>Designing and/or adapting challenging curriculum that is developmentally appropriate.</p> <p>Demonstrating cultural sensitivity in teaching and relationships with students, parents, community.</p> <p>Using information on student achievement and performance to advise and involve students and families.</p> <p>Integrating technology into instruction and assessment.</p> <p>Informing, involving, and collaborating with parents and families to support student success.</p>

* Italics denote standards unique to Washington. The remainder are based on national INTASC and NCATE standards. WAC 180-78A-270

**Italicized: RCW 28A.405.100. Non-italicized: WAC 392-191-010.

***All standards unique to Washington. WAC 180-78A-540.

PRE-SERVICE (RESIDENCY CERTIFICATE)*	BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE	EVALUATION**	PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE***
<p>Professional Development</p> <p>The opportunity for candidates to reflect on their teaching and its effects on student growth and learning.</p> <p>Educational technology including the use of computers and other technologies in instruction, assessment, and professional productivity.</p> <p><i>Strategies for effective participation in group decision making.</i></p>	<p>None</p>	<p><i>Effort toward improvement when needed:</i> An awareness of his or her limitations and strengths and continued professional growth.</p>	<p>Professional Development</p> <p>Evaluating the effects of his or her teaching through feedback and reflection.</p> <p>Establishing goals for professional improvement.</p> <p>Designing and implementing personal professional growth programs.</p> <p>Remaining current in subject areas, theories, practice, and research.</p> <p>Leadership</p> <p>Participating in activities within the school community to improve curriculum and instructional practice.</p> <p>Participating in professional and/or community organizations.</p> <p>Advocating for curriculum, instruction, and learning environments to meet the diverse needs of students.</p> <p>Demonstrating communication skills and/or strategies that facilitate group decision making.</p> <p>Participating collaboratively in school improvement activities.</p> <p>Incorporating democratic principles into practice.</p>

* Italics denote standards unique to Washington. The remainder are based on national INTASC and NCATE standards. WAC 180-78A-270

**Italicized: RCW 28A.405.100. Non-italicized: WAC 392-191-010.

***All standards unique to Washington. WAC 180-78A-540.

APPENDIX G: NEW PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM STANDARDS

STANDARD	DESCRIPTION	CHANGES FROM OLD STANDARDS
1. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD (PEAB) WAC 180-78A-250	PEABs advise teacher preparation programs in the development, implementation, and review of their programs. They must be comprised of at least 50 percent K-12 classroom teachers. Other members include: higher education faculty and school district administrators. PEABs (under different names) have been in place for almost 30 years.	No changes.
2. ACCOUNTABILITY WAC 180-78A-255	Accountability incorporates some aspects required under the old standards (e.g., graduate follow-up surveys and state program review). The teacher preparation programs are expected to be accountable through their performance-based program.	New standard.
3. RESOURCES WAC 180-78A-261	Resources include the requirement for a distinct administrative unit for the teacher preparation program, appropriate faculty qualifications, staff to advise candidates, and adequate financial, facility, and informational resources.	Combines the former administrative unit standard with the resources standard and reduces specifications of what type of faculty should teach.
4. PROGRAM DESIGN WAC 180-78A-264	Program design provides for a conceptual framework and curriculum which reflect best research practices, is performance based, and supports the state's learning goals and EALRs; recruitment and retention of candidates; criteria/performance for program completion, field experiences, collaboration with P-12, and candidate exit criteria.	New emphasis is placed on state education reform and performance. The former field experience standard is combined into the program design standard and reduces the specifications of what constitutes a field experience.
5. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS WAC 180-78A-270	Knowledge and skills includes 26 areas teacher candidates must acquire and apply. Many of these knowledge and skills were under the previous program approval standards and are based upon research on effective teaching and best practices as well as the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards. New areas include: state goals and EALRs, content for endorsement, ethics, group decision-making, educational technology, and critical thinking and problem solving.	Areas of knowledge and skills are not separated. Candidates will need to demonstrate their knowledge and skills (not just acquire them). Topics that are new or more emphasized are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State goals and EALRs • Content for endorsement area • Ethics • Group decision-making strategies • Education technology • Critical thinking and problem solving skills ▪ Special education.

APPENDIX H: SUMMARIES OF CASE STUDIES ON TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Four institutions with teacher preparation programs were selected as case studies to examine how Washington State's universities and colleges are preparing teacher candidates for the knowledge and skills they need to help K-12 students meet the state's new academic standards. Two degree levels were examined: undergraduate and master's. None of the preparation programs has yet submitted their documentation for SBE approval under the new standards for performance-based programs. More detailed case studies are available in the expanded report.

Teacher Preparation Programs Selected for Case Studies

	CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY AT VANCOUVER	WHITWORTH
DEGREES OFFERED	Undergraduate, Post baccalaureate, Master's	Undergraduate, Post baccalaureate, Master's	Post baccalaureate, Master's	Undergraduate, Post baccalaureate, Master's
TYPE OF INSTITUTION	Public	Public	Public	Private
NUMBER OF CANDIDATES FOR INITIAL CERTIFICATE IN 1997-98	507	492	40	45
PERCENT MINORITY	8% (undergraduate)	11% (undergraduate)	2% (master's)	2% (master's)
LENGTH OF PROGRAM	2-2.5 years (undergraduate)	2-2.5 years (undergraduate)	1.25 years (master's)	1.25 years (master's)
ENTRY GPA (GRADE POINT AVERAGE)	3.0 (undergraduate)	2.75 (undergraduate)	3.0 (master's)	3.0 (master's)

Central Washington University: Center for Teaching and Learning Ellensburg, Washington

Introduction. The Central Washington University (CWU) case study focused on the undergraduate program. Of the four case studies, CWU has the fewest proficiency requirements for entering the teacher preparation program. CWU is the only program that requires the Teacher Education Test (written exam) on basic skills of math and language arts (other tests may be substituted). Two out of every three applicants is accepted. The grade point average (GPA) required for entry into the program is 3.0 in the last 45 quarter hour credits. Candidates who want to teach elementary school usually major in elementary education. Candidates who plan to teach secondary school must have an academic major.

CWU is expanding opportunities for longer periods of student teaching. Basic math and technology are recent courses added to the requirements.

Strengths of the Program. CWU has two programs to recruit potential teachers: EDSTART for minorities and “Careers in Education” for high school students. A new education building with a large state-of-the-art technology center opened on campus in 1998. CWU has had a major push to define learner outcomes for all its classes on campus as well as ways to assess student performance on those outcomes. Each course lists the specific skills and knowledge every candidate will be expected to demonstrate by the end of the class (similar to the expectations of education reform). Recent graduates gave CWU’s special education program high marks.¹

Areas for Improvement. Recent graduates want the program to offer more experiences with diverse cultures and to ensure that education methods classes are more closely tied into real applications in K-12 classrooms.² Although field-based student teaching experiences have increased, they continue to be available for a very small percentage of the candidates. Student teaching evaluations did not address education reform goals and requirements. Graduates of the program also wanted more support and guidance from their college field supervisors during student teaching.³

Western Washington University: Woodring College of Education Bellingham, Washington

Introduction. The Western Washington University (WWU) case study focused on the undergraduate program. WWU has the lowest required GPA for entry (2.75). WWU has a strong emphasis on demonstrated proficiencies in writing and oral communication required for entering the teacher preparation program and also requires candidates to have five days of classroom observation prior to entry. One out of every two applicants is accepted. Sixty percent of the candidates entering WWU’s teacher preparation program transfer from community colleges. Candidates who want to teach elementary or secondary school must have an academic major.⁴ WWU is expanding its opportunities for longer periods of student teaching and integrating actual K-12 classroom experiences into education methods classes. Through its extension programs in Seattle and Everett, WWU has increased the number of minorities working toward teacher certification.

Strengths of the Program. WWU has a major emphasis on technology that is well integrated into the education classes. Faculty conduct online conferences with students. The Professional Development Schools (candidates work in local schools for the majority of a year) provide candidates an opportunity to collaborate with schools to implement education reform in areas such as research-based literacy, mathematics, and assessment techniques. There are a number of opportunities for multicultural experiences in teaching. Recent graduates gave WWU’s special education program high marks.⁵

¹ WSIPP Beginning Teacher Survey 1999.

² WSIPP Beginning Teacher Survey 1999.

³ WSIPP Beginning Teacher Survey 1999.

⁴ Special education and early childhood education are considered academic majors.

⁵ WSIPP Beginning Teacher Survey 1999.

Areas for Improvement. The area of how to use assessment for measuring K-12 student progress still needs additional emphasis in education classes. Student teaching evaluations did not address education reform goals and requirements. Candidates are not yet required to demonstrate a positive impact on student learning as a part of their student teaching experience. Although field-based student teaching experiences have increased, they continue to be available for a very small percentage of the candidates.

Washington State University at Vancouver Vancouver, Washington

Introduction. The Washington State University Vancouver Branch (WSUV) case study focused on the master's in teaching program. The WSUV program no longer requires the GRE or any other test for entry. All candidates must have BA and GPA of 3.0 in last 45 quarter hour credits. Candidates must document their math proficiency and experiences with youth for admission. An extensive prescreening interview process is required before acceptance into the program. Two out of every three candidates is accepted.

Strengths of the Program. WSUV has a field-based program where candidates are in K-12 classroom during the entire school year. There is a strong emphasis on literacy. WSUV is part of a consortium called Southwest Washington Educational Partnership (five school districts, Educational Service District 112, and WSUV) whose mission is to form new institutional relationships to enhance the practice of teaching, staff development, and school restructuring. Colleges of education supervisors provide a high level of support to student teachers. These supervisors also teach methods classes for MIT candidates. Major emphasis is placed on action research and portfolios.

Areas for Improvement. WSUV's program does not yet address assessment in a comprehensive way for candidates. Performance expectations of candidates in student teaching and the portfolio are not clearly articulated. There are very few minority candidates.

Whitworth College Spokane, Washington

Introduction. The Whitworth case study focused on the Master's in Teaching (MIT) program. Whitworth was the only private school examined in the case studies. Whitworth's program requires the GRE for entry as a measurement of basic skills. All candidates must have a BA and a GPA of 3.0 for the last two years of college. An extensive prescreening interview process is required before acceptance into the program. After the prescreening, 90 percent of the candidates are accepted.

Strengths of the Program. Whitworth has a field-based program where candidates are in K-12 classroom during the entire school year. Colleges of education supervisors provide a high level of support to student teachers. These supervisors also teach methods classes for MIT candidates. A multicultural month-long field experience is required of all candidates.

Performance benchmarks expected of candidates throughout the program are clearly articulated. Major emphasis is placed on action research and delivering professional papers to peers. All aspects of the program are well aligned with education reform goals and requirements. Recent graduates give Whitworth high marks for all aspects of the program.

Areas for Improvement. Whitworth has very few minority candidates.

Conclusions From the Case Studies

The programs have major differences in terms of size, academic expectations and time required. These differences were largely a function of the degree level offered (undergraduate vs. graduate). All the programs are addressing EALRs; some use them more extensively throughout their program (including student teaching) than others. All programs are making a concerted effort to increase candidate exposure to K-12 classrooms through out their preparation program. Demonstrating positive impact on student learning is still in the developmental stages. All programs are making a concerted effort to recruit minorities, but the percentage of minority candidates remains low compared to other campus programs. Follow-up of graduates and the use of PEABs for feedback varies based on the program.

APPENDIX I: ENDORSEMENTS

As of August 31, 2000, all teachers and teacher candidates will obtain endorsements* under WAC 180-82.

➤ **Broad Area Primary Endorsements**

60 quarter hours/40 semester hours

- English/language arts
- Science
- Social Studies

➤ **Primary Endorsements**

45 quarter hours/30 semester hours

- Biology
- Chemistry
- Designate World Languages
- Early Childhood Education
- Early Childhood Special Education
- Earth Science
- Elementary Education
- English
- Health and Fitness
- History
- Library Media
- Mathematics
- Music
- Middle Level
- Physics
- Reading
- Special Education
- Visual Arts

➤ **Supporting Endorsements**

24 quarter hours/16 semester hours

- Bilingual Education
- Dance
- Drama
- Designated World Languages
- Early Childhood Education
- English as a Second Language
- Library Media
- Reading
- Traffic Safety (12 quarter hours/8 semester hours)

➤ **Endorsements That Will No Longer Be Continued**

- Anthropology
- Art (part of visual arts)
- Comparative Religion
- Economics (part of Social Studies)
- Geography (part of Social Studies)
- Journalism
- Choral Music (part of Music)
- Instrumental Music (part of Music)
- Philosophy
- Physical Education (part of Health and fitness)
- Political Science (part of Social Studies)
- Psychology (part of Social Studies)
- Sociology
- Speech

* SBE is still studying whether or not to add Instructional Technology to the new endorsements.

APPENDIX J: TYPE OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM BY INSTITUTION

	TYPE OF INSTITUTION	TYPE OF PROGRAM			1996-97
		UNDER-GRADUATE	POST BACCALAUREATE	MASTERS	FIRST ISSUE INITIAL CERTIFICATE
Antioch College	private		X	X	84
City University	private			X	137
Gonzaga University	private	X	X	X	122
Heritage College	private	X	X	X	60
Northwest College	private	X	X		24
Pacific Lutheran University	private	X	X	X	178
Pacific Oaks College	private		X	X	39
Seattle Pacific University	private	X	X	X	130
Seattle University	private			X	96
St Martins College	private	X	X	X	92
University of Puget Sound	private			X	54
Walla Walla College	private	X	X		49
Whitman College	private	X	X		14
Whitworth College	private	X	X	X	121
Central Wash University	public	X	X	X	507
Eastern Wash University	public	X	X	X	404
The Evergreen State College	public			X	¹
University of Washington	public			X	102
UW: Bothell	public		X		25
UW: Tacoma	public		X		43
Washington State University	public	X	X	X	387
Western Wash University	public	X	X	X	492
Total		13	17	17	3160

Source: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report of Certificates Issued, 1997-98, p. 29.

¹ The Evergreen State College did not have a graduating class in 1996-97.

APPENDIX K: NATIONALLY AVAILABLE TEACHER ASSESSMENTS

Most states use assessments developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Some states have contracted with other entities, such as National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES), to develop state-specific tests. Although a larger number of states require Praxis, a larger number of teachers take NES examinations because states with large teacher populations have developed state-specific tests.

TEST	TEACHER LEVEL	PURPOSE	TYPE OF TEST	TEST METHODOLOGY	VALIDITY, RELIABILITY STUDIES	NUMBER OF STATES USING TEST
NES (CUSTOM TESTS FOR INDIVIDUAL STATES)	All levels of teachers' careers	Tailor to individual states' needs	Basic skills, subject area knowledge, and pedagogy	Multiple choice, essay, videotaping	Yes	11
PRAXIS I (ETS)	Entry into teacher education program; entry into teaching profession	Determine basic skills competency of prospective student or teacher	Basic skills in reading, writing, and math	Multiple choice, essay	Yes	24
PRAXIS II¹ (ETS)	Entry to teaching profession	Determine competency of prospective teacher	Subject matter content; subject matter pedagogy (for some subjects); general pedagogy	Multiple choice and constructed response	Yes	27 ²
PRAXIS III (ETS)	Beginning teacher (first year)	Determine competency of teacher for ongoing licensure	Pedagogy	Observations, pre- and post-observation conferences, prepared profile	Yes	0 (Ohio will start in 2002)

¹ The Praxis II tests replace the National Teacher Examination series, or NTE.

² This includes states using the NTE.

TEST	TEACHER LEVEL	PURPOSE	TYPE OF TEST	TEST METHODOLOGY	VALIDITY, RELIABILITY STUDIES	NUMBER OF STATES USING TEST
INTASC ³	Beginning teacher (first and second years)	Determine competency of teacher for ongoing licensure	Pedagogy; subject area knowledge and pedagogy	Portfolio of context, lesson plans, videotapes, student work samples	Validity; reliability in progress	0
NBPTS ⁴	Experienced teacher	Demonstration of teaching excellence	Pedagogy; subject area knowledge and pedagogy	Portfolio of videotapes, self-analysis, student work; assessment center exercises on planning and research	Yes	None require it; all allow it.

³ INTASC – Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium.

⁴ NBPTS – National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

APPENDIX L: TEACHER ASSESSMENTS IN OTHER STATES

At the time of this report, 42 states and the District of Columbia use assessments for program entry and/or the initial licensure of teachers. Tests used are detailed below.

Assessments for Program Entry or Initial Certification

	BASIC SKILLS TEST	TEACHING KNOWLEDGE TEST	CONTENT KNOWLEDGE TEST
ALABAMA	Prep program	Prep program	Prep program
ALASKA	Praxis I ¹		Praxis II ²
ARIZONA	State-specific test ³ (ATPA)	State-specific test	State-specific test
ARKANSAS	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
CALIFORNIA	State-specific test (CBEST)	State-specific test (RICA)	Praxis II
COLORADO	State-specific test (PLACE)	State-specific test	State-specific test
CONNECTICUT	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
DELAWARE	Praxis I		
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
FLORIDA	State-specific test	State-specific test	State-specific test
GEORGIA	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
HAWAII	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
IDAHO			
ILLINOIS	State-specific test (ICTS)		State-specific test
INDIANA	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
IOWA			
KANSAS	Praxis I	Praxis II	
KENTUCKY	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
LOUISIANA		Praxis II/NTE	Praxis II/NTE
MAINE	Praxis I	NTE	Praxis II
MARYLAND	Praxis I/NTE	Praxis II/NTE	Praxis II/NTE
MASSACHUSETTS	State-specific test (MECT)	State-specific test	
MICHIGAN	State-specific test (MTTC)		State-specific test
MINNESOTA	Praxis I		
MISSISSIPPI		Praxis II	Praxis II/NTE
MISSOURI	State-specific test (CBASE)	Praxis II/NTE	Praxis II/NTE
MONTANA	Praxis I		
NEBRASKA	Praxis I		
NEVADA	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Praxis I		Praxis II

¹ The Praxis tests are developed by the Educational Testing Service.

² This test is required for adding an endorsement area to a secondary certificate.

³ Many of the state-specific tests are developed by the National Evaluation Systems, Inc.

	BASIC SKILLS TEST	TEACHING KNOWLEDGE TEST	CONTENT KNOWLEDGE TEST
NEW JERSEY		NTE (elementary)	Praxis II
NEW MEXICO	State-specific test (NMTA)	State-specific test (NMTA)	NTE
NEW YORK	State-specific test (NYSTCE)	State-specific test	State-specific test
NORTH CAROLINA	Praxis I	Praxis II/NTE	Praxis II/NTE
NORTH DAKOTA⁴			
OHIO		Praxis II	Praxis II
OKLAHOMA	State-specific test (CEOE)	State-specific test (CEOE)	State-specific test
OREGON	CBEST/Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
PENNSYLVANIA		Praxis II	Praxis II
RHODE ISLAND		NTE	NTE
SOUTH CAROLINA	Praxis I	Praxis II/NTE	Praxis II
SOUTH DAKOTA			
TENNESSEE	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
TEXAS	State-specific test (TASP)	State-specific test (ExCET)	State-specific test (ExCET)
UTAH			
VERMONT			
VIRGINIA	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
WASHINGTON			
WEST VIRGINIA	Praxis I	Praxis II	Praxis II
WISCONSIN	Praxis I		
WYOMING			

⁴ Some preparing institutions have developed tests for basic skills, content, and pedagogy.

APPENDIX M: STATES' BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

	IS THE PROGRAM MANDATORY OR OPTIONAL FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS?	WHO IS ASSIGNED TO WORK WITH THE BEGINNING TEACHER?	WHO RECEIVES TRAINING UNDER THE PROGRAM?	IS A BEGINNING TEACHER'S PERFORMANCE ASSESSED UNDER THE PROGRAM? IF SO, FOR WHAT PURPOSE?	APPROXIMATE STATE APPROPRIATION FOR 1996-97	STATE EXPENDITURE PER BEGINNING TEACHER IN 1996-97 ¹
CALIFORNIA	Mandatory	Mentor	Beginning teachers and mentors	Participation required for certification, but no summative assessment	\$17.5 million ²	\$1,460
COLORADO	Mandatory	Mentor	Beginning teachers; some mentors	Yes, for certification. For employment, principal may seek input from mentor	None	\$0
CONNECTICUT	Mandatory	Mentor or mentor team	Beginning teachers and mentors	Yes, for certification	\$3 million	\$1,400
DELAWARE	Optional, but 100 percent participation	Mentor	Some beginning teachers; mentors	No	\$100,000 ³	\$143
FLORIDA	Mandatory ⁴	Mentor	Beginning teachers; some mentors	No	\$3.4 million for all staff development	N/A

¹ Reflects state funds only. Many states assume local school districts will pay a portion of the cost of assistance programs.

² California's 1998-99 appropriation for the beginning teacher assistance program is \$67 million.

³ Delaware's appropriation for 1998-99 is \$480,000.

⁴ Florida has recently folded all performance standards into teacher education programs and mandated that colleges of education track their graduates and report each year on their employment status. School districts are still being asked to design and implement a program for new inductees, but there is no state funding.

	IS THE PROGRAM MANDATORY OR OPTIONAL FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS?	WHO IS ASSIGNED TO WORK WITH THE BEGINNING TEACHER?	WHO RECEIVES TRAINING UNDER THE PROGRAM?	IS A BEGINNING TEACHER'S PERFORMANCE ASSESSED UNDER THE PROGRAM? IF SO, FOR WHAT PURPOSE?	APPROXIMATE STATE APPROPRIATION FOR 1996-97	STATE EXPENDITURE PER BEGINNING TEACHER IN 1996-97 ¹
GEORGIA	Optional	Mentor	Some beginning teachers; mentors	No	\$1.25 million	\$440
IDAHO	Optional	Mentor	Varies	No	\$375,000	\$1,071
INDIANA	Mandatory	Mentor	Beginning teachers and mentors	Yes, for employment	\$1.5 million	\$500
KENTUCKY	Mandatory	Mentor, principal, university faculty	Beginning teachers and mentors	Yes, for certification and employment	\$3.2 million	\$1,280
LOUISIANA	Mandatory	Mentor	Beginning teachers and mentors	Yes, for certification and employment	\$3.76 million	N/A
MAINE	Mandatory	Mentor or support team	Beginning teachers and mentors	Yes, for certification	None	\$0
MICHIGAN	Mandatory	Mentor	Beginning teachers and mentors	No	None	\$0
MINNESOTA⁵	Optional	Mentor	Varies	No	\$30,000	N/A
MISSOURI	Mandatory	Mentor	Varies	Participation required for certification, but no summative assessment	None	\$0

⁵ Minnesota has piloted their program in seven districts.

	IS THE PROGRAM MANDATORY OR OPTIONAL FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS?	WHO IS ASSIGNED TO WORK WITH THE BEGINNING TEACHER?	WHO RECEIVES TRAINING UNDER THE PROGRAM?	IS A BEGINNING TEACHER'S PERFORMANCE ASSESSED UNDER THE PROGRAM? IF SO, FOR WHAT PURPOSE?	APPROXIMATE STATE APPROPRIATION FOR 1996-97	STATE EXPENDITURE PER BEGINNING TEACHER IN 1996-97 ¹
NEBRASKA	Optional	Mentor	Neither	No	None ⁶	\$0
NEW JERSEY	Mandatory	Mentor and principal; possibly college of education faculty	Beginning teachers and mentors	Yes, for certification and employment	None; participants pay a fee for the program ⁷	\$0
NEW MEXICO	Mandatory	Varies	Varies	Yes, for certification and employment	None	\$0
NORTH CAROLINA	Mandatory	Mentor, principal, and generalist or specialist	Beginning teachers and mentors	Yes, for certification	\$3.5 million	N/A
OHIO	Optional, but will be mandatory as of 2002	Mentor	Some beginning teachers; mentors	Yes, for certification ⁸	\$1 million	\$2,000
OKLAHOMA	Mandatory	Mentor, principal, college of education faculty	Neither	Yes, for certification and employment	\$1.3 million	\$464
PENNSYLVANIA	Mandatory	Mentor	Beginning teachers and mentors	No	None	\$0

⁶ Nebraska's legislature just passed a bill dedicating 10 percent of their education lottery funding to a beginning teacher induction program. This will amount to about \$800 to \$1,000 per beginning teacher, to be used for a mentor stipend and release time.

⁷ New Jersey's beginning teachers pay \$550 (traditional certification route) or \$2,000 (alternative certification route) for assistance.

⁸ Ohio will use the Praxis III assessment for certification beginning in 2002. Trained assessors will evaluate beginning teachers for certification.

	IS THE PROGRAM MANDATORY OR OPTIONAL FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS?	WHO IS ASSIGNED TO WORK WITH THE BEGINNING TEACHER?	WHO RECEIVES TRAINING UNDER THE PROGRAM?	IS A BEGINNING TEACHER'S PERFORMANCE ASSESSED UNDER THE PROGRAM? IF SO, FOR WHAT PURPOSE?	APPROXIMATE STATE APPROPRIATION FOR 1996-97	STATE EXPENDITURE PER BEGINNING TEACHER IN 1996-97 ¹
RHODE ISLAND	Mandatory	Mentor	Varies	No	None	\$0
SOUTH CAROLINA	Mandatory	Mentor, district representative, principal	Beginning teachers and mentors	Yes, for certification and employment	\$560,000 ⁹	\$187
TEXAS	Mandatory	Mentor	Varies	No	None ¹⁰	\$0
UTAH	Mandatory	Mentor	Varies	No	None	\$0
WASHINGTON	Optional	Mentor	Beginning teachers and mentors	No	\$1.3 million ¹¹	\$854
WEST VIRGINIA	Mandatory	Mentor	Beginning teachers and mentors	Yes, for certification	\$220,000	\$600

⁹ South Carolina doubled the budget for this program to \$954,000 for 1998-99.

¹⁰ In 1998, Texas had a budget request of \$3.8 million for a pilot program to provide assistance for two years.

¹¹ The 1999 Legislature more than doubled the size of the appropriation in Washington for 1999-2001.

APPENDIX N: CASE STUDIES OF FOUR BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN WASHINGTON

Background

Four case studies of beginning teacher assistance programs were conducted to examine how school districts use state Teacher Assistance Program (TAP) funds to support first-year teachers. Programs were selected to provide a sample of different models of assistance provided by districts of various sizes.

Case Study Districts: Sizes and TAP Models (1997-1998)

SCHOOL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	TAP MODEL
LAKE WASHINGTON	24,852	1,272	District-sponsored; large district; full-time professional development staff and summer training program
KENNEWICK	13,328	730	District-sponsored; large district; mentors on contract with assistance from district coordinator
MOSES LAKE	6,109	316	ESD-sponsored; medium district; mentors on contract
OTHELLO	2,895	151	District-sponsored; small/medium district; mentors on contract with building-initiated training

Lake Washington School District

The Lake Washington School District (LWSD) includes nearly 25,000 students and 1,300 teachers in 42 schools. The district contributes substantial local resources to supplement TAP funds for its in-house beginning teacher assistance program. The program assists not only beginning teachers and educational staff associates, but also experienced teachers who are new to the district. Thirty-seven beginning teachers participated in 1997-98.

LWSD holds a week-long summer training institute to orient teachers to the district's policies, philosophy, and curriculum. Teachers hired later in the school year receive a condensed training or are invited to attend the institute the following year. Ten full-time professional development staff provide individual assistance on both a scheduled and as-requested basis by observing new teachers, working with specific students, modeling skills in the new teacher's classroom, and answering questions. Some buildings also assign partner teachers to help with building procedures, resources, and informal support. Four release days were provided for new teachers during the school year to provide training on such issues as classroom management, teaching reading and writing, curriculum integration, and communication skills.

Kennewick School District

The Kennewick School District (KSD) also contributes local funds to supplement the TAP allocation for their own beginning teacher assistance program. KSD educates over 13,000 students with 730 teachers in 22 schools. In 1997-98, there were 18 beginning teachers. The district relies on mentors who are full-time teachers to provide both formal and informal assistance. At least once or twice a year, mentors are expected to give mini-seminars on a planned topic with their beginning teacher or a group of beginning teachers.

KSD provides two training sessions for mentors and holds four seminars after hours during the school year where mentors and beginning teachers work on topics selected by the beginning teachers. Typical topics include classroom organization, lesson plan development, parent conferences, and student discipline. The district pays for three hours of substitute time for each team. Mentors are expected to observe their beginning teachers three times during the year, and beginning teachers observe their mentors at least once. An assistant superintendent oversees the program (along with other duties), provides some of the training, and mentors each beginning teacher at least twice during the year.

Moses Lake School District/North Central Educational Service District

The Moses Lake School District (MLSD) employs over 300 teachers for a student population of over 6,000 housed in 13 schools. The district channels all TAP funds to the North Central Educational Service District (NCESD). The ESD provided an assistance program for 67 beginning teachers in the region in 1997-98. Six of the nine beginning teachers from MLSD were able to participate that year.

NCESD arranges a stipend for experienced teachers to serve as mentors. Mentors are expected to provide informal assistance, as well as six one-on-one "seminars" for their beginning teachers on topics the team identifies. There is a day-long workshop at the ESD in the fall for mentors and beginning teachers where they receive some separate training and then work as a team to plan their year's activities. The ESD also holds a two-day retreat for beginning teachers in the winter. No funds were available in 1997-98 for substitutes for observations, but the ESD requested participating districts to try to provide at least ten hours of release time out of local funds.

Othello School District

The Othello School District (OSD) served nearly 3,000 students in five schools and employed 151 teachers in 1997-98. OSD had a large number (13) of beginning teachers that year for a district of its size. OSD uses experienced full-time teachers as mentors under a supplemental contract. Mentors attend an orientation meeting to brainstorm possible activities and topics of assistance for new teachers. One day of release time is made available for the team to observe teachers in another building or district, or to attend a conference or workshop. The team is encouraged to travel outside the district to broaden their perspectives, as well as spend collegial time together. No training for mentors or beginning teachers is available from the district, but one of the building principals created her own training program in 1997-98, including a day-long orientation before the start of the school year and Friday after-school seminars on a variety of topics. Beginning teachers receive \$50 to purchase materials for their classrooms.

APPENDIX O: BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA

California began providing assistance programs for beginning teachers in 1988. However, until 1998, funding was not sufficient to cover all teachers. Programs have always included a performance assessment component, but results are not used for state certification or employment decisions.

California New Teacher Project. The California New Teacher Project (CNTP) operated from 1988 to 1992 as a pilot project to test a variety of approaches for retaining capable teachers and improving their teaching abilities. A total of 37 local and regional partnerships across the state were funded, many collaborations were between universities and multiple school districts.

Evaluation studies from 1992 found that well-developed programs could increase retention rates and improve performance of first- and second-year teachers. These studies also found the most important program elements were:

- Involving experienced teachers, carefully selected and specially trained, in guiding and assisting new teachers;
- Providing scheduled, structured time for experienced and beginning teachers to work together;
- Providing instruction to groups of new teachers on topics directly related to their immediate needs and current stage of professional development; and
- Individual follow-up by experienced educators to ensure new teachers learn to use new skills effectively in their own classrooms.

CNTP also pilot-tested various assessment approaches such as observations, portfolios, interviews, simulations, and videotaping. An evaluation of these approaches was conducted separately as part of an overall review of performance assessments for teachers. The evaluation concluded that assessments needed to be based on a clearly defined set of knowledge, skills, and abilities; assessors should be carefully selected and trained; and teachers needed to be supported in their efforts to meet expectations.

Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA). Based on positive evaluations of the value of intensive support, training, and informative assessments, the California State Legislature created BTSA in 1992 with \$4.8 million. This covered about 2,000 teachers a year, or roughly 15 percent of eligible beginning teachers. Annual grants were awarded on a competitive basis to about 30 locally- and regionally-delivered programs. Grants included \$3,000 per beginning teacher from state funds and \$2,000 from locally-raised funds. In 1997, the budget was increased to \$17 million and served 10,000 new teachers. Positive evaluations led the California State Legislature to appropriate \$66 million for BTSA programs in 1998, which should cover all 22,000 of California's beginning teachers.

BTSA is intended to provide a structured program where support and assessment are integrated as dual objectives. BTSA programs are designed around two key features:

- A broad framework of challenging, realistic expectations regarding professional skills, abilities, and knowledge needed by beginning teachers; and
- Standards for the essential program elements that provide appropriate opportunities for new teachers to learn, grow, and develop professionally.

The framework is the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, which was developed over a five-year period and adopted in 1997. The standards describe effective teaching for new teachers across six “domains” of knowledge, skills, and abilities. These standards guide all support and assessment planning within a BTSA program.

Program approval standards are based on the research findings of the CNTP and include specific expectations for program design and organization, delivery of integrated support and assessment for beginning teachers, and resources and program development. The standards are broadly stated, but extensively explained, so that they provide both flexibility and guidance for local programs.

California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST). About half of the BTSA programs used a package called *Pathwise* for the assessment component of their program. *Pathwise* was developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) specifically to help new teachers develop their skills, not for employment or certification decisions. Most of the other programs used the California Teaching Portfolio, developed by West Ed. West Ed, ETS, and officials in California have worked collaboratively over the past several years to develop a new product called CFASST, based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Assistance programs are not required to use this product, but if they do not, they must show how their assessment approach meets the same standards. CFASST is being pilot-tested in 1998-99 and 1999-2000.

Under CFASST, mentor teachers receive 40 hours of training on the standards, observation and assessment skills, and strategies for instructive feedback. Methods of assessment include two structured observations and discussions in November and March, individual growth plans, and inquiries that the mentor and beginning teacher complete together. Each inquiry is a six to eight week set of activities that deals with establishing a learning environment, developing instructional experiences, and analyzing student learning. Materials, worksheets, manuals, and videotapes are part of the program. For each assessment, the beginning teacher and mentor discuss what was learned and how the beginning teacher could improve. Mentors do not share results and progress with principals in order to preserve the dual focus of support and assessment.

Comprehensive System for Teacher Credentialing. The findings from CNTP also prompted California to undertake a comprehensive review of teacher credentialing requirements in 1992—from pre-service through beginning teaching to ongoing professional development. Legislators were concerned that reforms in teacher preparation were occurring piecemeal. A four-year effort by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, a regional network of advisory committees, and a panel of 24 prominent educators and members of the public culminated in 1997 with *California’s Future: Highly Qualified Teachers for All Students*. The report outlines a coherent system of teacher preparation and development and contains numerous specific recommendations for changes to complete that system.

APPENDIX P: PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER CERTIFICATION IN OTHER STATES

There is growing interest by states to make certification of teachers performance-based. However, it can be difficult to determine which states use performance assessments because surveys of certification practices frequently lack adequate definitions. “Performance assessment” may refer to observation by a principal, successful completion of a student teaching experience, or a complex measurement of how a teacher’s knowledge and skills compare to a set of statewide standards.

Twenty-four states (see chart below) are considering, developing, or implementing performance assessments that:¹

- Occur after a teacher has been granted initial certification and is employed;
- Are conducted by the state or through a mandated state program for beginning teachers; and
- Require successful completion before a teacher is granted ongoing certification from the state.

STATE ²	WHO CONDUCTS ASSESSMENT	HOW OR WHEN ASSESSMENT OCCURS	IMPLEMENTATION STATUS
ARIZONA	Statewide (portfolio)	First two years of teaching	Developing
ARKANSAS*	Statewide	Not known	Developing
COLORADO	District	Beginning teacher program	Implementing
CONNECTICUT*	Statewide (portfolio)	Beginning teacher program	Implementing (phasing in new assessment)
DELAWARE*	Statewide	Not known	Considering
HAWAII*	Statewide (portfolio)	First two years of teaching	Considering
ILLINOIS*	Statewide	Not known	Considering

*Assessment will be standards-based, rely on multiple measures of classroom performance, incorporate professional development and assistance for the teacher, and be reviewed by trained raters.

¹ Sources: Telephone survey of other states’ beginning teacher assistance programs; conversation with INTASC; state websites; NASDTEC Annual Report (1998); Key State Education Policies on K-12 Education, Council of Chief State School Officers, August 1998. The status of other states’ consideration of performance assessments for teachers is changing rapidly. The information in this table may be out of date within months.

² California has a mandated beginning teacher program with performance assessments, but the assessment results are not used for state certification decisions. Tennessee is phasing in standards-based performance evaluation by all districts for employment decisions, but it is not implemented through a state-mandated program for beginning teachers.

STATE	WHO CONDUCTS ASSESSMENT	HOW OR WHEN ASSESSMENT OCCURS	IMPLEMENTATION STATUS
INDIANA*	Statewide (portfolio)	Beginning teacher program	Implementing (phasing in new assessment)
KANSAS*	Statewide	Not known	Considering
KENTUCKY	District/higher education team	Beginning teacher program	Implementing
LOUISIANA	District team	Beginning teacher program	Implementing
MAINE	District team	Beginning teacher program	Implementing
MISSOURI	District	Beginning teacher program	Implementing
NEW JERSEY	District team	Beginning teacher program	Implementing
NEW MEXICO	District	Beginning teacher program	Implementing
NEW YORK	Statewide (video)	First year of teaching	Implementing
NORTH CAROLINA*	Statewide (portfolio)	Beginning teacher program	Implementing (phasing in new assessment)
OHIO*	Statewide (observations/interviews)	Beginning teacher program	Developing (will phase in over next three years)
OKLAHOMA	District/higher education team	Beginning teacher program	Implementing
SOUTH CAROLINA	District team	Beginning teacher program	Implementing new assessment
TEXAS	Statewide	First year of teaching ³	Developing
WASHINGTON	District/higher education team through enrollment in college program	Third through fifth years of teaching	Developing
WEST VIRGINIA	District	Beginning teacher program	Implementing
WISCONSIN	District/higher education team assess professional growth plan	Within first five years of teaching	Considering

*Assessment will be standards-based, rely on multiple measures of classroom performance, incorporate professional development and assistance for the teacher, and be reviewed by trained raters.

³ Scheduled to occur early in a teacher's first year with the teacher preparation program held accountable for a graduate's performance.

APPENDIX Q: BEGINNING EDUCATOR SUPPORT AND TRAINING IN CONNECTICUT

Since 1989, Connecticut has required first-year teachers to participate in the Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) program, which includes support through mentoring and training and a formal performance assessment of knowledge and skills. Since 1992, Connecticut has been working independently and in collaboration with other states through INTASC to redesign BEST into a two-year assistance and assessment program that requires teachers to prepare subject-specific portfolios of their classroom performance in their second year of teaching.

Support. All beginning teachers receive mentoring from a school-based mentor or mentor team for at least one year. Mentors are exemplary teachers, selected by the school district, who complete a three-day training session. Their responsibilities include meeting at least weekly with beginning teachers, providing orientation, clarifying the responsibilities of the BEST program, observing and being observed by the beginning teachers, and assisting teachers in preparing their portfolios. In 1997-98, there were about 2,300 first-year teachers in Connecticut.

Portfolio Assessment. The portfolio assessment process is being phased in by subject area. For 1999-2000, the assessment will be used for teachers of English/language arts, mathematics, middle grades, music, physical education, science, social studies, special education, and visual arts (about 85 percent of all beginning teachers). World languages will be added in 2000-01. During their first and second years, teachers attend six seminars (a total of 18 to 20 hours) on how to teach their specific subject area. Teachers explore content standards and subject-specific models of teaching and learning, and, by the second year, are focused on development of more complex teaching strategies that foster active student participation in their own learning. Master teachers who have served as assessors on the portfolios teach the seminars.

Toward the end of their second year, the beginning teachers submit a portfolio that documents planning, teaching, and student learning within a unit of instruction over a two-week period of time. The portfolio includes lesson plans, videotapes, student work samples, and assessments of student learning. The teacher also prepares a written commentary explaining the instructional decisions and reflecting on how those decisions affected his or her teaching and student learning. The lessons and materials expected for each portfolio vary by subject area and are aligned with Connecticut's student learning standards.

Rating of Assessments. Assessors are exemplary teachers who receive 50 hours of training and assess portfolios for their content area during the summer. The portfolios are returned to teachers in the fall with feedback on the portfolio and eligibility for the provisional educator certificate. Teachers who do not meet the performance standards on the portfolio may be eligible for a third year in the program in order to complete this assessment. Among mentors, portfolio assessors, and beginning teachers, Connecticut estimates that over 40 percent of its teaching force has experience with the new assessments.

Cost. Connecticut estimates that it cost \$1,026,000 over a three-year period to develop and validate the teaching standards and develop and pilot-test the portfolio assessments, although this work is not complete. Estimated annual cost for mentor training and training and certification of assessors is \$308,000, which should support about 2,000 beginning teachers. Scoring the portfolios for 2,000 teachers is estimated at \$250,000. In addition, the state spends \$3 million annually on mentoring, training, and clinics to support beginning teachers. School districts receive only \$200 per teacher out of these funds.

APPENDIX R: ALIGNMENT OF WASHINGTON STATE TEACHER PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT WITH STRATEGIES TO IMPLEMENT EDUCATION REFORM

STRATEGIES TO IMPLEMENT EDUCATION REFORM	RESIDENCY CERTIFICATE (PRE-SERVICE)	BEGINNING TEACHER ASSISTANCE (YEAR 1)	EMPLOYMENT EVALUATION - FORMAL (YEARS 1-4 AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION)	PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE (YEARS 3 - 5)	ONGOING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CAREER-LONG)	EMPLOYMENT EVALUATION - PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OPTION (AFTER 4 FORMAL EVALUATIONS)
STANDARDS FOR KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS	1 standard 22 criteria Positive impact on student learning Adopted 1997	None	7 standards Additional standards negotiable locally Adopted 1976	3 standards 18 criteria Positive impact on student learning Adopted 1997	To maintain certification: 3 standards 5 criteria To earn credit on salary schedule: 5 criteria Adopted 1997	Standards negotiable locally
PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	Local decision by preparation program	Formal assessment prohibited Local decision by district for informal assessment	State-required number of classroom observations Additional processes negotiable locally	Local decision by certificate program	None	Local district decision
ACCOUNTABILITY	No state exit assessment Limited state funds Limited state oversight	State program requirements are input-based State and local funds No state oversight	Continued employment is local decision by district No state funds No state oversight	No common assessment tool statewide No state funds Limited state oversight of pilots	District approves credit for salary schedule and certification State and local funds Limited state oversight	Continued employment is local decision by district No state funds No state oversight

APPENDIX S: ASSESSMENT OPTIONS FOR WASHINGTON

Basic Skills: Admission to Program

Goal: Ensure that candidates in pre-service programs have a basic competency in reading, writing, and math.

Option 1

Contract with Education Testing Service (ETS) for Praxis I. Twenty-four states use Praxis I as their basic skills test. ETS has already conducted validity and reliability studies for the test. It would be up to the state to do the necessary work to establish cut scores.

Concerns about differential minority pass rates might be addressed by using the test to determine areas that need remediation, rather than as a gateway exam, and then having a course available to address those remediation needs. This might also eliminate the need to set cut scores because the test would be considered a means of getting information about a candidate's basic skill proficiency so that appropriate fine-tuning could occur.

Some states use Praxis I as an exit exam. This was not its original intention and presents the problem of denying certification due to lack of proficiency in basic skills to someone who has, perhaps, just successfully completed a teacher preparation program.

Option 2

Contract with a test developer such as National Evaluation Systems (NES) to develop a state-specific basic skills test for Washington State pre-service teachers. This option would be a preferred route if Washington wants to ensure that teachers have the same basic skills that are required under the state's Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs).

Content: Program Exit or Residency Certificate (for out-of-state candidates)

Goal: Ensure that graduates of pre-service preparation programs know the content and have the skills required for the EALRs in the areas they would teach.

Option 1

Choose tests from the Praxis II series. These tests are available in nearly every subject area, with a large variety of content and format, including content-only and content-related pedagogy. Validity and reliability tests have already been completed, but, as with Praxis I, the state would have to set the cut scores.

The issue with a nationally-available content test is whether it could incorporate Washington's student learning standards. The state would want to examine the Praxis content tests to see how well the material tested covers the Washington EALRs.

Option 2

Develop a test that reflects and expands upon the EALRs in each content area. The state would have to conduct the validity and reliability studies and set the cut scores.

Pedagogy: Program Exit

Goal: Ensure that graduates of preparation programs have the pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary to positively impact student learning.

Option 1

Use Praxis II, which also includes tests of basic pedagogy in addition to the content-related pedagogy mentioned above. While knowledge of subjects such as child development, principles of learning, cognition, etc., could be easily assessed, there is a great deal of disagreement about the efficacy of a paper and pencil test of teaching skill, given the inherent complexity of every teaching situation.¹ As with the other Praxis tests, studies of validity and reliability have been conducted; cut scores must be set by the state.

Option 2

Rely on performance assessment of teacher standards conducted through student teaching. Candidates would be required to provide evidence (observation, portfolio artifacts) of their accomplishment of each teacher standard. Teacher preparation programs would be required to evaluate the performance level of each standard through the evidence provided. Decisions to be made include:

- Framework to be used (preferably one framework, statewide, for pre-service, induction, professional certification, and evaluation).
- Who would provide the assessment.
- Necessary level of performance for issuance of a residency certificate.

¹ For a discussion of this issue, see Linda Darling-Hammond, Arthur E. Wise, and Stephen P. Klein, *A License to Teach*, (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1999), Chapters 3 and 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Section II: State Policies to Assure Teacher Quality, and Section III: Pre-service Teacher Preparation

Allen, Wendall. "Professional Education in Washington Part 1: 1948-73." White Paper for the State Board of Education, Date Unknown.

Andrew, Michael and Richard Schwab. "Has Reform in Teacher Education Influenced Teacher Performance? An Outcome Assessment of Graduates of an Eleven-University Consortium." *Action in Teacher Education* 27, no. 3 (Fall 1995): 43-53.

Andrews, Ted. "A Study of Change Strategies Used by the Office of Teacher Education and Certification in the State of Washington: A Case Study." Ph.D. Dissertation at the State University of New York at Albany, School of Education, 1977.

_____. *Teacher Preparation and Development 1983-1998: A Historical Perspective*. Olympia, WA, 1999.

Archer, Jeff. "New Teachers Abandon Field At High Rate," *Education Week on the Web*, March 17, 1999.

Bull, Barry. *Analysis of Data on First Teaching Certificate Completers at Five Public Institutions*. Olympia, WA: Council for Postsecondary Education, 1985.

_____. *A Study of Initial Teacher Preparation in Washington*. Olympia, Wa: Council for Postsecondary Education, May 1985.

_____. "Confronting Reform in Teacher Preparation: One State's Experience." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 91, no. 1 (1987): 25-40.

Bullard, Chloe. "Qualified Teachers for all California Students: Current Issues in Recruitment, Retention, Preparation and Professional Development." Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau, CRB-98-012, 1998.

Burris, Gary. *The Impact of Teaching, Learners and Schools on Student Achievement in a Standards Based Environment*. Olympia, WA, 1999.

Bush, Robert. "Teacher Education Reform: Lessons From the Past Half Century". *Journal of Teacher Education* (May-June 1987).

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. New York: The Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, May 1986.

Cochran, Katheryn, James DeRuiter, and Richard King. "Pedagogical Content Knowledge: An Integrative Model for Teacher Preparation" *Journal of Teacher Education* 44, no. 4 (September-October 1993): 264.

Cohen, David and Heather Hill. *State Policy and Classroom Performance: Mathematics Reform in California*. Consortium for Policy Research in Education Policy Brief, January 1998.

Cowart, Bill and David Myton. "The Oregon Work Sample Methodology; Rationale and Background" in *Grading Teachers, Grading Schools: Is Student Achievement a Valid Evaluation Measure*, ed. Jason Millman. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc., 1997.

Danielson, Charlotte. *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1996.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Standards for Assessing Teaching Effectiveness Are Key: A Response to Schalock, Schalock, and Myton." *Phi Delta Kappan* (February 1998): 471-472.

_____. *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. Kutztown, PA: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996.

_____. *Doing What Matters Most: Investing in Quality Teaching*. Kutztown, PA: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1997.

Edelfelt, Roy. *Continuity and Progress: The State Board of Education's Report on Teacher Education in Washington*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Board of Education, 1985.

Educational Testing Service. "How Do Teachers Compare." Princeton, NJ: February 1999.

Elmore, Richard. "Getting to Scale with Good Educational Practice." *Harvard Educational Review* 66, no. 1 (Spring 1996).

Feistritzer C. Emily. "The Evolution of Alternative Teacher Certification." *The Educational Forum* 58 (Winter 1994): 137.

Feistritzer, C. Emily and David T. Chester. *Alternative Teacher Certification: A State-by-State Analysis*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information, 1998.

Feistritzer C. Emily, Michael D. Hill, and George C. Willett. *Profile of Troops to Teachers*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information, 1998.

Ferguson, Patrick and Sid Womack. "The Impact of Subject Matter and Education Coursework on Teaching Performance." *Journal of Teacher Education* 44, no. 1 (January-February 1993): 61.

Ferguson, Ronald. "Paying for Public Education: New Evidence on How and Why Money Matters." *Harvard Journal on Legislation* 28 (Summer 1991): 477.

- Finney, Joni. *At the Crossroads: Linking Teacher Education to School Reform*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1992.
- Fouts, Jeff et al. *School Restructuring and Student Achievement in Washington State*. Seattle, WA: Seattle Pacific University, 1998.
- Frazier, Calvin. *A Shared Vision: Policy Recommendations for Linking Teacher Education to School Reform*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, July 1993.
- Gitomer, Drew; Andy Latham, and Robert Ziomek. *The Academic Preparedness of Prospective Teachers*. Draft presentation to the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. Washington, DC: February 1999.
- Goldhaber, Dan and Dominic Brewer. *Evaluating the Effect of Teacher Degree Level on Educational Performance*. Rockville, MD: Westat, 1996.
- Greenwald, Robert; Larry Hedges, and Richard Laine. "The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement." *Review of Educational Research* 66, no. 3. (Fall 1996): 381-396.
- Grossman, Pamela. *The Making of a Teacher: Teacher Knowledge and Teacher Education*. New York: Teachers Education College Press, 1990.
- Guest, Linda Sand. *Improving Teacher Preparation: What the Reform Reports Say*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, May 1993.
- Haney, Walter, et al. "Charms Talismanic: Testing Teachers for the Improvement of American Education." In *Review of Research in Education*, Volume 14, ed. Ernst Rothkopf. Washington, DC: AERA, 1987.
- Haberman Martin. "Alternative Teacher Certification Programs," *Action in Teacher Education* 8, no. 2. (1986): 13-18, cited in Stoddart, Trish and Robert E. Floden. *Traditional and Alternate Routes to Teacher Certification: Issues, Assumptions, and Misconceptions*. Paper prepared for the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, 1995, p. 4.
- Hair, Donald. *Teacher Assignment Policy*. Olympia, WA: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1984.
- Hamacheck, Don. "Expectations Revisited: Implications for Teachers and Counselors and Questions for Self- Assessment." *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*. (1995).
- Harris, Larry, et al. *Using Performance-Based Assessment to Improve Teacher Education*. Paper presented at Association of Teacher Education, February 1997. ERIC report ED 406 346.
- Hawley, Willis. "Chapter 16: United States" in *Issues and Problems in Teacher Education*, ed. Howard Leavitt. New York, NY: Greenwood Press, 1992.

- Hirsch, Eric, Julia Koppich, and Michael Knapp. *What States Are Doing to Improve the Quality of Teaching: A Brief Review of Current Patterns and Trends*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, December 1998.
- Holmes Group. *Tomorrow's Teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author, 1986.
- Housego, B. "How Prepared Were You to Teach?" *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* XL, no. 3 (September 1994): 355-373.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing and Development*. Washington, DC: Author, 1992.
- _____. *Next Steps: Moving Toward Performance-Based Licensing in Teaching*. Washington, DC: Author, 1995.
- Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (formerly the Legislative Budget Committee), *Program Review of the Future Teachers Conditional Scholarship Program*. Report 93-10. Olympia, WA, 1993.
- Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (formerly the Legislative Budget Committee), *Program Review of the Incentive Loan Program for Mathematics and Science Teachers*. Report 89-2. Olympia, WA, 1989.
- Jordan, Heather, Robert Mendro, and Dash Weerasinghe. *Teacher Effects on Longitudinal Student Achievement in Dallas Texas*. Dallas, TX, 1997.
- Kanstoroom, Marci and Chester Finn, ed. *Better Teachers, Better Schools*. Washington D.C.: Thomas Fordham Foundation, July 1999.
- Knapp, Michael and Marguerite Roza. "Influences on Student Achievement: What Educational Research Does (and Doesn't) Tell Us." Presentation at the Spring Regional Meeting of the Washington Educational Research Association, May 1995.
- Kooi, Beverly. *Effective Teacher Preparation for Educational Reform in Washington State*, Olympia, WA, 1999.
- Koziol, Stephen, J. Bradley Minnick, Michael Sherman. "What Student Teaching Evaluation Instruments Tell Us About Emphases in Teacher Education Programs." *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 10 (1996): 53-74.
- Ladd, Helen and Ronald Ferguson. Chapter 8 in *Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-based Reform in Education*, ed. Helen Ladd. Washington, DC: Brookings, 1996.
- Lake, Robin, Paul Hill, et al. *Making Standards Work: Active Voices, Focused Learning*. University of Washington: Center on Reinventing Public Education, February 1999.
- Lucas, Christopher. *Teacher Education in America: Reform Agendas for the Twenty-first Century*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

- McKibbin Michael D. "Voices and Views: Perspectives on California's Teaching Internship Programs." Paper presented at the National Center for Alternative Certification conference, Bellevue, WA, April 8-10, 1999.
- Miller, John W. *Journal of Teacher Education*, May-June 1998, cited in "Alternative Certification," *Education Week on the Web*, October 14, 1998.
- Monk, David. "Subject Area Preparation of Secondary Mathematics and Science Teachers and Student Achievement." *Economics of Education Review* 13, no. 2 (1994): 125-145.
- Morgan, Jacel B. "Houston ISD Alternative Certification Program". Presentation to the Texas State Board for Educator Certification, September, 1998.
- Murnane, Richard. *Who Will Teach? Policies that Matter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- National Association of State directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). *Manual on the Preparation and Certification of Education Personnel*, 4th edition, ed. Ted Andrews. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1998-99.
- Office of Financial Management. *Teacher Supply and Demand in Washington State*. Olympia, WA, 1990.
- Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. "Teacher Shortages in America," In *Facts About the Teaching Profession* <http://www.rnt.org/rntfacts.html#shortages>.
- Rivkin, Steve, Eric Hanusheck, and John Kain. *Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement*. Paper presented at the American Public Policy Analysis and Management conference in New York, Fall 1998.
- Sanders, William L. and June Rivers. *Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement*. Nashville: The University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center, 1996.
- Schalock, Del, Mark Schalock, and Gerald Girod. "Teacher Work Sample Methodology as Used as Western Oregon State College in Grading Teachers." In *Grading Schools: Is Student Achievement a Valid Evaluation Measure*, ed. Jason Millman. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc., 1997.
- Schalock, Del; Schalock, Mark; and Myton, David. "Effectiveness – Along with Quality – Should Be the Focus." *Phi Delta Kappan* (February 1998): 468-470.
- Shulman, Lee. "Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform." *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no. 1 (February 1987).
- Stiggins, Rick. *Auditing the Quality of Classroom Assessment Training in Teacher Education Programs*. Portland, OR: Rick Stiggins Assessment Training Institute, February 1998.

- Stoddart, Trish and Robert E. Floden. *Traditional and Alternate Routes to Teacher Certification: Issues, Assumptions, and Misconceptions*. Paper prepared for the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, 1995.
- Tafel, Linda and Judith Christensen. "Teacher Education in the 1990s: Looking Ahead While Learning from the Past." *Action in Teacher Education* 10, no. 3 (Fall 1988).
- Turlington Debra P.v, 474 F. Supp. 177 (M.D. Fla 1979), aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 644 F.2 397 95th Cir 1981); on remand, 564 F. Supp 177(M.D. Fla. 1983), aff'd 730 F.2nd 1405 (11th Cir. 1984).
- U.S. Department of Defense. *Troops to Teachers: Evaluations for Teachers Beginning in the 1995/96 School Year*. Washington, DC: Defense Activity for Nontraditional Support (DANTES), June 1998.
- U.S. Department of Education. *America's Teachers: Profile of the Profession*. NCES 97-460. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1993-94.
- U.S. Department of Education. *Status of Education Reform in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools: Teachers' Perspectives*. NCES 1999-045. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1998.
- U.S. Department of Education. *Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualification of Public School Teachers*. NCES 99-080. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1999.
- Verstegen, Deborah and Richard King. "The Relationship Between School Spending and Student Achievement: A Review and Analysis of 35 Years of Production Function Research." *Journal of Education Finance* 24 (Fall 1998): 243-262.
- Washington State Board of Education. *Report to the 1990 Legislature*. Olympia, WA, 1990.
- Wilson, Suzanne and Deborah Ball. "Helping Teachers Meet the New Standards: New Challenges for Teacher Educators." *Elementary School Journal* 97 (1996): 121-138.
- Wise, Arthur. "The Coming Revolution in Teacher Licensure: Redefining Teacher Preparation." *Action in Teacher* 16, no. 2 (Summer 1994): 1-13.
- Word, Elizabeth et al. *Student Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR) Tennessee's K-3 Class Size Study Final Summary 1985-1990*. Nashville, TN: Tennessee Department of Education, 1991.

Section IV: Beginning Teacher Assistance

- Bartell, Carol. "Shaping Teacher Induction Policy in California." *Teacher Education Quarterly* 22, no. 4 (1995).
- Bradley, Ann. "California Revises Training for New Teachers," *Education Week*, October 7, 1998.
- Bradley, Leo and Gordon, Stephen. "Comparing the Ideal to the Real in State-Mandated Teacher Induction Programs." *Journal of Staff Development* 15, no. 3 (1994).
- Brock, Barbara and Grady, Marilyn. *Beginning Teacher Induction Programs*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the National Council of Professors in Educational Administration, August 6-10, 1996. ERIC document 399 631.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. *California's Future: Highly Qualified Teachers for All Students*. Sacramento: Author, 1997.
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/sb1422publication/1422lite.html>.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and State Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs*. Sacramento: Author, 1997.
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/btsapublication/btsaprogstds.html>.
- Dianda, Marcella and Quartz, Karen. "Promising New Teacher Support Strategies and Their Costs." *Teacher Education Quarterly* (Fall 1995).
- Education Week*. "Large Numbers of Young Teachers Abandon the Profession." March 17, 1999.
- Education Week*. "California Revises Training for New Teachers." October 7, 1998.
- Feiman-Nemser, Sharon and Parker, Michelle. "Making Subject Matter Part of the Conversation in Learning to Teach." *Journal of Teacher Education* 41, no. 3 (1990).
- Furtwengler, Carol. "Beginning Teachers Programs: Analysis of State Actions During the Reform Era." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 3, no. 3 (1995).
- Gold, Yvonne. "Beginning Teacher Support: Attrition, Mentoring and Induction." In, *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* 2nd edition, ed. John Sikula. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan: Association of American Teachers, 1996.
- Gordon, Stephen. *How to Help Beginning Teachers Succeed*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1991.
- "Help for New Teachers: CFASST Debuts." *ETS Developments* 44, no. 1, 1998.
- Huling-Austin, Leslie. *Assessing the Impact of Teacher Induction Programs: Implications for Program Development*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1987.

- _____, ed. *Assisting the Beginning Teacher*. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators, 1989.
- _____. *Components of Teacher Induction Programs: ERIC Digest No. 4*. Washington D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1986.
- _____. "Research on Learning to Teach: Implications for Teacher Induction and Mentoring Programs." *Journal of Teacher Education* 43, no 3 (1992).
- _____. "Review of the Literature" in *Teacher Induction*, ed. Judy Reinhartz. Washington DC: National Education Association, 1989.
- _____. "Teacher Induction: Rationale and Issues." In *Teacher Induction—A New Beginning*, ed. Douglas Brooks. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators, 1987.
- Illinois Induction Advisory Panel. *Recommendations from the Illinois Induction Advisory Panel, Phase II*, January 1999.
- Kester, Ralph and Marockie, Mary. "Local Induction Programs." In *Teacher Induction - A New Beginning*, ed. Douglas Brooks. Reston: Association of Teacher Educators, 1987.
- Marlow, Leslie et al. "Beginning Teachers: Are They Still Leaving the Profession?" *The Clearinghouse* 70, no. 4 (1997).
- Mitchell, Douglas, et al. *California Mentor Teacher Program Evaluation: Technical Report*. Sacramento, CA: California Educational Research Cooperative, 1996.
- _____. *The California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program: A Statewide Evaluation Study*. Sacramento, CA: California Educational Research Cooperative, 1997.
- Odell, Sandra. "Induction Support of New Teachers: A Functional Approach." *Journal of Teacher Education* 37, no. 1 (1986).
- _____. *Mentor Teacher Programs*. Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1990.
- _____. "Teacher Induction: Rationale and Issues." In *Teacher Induction: A New Beginning*, ed. Douglas Brooks. Reston: Association of Teacher Educators, 1987.
- Office of Educational Research and Improvement. *Components of Teacher Induction Programs*. Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1986.
- Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. "The 1998-99 Teacher Assistance Program" Bulletin No. 47-98. Olympia, WA, June 5, 1998.
- _____. OSPI Budget Request 1999-01, Decision Package BB. Olympia, WA, 1999.

- _____. *Report to the Legislature on the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program.* Olympia, WA, January 1987.
- _____. *Report to the Legislature on the Teacher Assistance Program Pilot Program: RCW 28A.415.260.* Olympia, WA, December 1995.
- _____. *The 1989-90 Teacher Assistance Program: Annual Report.* Olympia, WA, February 1991.
- Panel for Texas Novice Teacher Induction Support System. *Final Report.* Austin: Texas, 1998.
- Perez, Katherine et al. "An Analysis of Practices Used to Support New Teachers." *Teacher Education Quarterly* (Spring 1997).
- Reiman, Alan et al. "Linking Staff Development and Teacher Induction." *Journal of Staff Development* 9, no. 4 (1988).
- Reinhartz, Judy, ed. *Teacher Induction.* Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1989.
- Reynolds, Anne. "The Knowledge Base for Beginning Teachers: Education Professionals' Expectations versus Research Findings on Learning to Teach." *The Elementary School Journal* 95, no. 3 (1995).
- _____. "What is Competent Beginning Teaching? A Review of the Literature." *Review of Educational Research* 62, no. 1 (1992).
- Schaffer, Eugene et al. "An Innovative Beginning Teacher Induction Program: A Two-Year Analysis of Classroom Interactions." *Journal of Teacher Education* 43, no. 3 (1992).
- Schlechty, Philip. "A Framework for Evaluating Induction into Teaching." *Journal of Teacher Education* 36, no. 1 (1985).
- Wagner, Laura, Linda Ownby, and Janet Gless. "The California Mentor Teacher Program in the 1980's and 1990s: A Historical Perspective." *Education and Urban Society* 28, no. 1 (1995): 20-39.
- Wildman, Terry et al. "Teacher Mentoring: An Analysis of Roles, Activities and Conditions." *Journal of Teacher Education* 43, no. 3 (1992).
- Wilkinson, Gayle. "Support for Individualizing Teacher Induction." *Action in Teacher Education* XVI, no. 2 (1994).
- Veenman, Simon. "Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers." *Review of Educational Research* 54, no. 2 (1984).

Section V: Professional Certification

Andrews, Ted. "Memo to Professional Certificate Discussion Group." Olympia, WA, Office of Professional Education and Certification, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, November 13, 1997.

_____. "Memo to State Board of Education." Olympia, WA, Office of Professional Education and Certification, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, January 22-24, 1997.

_____. "Memo to Washington Advisory Council for Professional Teaching Standards." Olympia, WA, Office of Professional Education and Certification, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, June 20, 1995.

_____. "Memo to Washington Advisory Council for Professional Teaching Standards." Olympia, WA, Office of Professional Education and Certification, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, October 24, 1995.

_____. "Memo to Washington Advisory Council for Professional Teaching Standards." Olympia, WA, Office of Professional Education and Certification, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, February 20, 1998.

Berliner, David. "The Wonder of Exemplary Performances." In *Creating Powerful Thinking in Teachers and Students*, ed. John Mangieri and Cathy Collins Block. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1994.

Cady, Lillian. "Memo to Washington Advisory Council for Professional Teaching Standards" Olympia, WA, Office of Professional Education, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, June 16, 1999.

Certification Models Pilot Project: Sumner, Tacoma, Bethel, Cascade Christian School Districts, University of Washington-Tacoma and Pacific Lutheran Universities. *Final Evaluation Report*. Tacoma, WA, 1998.

Connecticut State Department of Education. *BEST Program Overview and History*. <http://www.aces.k12ct.us/www/best/OVERVIEW.HTM>.

_____. *Connecticut Competency Instrument (CCI) Overview*. <http://www.state.ct.us/sde/brta/cciover.htm>.

_____. *A Guide to the BEST Program for Beginning Teachers and Mentors*. CT: Author, August 1997.

Council of Chief State School Officers. *Key State Education Policies on K-12 Education: Standards, Graduation, Assessment, Teacher Licensure, Time and Attendance. A 50-State Report*. Washington DC: Author, August 1998.

Darling-Hammond, Linda et al. *A License to Teach: Raising Standards for Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.

Dwyer, Carol Anne. *Development of the Knowledge Base for the PRAXIS III: Classroom Performance Assessments Assessment Criteria*. Princeton, NJ: Education Testing Service, 1994.

_____. "Psychometrics of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments." *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 12, no. 2 (1998): 163-187.

Educational Service District 123. *Handbook for ESD 123 Consortium Professional Certification Field Project*. Pasco, WA, February 19, 1998.

Indiana Professional Standards Board. "Budget Overview for Beginning Teacher Portfolio Assessment, 1999-2001 Biennium Budget Request." IN, 1999.

_____. "Update on the Redesign of the Preparation and Licensure of Education Professionals." Winter, 1998-99.

Jacobson, Larry S., et al. *Situated (Portfolio-Based) Assessment: A New Assessment Tool?* 25th International Congress on Assessment Center Methods, April 29, 1997. London, England.

Klein, Stephen. "Standards for Teacher Tests." *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 12, no. 2 (1998): 123-138.

Kooi, Beverly Y. *Feasibility of Implementing the Professional Certification Program in Washington State*. Paper prepared for the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, WA, December 1998.

Linn, Robert et al. "Complex, Performance-Based Assessment: Expectations and Validation Criteria." *Educational Researcher* 20, no. 8 (1991): 15-23.

Long, Claudia and Stansbury, Kendyll. "Performance Assessments for Beginning Teachers." *Phi Delta Kappan* 66, no. 12 (1994): 318-322.

McGuire, Margit. "Memo to State Board of Education" Seattle, WA, State Board and WACTE Task Force, February 23, 1999.

Milanowski, Anthony et al. "Teacher Knowledge and Skill Assessments and Teacher Compensation: An Overview of Measurement and Linkage Issues." *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 12, no. 2 (1998): 83-101.

Moss, Pamela et al. "An Integrative Approach to Portfolio Evaluation for Teacher Licensure," *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 12, no. 2 (1998): 139-161.

North Carolina State Board of Education. "Supplemental Budget Request: 1998-99." www.dpi.state.nc.us/about_dpi/state_board/supplemental_budget_98-99.html.

North Carolina State Board of Education and Department of Public Instruction. *Performance-Based Licensure Resource Materials*. Raleigh, NC: Author, 1998-99.

- _____. *North Carolina Beginning Teacher Induction Program*. Raleigh, NC: Author, 1998.
- Northwest Consortium for Teachers' Professional Certification. *Candidate Handbook*. Bellingham, WA, 1997.
- Office of Professional Education and Certification, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Interim Report of Progress for Seven Washington State Professional Certification Field Test Projects*. Olympia, WA, May 1998.
- _____. *Washington: Teacher Certification for the 21st Century*. Olympia, WA, June 1996.
- Pecheone, Raymond, and Stansbury, Kendyll. "Connecting Teacher Assessment and School Reform." *Elementary School Journal* 97, no. 2 (1997): 163-177.
- Porter, Andrew et al. "Advances in Teacher Assessments and Their Uses." To appear in *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (4th edition), ed. V. Richardson (forthcoming).
- Professional Certification Program: Edmonds and Mukilteo School Districts, King's Garden Schools and Seattle Pacific University. *Program Evaluation Final Report*. Seattle, WA, 1998.
- Pullin, Diana C. *Reforms in Standards-Based Teacher Education, Certification and Licensure: Legal Issues in Implementation*. Paper prepared for Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, 1998.
- Report to State Board of Education from Washington Advisory Council for Professional Teaching Standards. March 19, 1998.
- Roth, Robert. "Standards for Certification, Licensure, and Accreditation." In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, 2nd edition, ed. John Sikula. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan: Association of American Teachers, 1996.
- Sagor, Richard. *How to Conduct Collaborative Action Research*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 1982.
- Seashore Teacher Professional Certification Program. *Interim Report to State Board of Education*. Seattle, WA, Fall, 1998.
- Spagnolo, Joseph. "World Class Educators for the 21st Century: Illinois Framework for a Restructured Licensure System." *Action in Teacher Education* XIX, no. 2 (1997): 7-16.
- Tan, Gerdean (Washington State University), and Cotes, O.J. (Spokane District 81). *Professional Certification Pilot Project Report*. Pullman and Spokane, WA, October 8, 1998.
- Vedros, R, Butchart, R, and Lamoreaux, D. *Framework for Proficient Teaching and Student Learning: Measuring Up to Professional Certification*. Tacoma, WA, 1997.

Washington Advisory Council for Professional Teaching Standards. *Initial Recommendations to the State Board of Education*. Olympia, WA, January 1996.

_____. Meeting Minutes. Oak Harbor, WA, October 27 - 28, 1998.

Washington State University/Spokane District 81 Professional Level Certification Project. *Self Assessment Handout for WSU EdAd 507*. Spokane, WA, November 30, 1998.