

**Partnerships for Preparing Teachers:
Transforming Teacher Preparation and Professional Development in Maryland
Report Prepared for
Governor's P-20 Leadership Council Task Force on Teacher Education**

Charge: The P-20 Task Force on Teacher Education is charged with making recommendations and creating an action plan that will ensure high quality teacher education programs that are responsive to the needs of the prekindergarten through grade 12 schools, aligned with Maryland College and Career Ready Standards (MDCCRS), and designed to support student success for all Maryland students. Specifically the Task Force will:

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

**Partnerships for Preparing Teachers:
Transforming Teacher Preparation and Professional Development in Maryland
Report Prepared for
Governor's P-20 Leadership Council Task Force on Teacher Education**

Task Force Membership

Tim Chandler, co-chair, Towson University
Jack Smith, co-chair, Maryland State Department of Education,
James Ball, Carroll Community College
Tina Bjarekull, Maryland Independent College and University Association
Joann Boughman, University System of Maryland (Zakiya Lee, designee)
Margaret Dammeyer, Catholic Schools' Archdiocese of Baltimore
Colleen Eisenbeiser, Anne Arundel Community College
Richard Green, The New Teacher Project
Darren Hornbeck, Maryland State Education Association
Catherine Shultz, Secretary of Higher Education Commission
Deborah Kraft, Stevenson University
Melinda Kramer, Prince George's Community College
Kristina Kyles, Baltimore City Public Schools
Tawana Lane, Maryland State Education Association
Elizabeth Ysla Leight, Maryland PTA
Bernadette Sandruck, Howard Community College
Jean Satterfield, Maryland State Department of Education
Nancy Shapiro, University System of Maryland
Robert Stevenson, Beall Elementary School
Deborah Sullivan, Prince George's County Public Schools
Karen Verbeke, Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Henry Wagner, Public School Superintendents of Maryland
Patricia Welch, Morgan State University
Donna Wiseman, University of Maryland, College Park

Subcommittees

Teacher Education, the Common Core and Other Current Reforms

Chair: Bernadette Sandruck, Howard Community College

Diane Hampton, Maryland Independent College and University Association

Danette Howard, Maryland Higher Education Commission

Andrea Kane, Anne Arundel County Public Schools

Melinda Kramer, Prince George's Community College

Dana McCauley, Cecil County Public Schools

Carolyn Teigland, Cecil County Public Schools

Internships and Induction Continuum

Chair: Tina Bjarekull, Maryland Independent College and University Association

Portia Bates, Morgan State University

Colleen Eisenbeiser, Anne Arundel Community College

Tawana Lane, Maryland State Education Association

Elizabeth Ysla Leight, Maryland PTA

Henry Wagner, Dorchester County Public Schools

Patricia Welch, Morgan State University

Donna Wiseman, University of Maryland, College Park

Criteria for Teacher Education Programs and External Accreditation Requirements

Chair: Jean Satterfield, Maryland State Department of Education

Margaret Dammeyer, Catholic Schools Archdiocese of Baltimore

Darren Hornbeck, Maryland State Education Association

Deborah Kraft, Stevenson University

Fran Kroll, Howard Community College

Zakiya Lee, University System of Maryland

Maggie Madden, Maryland State Department of Education

Karen Verbeke, University of Maryland Eastern Shore

Alternative Teacher Education Pathways and Leveraging Pipelines

Chair: Krisina Kyles, Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals

James Ball, Carroll Community College

Michelle Dunkle, Maryland State Department of Education

Richard Green, The New Teacher Project

Scott Pfeifer, Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals

Bob Stevenson, Allegany County Public Schools

Deborah Sullivan, Prince George's County Public Schools

Staff

Gail Hoerauf-Bennett, Maryland State Department of Education

Dewayne Morgan, University System of Maryland

**Partnerships for Preparing Teachers:
Transforming Teacher Preparation and Professional Development in Maryland
Report Prepared for
Governor's P-20 Leadership Council Task Force on Teacher Education**

Abstract

On November 18, 2013, the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council charged a P-20 Task Force on Teacher Education with making recommendations and creating an action plan to ensure that all teacher preparation programs in Maryland will produce the high quality teachers our students deserve. Co-chairs Jack Smith, Deputy Superintendent, Maryland State Department of Education, and Tim Chandler, Provost, Towson University, convened five meetings of the Task Force between December 2013 and April 2014. The appointed members included representatives from Prekindergarten through grade-12 (PreK – 12) schools, the higher education community, parent organizations and teacher associations. In addition to the monthly Task Force meetings, the co-chairs presided over targeted sub-committee meetings, conference calls, and electronic reviews of documents.

Building on a strong foundation of educational excellence in Maryland, and taking lessons from many sources, the P-20 Task Force on Teacher Preparation offers recommendations in four key areas:

1. Pre-service teacher preparation
2. Pre-tenure teacher induction
3. Professional development for current teachers
4. Continuous improvement through accountability

Key recommendations:

Pre-Service Teacher Preparation:

1. Establish higher Maryland standards for admission to all teacher preparation programs.
2. Align teacher preparation programs, including Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) programs, with Maryland College and Career Readiness Standards (MCCRS).
3. Transition to Professional Learning Networks built on a model of internships and residencies to increase the number and variety of field placements for teacher candidates.
4. Increase the number and variety of field placements to promote adaptive expertise, with the final placement organized in a way that simulates what is expected in the first year of teaching.
5. Prioritize in-state programs for field placements, internships, and post-baccalaureate residencies.
6. Invest in scholarships, loan forgiveness, and early college/teacher academies to recruit highly qualified students into teaching careers.

Pre-Tenure Induction

1. Establish a 3-year residency model for all pre-tenured teachers that engages higher education teacher preparation programs in collaborative partnerships with school districts.
2. Establish collaboratively supported Teaching Innovation Centers (hubs of innovation).
3. Fund three initial pilot Teaching Innovation Centers with state “seed” money and subsequently with savings from reduced teacher attrition.

Professional Development for Current Teachers

1. Establish career-long professional development programs and career ladders for educators that are aligned with the high expectations of MCCRS.
2. Establish a school/university partnership process for building professional development programs for educators.
 - a. Programs should be collaboratively developed by PreK-12 and higher education.
 - b. Programs should build strong content and pedagogy competencies.
3. Reallocate existing funds for professional development to support the new collaboratively developed models.

Continuous Improvement through Accountability

1. Build Maryland accountability recommendations around the ideal conditions that contribute to the development of highly effective teachers and set a high bar for qualifications and expectations for all teacher preparation programs.
2. Align current Institutional Performance Criteria to reflect school reform initiatives.
3. Ensure that higher education institutions have access to all data necessary for continuous improvement research.
4. Align elements of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards for accreditation with Maryland’s priorities to ensure efficient and effective use of resources.

Regulatory Revision

As a co-requisite to the implementation of these recommendations, the Task Force recommends that the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), in collaboration with representatives from the Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE) review current regulations for clarity and revise or propose new regulatory language aligned with the recommendations and priorities identified in this report.

Fiscal Impact

These recommendations represent the current best practice and scholarship in the policy area of teacher preparation and teacher professional development. The Task Force arrived at consensus on these recommendations as the priorities for Maryland’s teacher preparation policy framework, with the understanding that subsequent work will be needed to develop a fiscal analysis and implementation plan.

Overview of the Process

On November 18, 2013, the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council charged a P-20 Task Force on Teacher Education with making recommendations and creating an action plan to ensure that all teacher preparation programs in Maryland will produce the high quality teachers Maryland's students deserve. Co-chairs Jack Smith, Deputy Superintendent, Maryland State Department of Education, and Tim Chandler, Provost, Towson University, convened five meetings of the Task Force between December 2013 and April 2014. The appointed members included representatives from PreK-12 schools, the higher education community, parent organizations and teacher associations. In addition to the monthly Task Force meetings, the co-chairs presided over sub-committee meetings, conference calls, and electronic reviews of documents.

In responding to the charge, the Task Force examined national research reports and policy documents assembling categories of best practices, reviewed existing Maryland statutes and regulations related to teacher preparation, reached out to stakeholder groups, and circulated multiple drafts of the recommendations. The Task Force engaged with a variety of stakeholders including deans and directors of education at Maryland's two-year and four year colleges and universities, principals and Professional Development Coordinators convened by the University of Maryland, local school district superintendents, teachers and teacher association representatives, alternative certification providers, parent organizations, a number of national professional organizations, and the business community.

Maryland has also been a leader, through the use of Race to the Top (RTTT) funding, in reflecting global priorities. The increase in the quality and quantity of teachers in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) areas has been a focus for the last four years. Additionally RTTT prioritized preparing principals and teachers to be effective in challenging schools. The Task Force recommendations underscore the belief that closing the achievement gap is paramount in preparing all of Maryland's students for college and for successful careers.

The recommendations in this report draw on ideas and suggestions from all these sources. Three drafts (4/12/14; 4/18/14 and 4/23/14) of the report were sent out for review to the broad community of stakeholders and the recommendations were presented to the Governor's P-20 Council on Education on May 7, 2014. The list of the sources that the Task Force used is included in the references section of this report.

Just as the Task Force was completing its work, President Barack Obama issued his call for action on teacher preparation.

[T]he vast majority of new teachers – almost two-thirds – report that their teacher preparation program left them unprepared for the realities of the classroom. Moreover, for decades, institutions that prepare teachers have lacked the feedback needed to identify their strengths and weaknesses, and had little information on where program graduates go to teach, how long they stay, and how they perform in the classroom. Existing federal regulations on teacher preparation focus on information that is not sufficiently meaningful to preparation programs, potential teachers or potential employers.

Today, President Obama directed the U.S. Department of Education to lay out a plan to strengthen America’s teacher preparation programs for public discussion by this summer, and to move forward on schedule to publish a final rule within the next year. The Administration will encourage and support states in developing systems that recognize excellence and provide all programs with information to help them improve, while holding them accountable for how well they prepare teachers to succeed in today’s classrooms and throughout their careers. (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/04/25/fact-sheet-taking-action-improve-teacher-preparation>).

We believe that the recommendations included in this report anticipate and directly respond to President Obama’s call for action.

Purpose of the Task Force:

The Task Force on Teacher Preparation grew out of a Teacher Education Summit, October 11, 2013 at Towson University. The keynote speaker, Chancellor Nancy Zimpher of the State University of New York, challenged the assembled participants to think broadly about their aspirational goals and the changing context of teaching and teacher preparation. The Task Force accepted the charge, and has framed a set of recommendations that attempts to balance the on-the-ground realities with transformational best practices. The Task Force agreed that the recommendations should:

- Address the gap between teacher preparation programs and the on-the-ground realities in schools.
 - Align and integrate teacher preparation programs with the world of classroom teachers.
 - Prepare all teachers with background and strategies to understand and adapt to changing student populations, including cultural differences, poverty, and special learning, social and emotional needs.
- Recognize that while new teachers must be adequately prepared in advance to enter the classroom, preparation must link seamlessly with school district induction and embedded professional development to ensure a successful and long-lasting teaching career.

- Use multiple qualitative and quantitative measures to study teacher preparation and look for evidence-based ways that lead to building continuous improvement
- Develop a common Maryland framework that, while allowing for program flexibility and innovation, holds all education preparation providers, both traditional and alternative, accountable to a common set of rigorous expectations.
- Address the need for cycles of regular review and evaluation.

Building on a strong foundation of educational excellence in Maryland, and taking lessons from many sources, the P-20 Task Force on Teacher Preparation offers recommendations in four key areas:

1. Pre-service teacher preparation
2. Pre-tenure teacher induction
3. Professional development for current teachers
4. Continuous improvement through accountability

The Task Force recognizes the importance of scholarship and research to guide the work (for example, Darling-Hammond and Sykes, 2003; Lampert and Ball 1998; Wilson, Floden, and Ferrini-Mundy, 2001), and the necessity of building in a continuous improvement system of accountability in recognition of the dynamic nature of teaching and research in this field. (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012) Changes in technology, increased knowledge, changing student populations, and new brain research are only a handful of the many transformational currents affecting teaching and educator preparation. The Task Force began its work by asking the question: How do we prepare future professionals to have the knowledge, skills and dispositions to meet the needs and unanticipated realities of the future?

Maryland's current policy is grounded in the work of a 1991 Task Force, which developed the original criteria for State program approval. Maryland's current Institutional Performance Criteria include four key elements:

1. Strong Academic Content
2. Extended Clinical Experiences
3. Performance Assessment
4. Linkage with PreK-12 Priorities

The P-20 Teacher Preparation Task Force took a close look at the current policies and offers recommendations intended to revise the current policies to align them more closely with the rapidly changing context of teaching and teacher preparation. Building on Maryland's strong history of partnership, and Professional Development Schools as original "communities of practice," the Task Force recommends revisiting the current model to align it more closely with current realities; Maryland is a majority minority state, with a decreasing PreK-12 enrollment projected over the next ten years. According to the most recent National Center for Education Statistics publication, public school enrollments are expected to decrease 9 percent between

2008–09 and 2020–21 for students who are White; decrease 6 percent between 2008–09 and 2020–21 for students who are Black; and increase 63 percent between 2008–09 and 2020–21 for students who are Hispanic (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013008.pdf>).

Teacher preparation and professional development need to be reconsidered in light of the changing nature of the reality on the ground. While the economic outlook is murky and technology has progressed in ways that no one imagined even five years ago, teachers must not only have technological competencies, but be culturally proficient to effectively teach in diverse classrooms. In addition, new models must include these competencies and layer them onto content, assessment, and classroom management expertise. Finally, teacher preparation must prepare individuals to build strong, positive relationships with students.

The Task Force recommends that MSDE, in collaboration with representatives from MACTE review current regulations for clarity and revise or propose new regulatory language aligned with the recommendations and priorities identified in this report.

The first three categories of recommendations below are tightly inter-connected. They can best be understood as a three-legged stool that supports a high quality teaching profession that is developed and designed to support success for all students. If the medical profession has as its mission “First, do no harm,” the teaching profession’s mission may best be captured by the comment most closely associated with Christa McAuliffe, as she boarded the space shuttle Challenger: “I touch the future. I teach.”

The last category—continuous improvement through accountability - is in service of this greater vision.

Recommendations

I. Key recommendations in the area of pre-service preparation

A comprehensive policy approach to pre-service teacher preparation should include investments in recruitment (scholarships and loans), investments in urban and rural programs to expand training into high need locations, attention to teaching diverse student populations, and clear, competency-based exit standards for teachers graduating from programs and entering classrooms. The recommendations related to pre-service preparation are drawn from multiple sources.

All of the key sources recommend that an academic/intellectual threshold be based on grade point average (GPA) and test scores for entrance into teacher preparation programs be balanced against the need for social and cultural understandings, communication skills, grit and perseverance.

The intent of the recommendations below, the first of our three-legged stool, is to affirm that candidates should not qualify for internships until they have met a high standard, and they do not exit without exhibiting high levels of independent performance.

1. Establish higher standards for admission to teacher preparation programs using multiple indicators, recognizing that successful candidates will embody different types of exceptional qualities. (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005)
 - a. Raise GPA requirements for entry into teacher preparation programs. Ensure that the average GPA of students accepted into teacher preparation programs (traditional and alternative) meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum GPA of 3.0. (Ball, Hill, & Rowan, 2005) (American Federation of Teachers, 2012) (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012) (Council for the Accreditation for Educator Preparation, 2013) (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2013)
 - b. Following practices of other professions (LSAT, MCAT) require that teacher candidates pass Praxis I prior to admission to all teacher preparation programs.
 - c. Require that teacher candidates demonstrate a minimum level of performance on essential classroom culture and instructional skills in order to complete a pre-service training program. (Haberman, 1996)

2. Align all teacher preparation programs (traditional and alternative) with Maryland's College- and Career- Ready Standards (MCCRS). Two-year Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) programs should be promoted and aligned with four-year programs and state priorities.

3. Transition Professional Development Schools to Professional Learning Networks built on a model of internships and residencies.¹
 - a. Both higher education and school districts must be involved in the preparation of teachers, and in the design and development of the networks. Development and design of the networks must respect logistical and capacity issues.
 - b. Provide state resources for school district-college/university collaborations.
 - c. Support existing and new professional networks through partnerships between schools and teacher preparation programs at Institutes of Higher Education (IHE), (both community colleges and four-year universities) and Maryland Approved Alternative Certification Programs.

4. Increase the number and variety of field placements to promote adaptive expertise, with the final placement organized in a way that simulates what is expected in the first year of teaching. This will include:
 - a. "Wall-to-wall" field placements (continuous placement from admissions to graduation, scaffolding greater degrees of sophistication and responsibility, including team teaching and collaborative teaching experiences);
 - b. Variety in grade levels within the certification range;
 - c. Variety and diversity in the students and communities served (e.g.: medical school rounds, legal education model, post-doc fellowship model, CPA model); and

¹ <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Teacher-Residencies-2014.pdf>

- d. Autonomous functioning in a real classroom setting for an appropriate length of time to ensure that teachers have extensive “active teaching practice,” with ongoing direct feedback, in order to be prepared to enter classrooms as teachers of record.
5. Prioritize in-state programs (traditional and alternative) over out-of-state programs for purposes of field placements, internships, and post-baccalaureate residencies. Collect and analyze data on the impact of out-of-state programs on the availability of quality field placements, internships, and post-baccalaureate residencies.
6. Invest in scholarships, loan forgiveness, and early college/teacher academies to recruit highly qualified students into the teaching profession.

II. Key recommendations in the area of pre-tenure induction

The Task Force envisions a robust and revolutionary induction period that needs to be conceptualized as building a bridge between pre-service and fully empowered classroom teachers. Taking the lead from the CCSSO Task Force on Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession (2012):

States should also leverage the relationships between preparation providers and the districts in which their candidates are placed (either for clinical practice, residencies, or employment) so there is follow through into the early induction years and a culture of collegial coaching carries over from preparation into early practice. The state’s interest is in seeing initial licensure candidates supported and further developed so they reach the professional licensure stage with limited attrition. This opportunity to learn and scaffold the development of early educators should be transparent and resourced, and should be a shared responsibility among preparation providers, districts, and states. (p. 16)
NCTAF has estimated the annual cost of teacher turnover in Prince George’s County Public School System to be \$23,292,500 and the annual cost for Baltimore City was estimated to be \$19,013,750. (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF), 2007) (Zimpher, 2013)

The intent of the recommendations below builds on the pre-service recommendations and can be seen as the second leg of the three-legged stool. During the induction period, it should be clear that only teachers who exhibit the highest standards of performance with reasonable support will be promoted to tenured positions.

1. Establish a three-year residency model, in collaboration with higher education, for all pre-tenured teachers of record that would include ongoing direct feedback and continuous practice through extended mentorship, continuing communities of practice, and opportunities for pre-tenure teachers to participate in professional development at teaching innovation centers. (National Education Association, 2014)
 - a. Research and analyze costs of recommended new models to school districts and institutions of higher education. Such costs might include: substitutes, stipends, and mileage.

- b. Integrate community college AAT programs into continuing communities of practice and innovation centers.
 - c. Research and analyze creating a specialized post-baccalaureate/master's program or endorsements in Teacher Leadership for mentors and content-specific instructional leaders.
 - d. Research and analyze the impact of mentoring and other new teacher professional development on multiple measures of teacher performance, by using classroom observations and including student outcome and growth measures.
2. Establish collaboratively supported Teaching Innovation Centers (hubs of innovation) where pre-service and in-service teachers can be exposed to state-of-the art professional development.
- a. Centers should be collaboratively supported by two-year and four-year institutions of higher education and school districts.
 - i. Centers are envisioned as regional pilots to explore “out of the box thinking” about preparation and professional development.
 - ii. Centers would be venues to explore virtual learning and social networking as learning vehicles in addition to traditional, research-based instructional practice.
 - b. Centers should include capacity to anticipate the impact of technology and focus on preparing teachers for future classrooms where teaching and learning may happen differently than it does now.
 - c. Centers should include capacity to offer simulations to pre-service and in-service educators.
 - d. Community colleges should be looked at as possible venues for centers of innovation.
3. Provide funding for Centers initially with state “seed” money, and subsequently with savings from reducing teacher attrition.
- a. Analyze costs associated with teacher attrition and realistically estimate savings.
 - b. Evaluate Centers after three years using multiple sources of data.

III. Key Recommendations in the area of professional development for current teachers

Finally, as the third leg of the stool, the recommendations below offer a framework for professional progression with high accountability for continued strong performance and cutting edge professional development experiences. Such experiences should be based on action research, learning and teaching theory, and evidence-based current best practices.

Reimagining teacher preparation only addresses a small percentage of current teachers. The Task Force makes recommendations for continuing professional development for all current teachers, since they will have the most immediate impact on student success. Additional research and policy studies recommend that colleges and universities “be at the table where teacher career ladders are being developed...because...the promise of options has a major impact on teacher education recruitment efforts...and because the quality of teacher education

increasingly depends on the ...inclusion of practicing teacher as teacher educators(Clark, 1985, p77).²

1. Establish career-long professional development programs and career ladders for educators that are aligned with Maryland's prekindergarten through grade 12 curriculum.
2. Establish school/university partnership processes for building professional development programs for educators.
 - a. Programs should be collaboratively developed by school districts and higher education.
 - b. Programs should build strong content and pedagogy competencies.
3. Reallocate existing funds for professional development to support new collaboratively developed models.

IV. Key recommendations in the area of continuous improvement through accountability

These recommendations are in service to the three previous recommendations and they echo President Obama's call for high quality teacher preparation programs. Key points include:

- *Build on state systems and efforts and the progress in the field to encourage all states to develop their own meaningful systems to identify high- and low-performing teacher preparation programs across all kinds of programs, not just those based in colleges and universities.*
- *Ask states to move away from current input-focused reporting requirements, streamline the current data requirements, incorporate more meaningful outcomes, and improve the availability of relevant information on teacher preparation.*

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/04/25/fact-sheet-taking-action-improve-teacher-preparation>

1. Set a high bar for qualifications and expectations for all teacher preparation programs. Establish a "level playing field" for program accountability for all programs, holding all Maryland approved programs to the same high standards. (Hill, 2009)
2. Align current Institutional Performance Criteria to reflect school reform initiatives such as Maryland College- and Career- Ready Standards, dual enrollment and early college.
3. Ensure that IHEs have access to all program data from higher education and prekindergarten through grade 12 that contribute to research for continuous improvement.
 - a. Incentivize universities and their faculties to research "problems of practice," recognizing that colleges and universities have different capacities to provide research grants and incentives.

² Richard J. Clark, 1985, The logical link between career ladders and teacher education, November, *Education Leadership*, pp 77-81)

- b. Align the appointment, review and tenure practices of higher education institutions to reward scholar-practitioners, prioritizing scholar/practitioner research with respect to its value to practicing educators.
 - c. Prioritize partnership relationships between researchers and practitioners with incentive funding (Snow, C., AERA, 4.4.14).
 - d. Build accountability systems from the beginning of teacher preparation programs through the induction years (years 1-3).
 - e. Identify indicators of program quality and impact based on multiple sources of evidence, including school/district input, surveys, classroom performance and impact on student outcomes. (Darling-Hammond, 1999)
 - f. Develop a systematic approach to formative assessment of the teacher candidate's ability to influence student learning.
4. Align educator preparation assessment systems with Teacher and Principal Evaluation systems in school districts whenever possible (i.e.: Danielson³ and edTPA⁴ or PPAT⁵).

³ <http://www.danielsongroup.org/>

⁴ <http://edtpa.aacte.org>

⁵ <http://www.ets.org/ppa/>

Immediate Next Steps

- P-20 Council Executive Committee will review the report and recommend next steps.
- Possible next steps include:
 - Establish a working group of district level leadership (both instructional and administrative), teacher educators at IHEs, school district principals, and MSDE staff tasked with identifying models of teacher preparation that involve systematic preparation across the five-year pre-service/pre-tenure period. The work group should:
 - Propose models
 - Identify specific steps to implementation
 - Calculate the associated costs and likely benefits
 - Project a budget for recommended actions
 - Establish a working group of PreK-12 and higher education educators and policy advisors (including industry, community, and government representatives) to review and adjust teacher certification and licensure regulations to reflect the shared assumption that “less is more” with respect to regulatory language. New regulations should focus less on inputs and more on outcomes and accountability.
 - Ensure that institutions of higher education have access to school system curricula/instructional materials through website access, collaborative meetings, and greater transparency.
 - Establish a workgroup of MSDE staff and MACTE deans to review, revise and propose new regulatory language aligned with the recommendations of the Task Force.

SWOT Review of Recommended Action Items:

In addition to the major recommendations, the Task Force raised a number of action items that require further analysis of implementation challenges and unintended consequences. The Task Force recommends that P-20 Leadership Council charge a group to do a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) of the recommendations below. These action items are organized according to the four categories of the report: Pre-service, Pre-tenure induction, Professional development for current teachers, Continuous improvement and accountability.

Pre-Service

- Establish ongoing programs of scholarships and loan forgiveness to support individuals who prepare to teach in shortage content areas shortage fields and hard to staff locations.
- Review the existing AAT transfer agreements to ensure transferability among IHEs and alignment with Maryland College and Career Readiness Standards, Next Generation Science Standards, and teacher shortage areas.

- Explore impact of dual certification in special education
- Design pre-service programs to ensure that all pre-service teachers develop knowledge and skill sets to work with students with a broad spectrum of cultural, language and learning needs
- Review, evaluate and revise program entrance requirements to ensure highest quality candidates. Consider the following and ensure alignment with CAEP standards:
 - State-approved basic skills test (i.e., Praxis I) for entry into a teacher education program rather than as a certification requirement
 - Successful completion of a state-approved content test for program completion
 - Raising GPA requirements for entry into programs.
- Align pre-service models with educational reform priorities including, but not limited to: cultural competence, classroom management, multi-campus Professional Development sites that include challenging schools, intern rotations, and paid internships.
- Revisit, revise and update the requirement for the number of reading courses required for teacher candidates for all content/grade level areas.
- Revisit, revise and update current mathematics requirements for elementary education teacher candidates.
- Develop a cost/benefit analysis of the potential impact of requiring all teacher candidates to have a bachelor's degree in a content area before beginning a teacher preparation program, including but not limited to impact on higher education institutions and other providers and school districts.
- Investigate innovative programs such as UTeach at Towson University and Terps Teach at the University of Maryland, College Park that could serve as models for teacher preparation programs.

Induction

- Establish regional P-20 councils where IHEs and PreK-12 school districts can work on local and regional issues. Regional Councils would set their own agendas, engage in collaborative leadership, and report regularly to the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council.
- Bridge pre-service and induction by creating alignments between pre-service and in-service professional development experiences and strengthening the structure for induction by creating opportunities for IHE engagement.
- Restructure the school schedule/calendar to include opportunities for collaborative planning between experienced and new teachers.

Professional Development

- Restructure school calendars to employ teachers on regular 12-month contracts, allowing time for professional development, extended year experiences for students and annual leave opportunities for teachers
- Restructure higher education calendars to ensure that faculty members involved in Professional Development are employed and available in the summer months.
- Establish new specialist roles to bridge the technological challenges of digital teaching, learning and assessments

- Utilize technological tools for professional communities of practice.
- Schedule annual statewide and/or regional teacher preparation forums focused on sharing proven best practices, highlighting common challenges and identifying potential solutions.

Continuous Improvement and Accountability

- Reward programs that produce high quality teachers and teacher leaders:
 - Offer subsidies and expanded capacity, with focused scholarships, for programs that recruit and prepare a highly qualified, diverse pool of effective educators in high-need fields and locations,;
 - Allocate reduced attrition savings to IHEs that prepare teachers who are retained in school districts beyond three years.
 - Create new pathways into teaching that align the resources of Maryland community colleges and universities with supports for candidates willing to commit to working in high-need schools;
 - Recognize existing pathways, such as Teacher Academy of Maryland, with support for tuition or loan repayment.
 - Offer incentives and high-quality accessible pathways for already licensed teachers to become cross-trained in shortage areas like special education, English language acquisition, bilingual education, mathematics or science.

References

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006). *Teacher Induction Programs: trends and opportunities*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.aascu.org/uploadedFiles/AASCU/Content/Root/PolicyAndAdvocacy/PolicyPublications/TeacherInduction.pdf>
- American Federation of Teachers. (2012). *Raising the Bar: Aligning and elevating teacher preparation and the teaching profession*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.aft.org/pdfs/highered/raisingthebar2012.pdf>
- Ball, D., Hill, H., & Rowan, B. (2005). Effects of Teachers' Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching on Student Achievement. *Educational Research Journal*, 42 (2), 371-406.
- Clark, R. J. (1985). The logical link between career ladders and teacher education. *Educational Leadership*, 43 (3), 77-81.
- Council for the Accreditation for Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP 2013 Standards for Accreditation of Educator Preparation*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2012). *Our Responsibility, Our Promise: Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2012/Our%20Responsibility%20Our%20Promise_2012.pdf
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Educating teachers for the next century: rethinking practice and policy. In G. A. Griffin, *The Education of Teachers* (pp. 221-256). Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (2003). Wanted: A national teacher supply policy for education. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 11 (33).
- Darling-Hammond, L., Holtsman, D. J., & Heilig, J. V. (2005). Does Teacher Preparation Matter? Evidence about teacher certification, Teach for America, and teacher effectiveness. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13 (42). Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/147>
- DeMonte, J. (2013). High-Quality Professional Development for Teachers. Center for American Progress. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/DeMonteLearning4Teachers-1.pdf>
- Goldrick, L., Osta, D., Barlin, D., & Burn, J. (2012). *Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/147/273>
- Haberman, M. (1996). Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In J. P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton, *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 747-760). New York: Macmillan.

- Hill, H. C. (2009). Fixing Teacher Professional Development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90 (7), pp. 470-476.
- Hussar, W. J., & Bailey, T. M. (2013). *Projections of Education Statistics to 2021 (NCES 2013-008)*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Lambert, M., & Ball, D. L. (1998). *Teaching, multimedia, and mathematics: Investigations of real practice*. New York City: Teacher College Press.
- Levine, A. (2006). *Educating School Teachers*. The Education Schools Project. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED504144.pdf>
- Levine, A. (2014). *We Need Ed Schools*. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED504144.pdf>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2012). *Teacher Staffing Report: 2012-2014*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/F3F5D904-0F5E-4FC7-87CE-464FC17DABB5/33624/MarylandTeacherReport20122014.pdf>
- National Academy of Education. (2005). *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom: Preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve*. (L. Darling-Hammond, & J. Baratz-Snowden, Eds.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future . (2007). *The High Cost of Teacher Turnover*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/NCTAFCostofTeacherTurnoverpolicybrief.pdf>
- National Council on Teacher Quality. (2013). *NCTQ Teacher Prep Review standards*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from http://nctq.org/dmsView/Standard_Book_1
- National Education Association. (2014). *Teacher Residencies: redefining preparation through partnerships*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Teacher-Residencies-2014.pdf>
- National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing Teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- The New Teacher Project. (2014). *Fast Start: training better teachers faster, with focus, practice and feedback*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_FastStart_2014.pdf
- Wilson, S. W., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2011). *Teacher preparation research: Current Knowledge, gaps, and recommendations*. Seattle, WA: U.S. Department of Education.
- Zimpher, N. (2013). Maryland Teacher Education Summit Keynote Address. Towson, MD.