

# GREAT TEACHERS AND GREAT LEADERS

**O**f all the work that occurs at every level of our education system, the interaction between teacher and student is the primary determinant of student success. A great teacher can make the difference between a student who achieves at high levels and a student who slips through the cracks, and a great principal can help teachers succeed as part of a strong, well-supported instructional team. Research shows that top-performing teachers can make a dramatic difference in the achievement of their students, and suggests that the impact of being assigned to top-performing teachers year after year is enough to significantly narrow achievement gaps. We have to do more to ensure that every student has an effective teacher, every school has effective leaders, and every teacher and leader has access to the preparation, on-going support, recognition, and collaboration opportunities he or she needs to succeed. Our proposals will ask states and districts to put in place the conditions that allow for teachers, principals, and leaders at all levels of the school system to get meaningful information about their practice, and support them in using this information to ensure that all students are getting the effective teaching they deserve.

## OUR APPROACH

- ▶ Elevating the profession and focusing on recruiting, preparing, developing, and rewarding effective teachers and leaders.
- ▶ Focusing on teacher and leader effectiveness in improving student outcomes.
- ▶ Supporting states and districts that are willing to take bold action to increase the number of effective teachers and leaders where they are needed most.
- ▶ Strengthening pathways into teaching and school leadership positions in high-need schools.

This page intentionally left blank.

# EFFECTIVE TEACHERS AND LEADERS

## OUR APPROACH

- ▶ **Flexibility with results.** Flexible formula grant funding conditioned on SEA and LEA improvements in teacher and leader effectiveness and equity.
- ▶ **Fair, rigorous evaluation systems.** Focus on teacher effectiveness and improved teacher evaluation through requirements that LEAs implement a state-approved evaluation system that uses multiple rating categories, takes into account student achievement results, and provides meaningful feedback and support to teachers for improvement.
- ▶ **Strengthen the profession.** Treat teachers like the professionals they are by providing time for collaboration, implementing performance-based pay and advancement, and providing on-the-job learning opportunities with peers and experts linked to evaluations and to student needs.
- ▶ **Equity.** More equitable distribution of qualified and effective teachers and leaders through better data, an equity plan, and a requirement that Title II funds be directed toward improving equity where LEAs are not meeting performance targets.
- ▶ **Data for transparency and decision-making.** Use of meaningful data and accountability for results through program performance measures, state and district human-capital report cards, and tracking the effectiveness of professional development and teacher-preparation programs.

### *An Effective Teacher in Every Classroom*

**The key to student success is providing an effective teacher in every classroom and an effective principal in every school.** Teacher effectiveness matters; the research demonstrates that teacher effectiveness contributes more to improving student academic outcomes than any other school characteristic and that an effective principal is central to recruiting and supporting teachers and leading school improvement (Murphy et al., 2006; Rivkin et al., 2005; Waters et al., 2003). Studies suggest that a student who has great teachers for several years in a row will be on a path of continued growth and success, while a student who is taught by a succession of less effective teachers may experience lasting academic challenges (Hanushek, 2009; Sanders and Rivers, 1996).

**Teachers believe that collaboration among colleagues is key to improving student**

**achievement, and a recent study suggests that teachers learn from other teachers who are effective.** Two-thirds of teachers report that they believe that more collaboration among teachers would greatly improve student achievement (MetLife, 2010). One study found that teachers perceive that the support they receive from paraprofessionals and other teachers is extremely important in helping them to meet the academic needs of the English learners in their classrooms (Elfers et al., 2009). Finally, a recent study suggests that teachers learn from other effective teachers in their schools and are more likely to raise student achievement when they are surrounded by colleagues who are effective at raising achievement (Jackson and Bruegmann, 2009).

**The current Title II, Part A program must be strengthened in order to promote improvements in teacher and leader effectiveness.** Districts have broad latitude in

how they spend Title II, Part A, formula grant funds without being accountable for a systemic approach or for improved teaching and learning. For example, while approximately 39 percent of funds are devoted to professional development (U.S. Department of Education, 2009a), the most recent federal evaluation of the ESEA finds that most teachers report that their professional learning experiences (regardless of funding source) do not reflect the research-based characteristics of effective professional development. Only 6 percent of elementary teachers reported that they participated in more than 24 hours of professional development focused on the “in-depth study of topics in mathematics” over the entire 2005–06 school year, and only 14 percent reported more than 24 hours of professional development focused on the “in-depth study of topics in reading” (U.S. Department of Education, 2009b).

Another large portion of Title II, Part A, funds (38 percent) is devoted to class size reduction

(U.S. Department of Education, 2009a). Research suggests that when well implemented, substantial reductions in class sizes can have a positive impact on student achievement, especially for high-need students. Most notably, the rigorous Tennessee STAR experiment found that reducing class sizes in grades K–3 from 22–25 students down to 13–17 students had a substantial and statistically significant effect on student achievement across all four grades in both reading and mathematics; some effects were great for minority students and for students in inner-city schools (Krueger and Whitmore, 2001; Mosteller, 1995; Ready, 2008). However, there is no requirement in current law that class-size-reduction efforts be research-based.

**A systemic and intensive approach to the “people side” of education reform can help to ensure that all students, particularly those in high-poverty schools, have the effective teachers and principals they deserve.** In order to make significant improvements in teacher and

### **Mission Possible Program: Improving Equitable Distribution of Teachers**

*Guilford County, North Carolina*

Guilford County, North Carolina, with a student population of over 70,000 in 120 schools, found its highest-poverty schools staffed by teachers with little experience. One high school did not have a certified math teacher for an entire school year. Other schools were unable to fill their math vacancies. To address inequities in their teacher workforce, Guilford launched the Mission Possible teacher incentive intervention program in 2006. The program started in 20 of its high-need elementary, middle, and high schools and added eight more in the second year. Mission Possible combines recruiting, preparation, and performance incentives for qualified teachers. Recruitment and performance incentives are significant—for example, a \$10,000 bonus for those certified in secondary math and up to a \$4,000 annual bonus for teachers who produce above-average student achievement gains. The program is funded with a combination of local, foundation, and federal funds.

In Mission Possible schools, 74 percent of eligible math teachers received a performance bonus. Teacher attrition fell 23 percent, and Mission Possible faculty transferring to another district fell 57 percent. Within two years, the student-performance gap between Mission Possible and other district schools was eliminated in Algebra I, reduced by two-thirds in Algebra II, and diminished by 40 percent in Geometry (Holcombe and Sonricker, 2008). An independent evaluation shows that the percentage of fifth- through eighth-graders scoring as proficient or above on the state’s annual math assessment was growing faster in Mission Possible schools than in comparison schools (Bayonas, 2009; Holcombe and Sonricker, 2008).

leader effectiveness, we need to take a comprehensive and systemic approach—one that builds the collective capacity of the school as well as the effectiveness of individuals. This approach includes: teacher preparation programs; teacher and school leader evaluations and the use of evaluations for improvement; compensation and incentives to recognize and reward effectiveness; the equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders across schools; on-going professional development and school conditions that provide teachers and leaders with the time and tools for on-the-job learning with colleagues to become as effective as possible; and effective school leadership (Goldhaber and Hannaway, 2009; Jerald, 2009; Odden and Kelly, 2008).

**Teacher qualifications are important but do not ensure effectiveness on the job.** The NCLB provisions relating to “highly qualified” teachers require that all teachers have a bachelor’s degree and state certification, and have demonstrated subject matter expertise in every core academic subject they teach, or be working toward full certification as a participant in an alternative route to teaching. The percentage of classes taught by teachers who meet these requirements has steadily increased over the past decade to an average of 95 percent (U.S. Department of Education, 2009c). This was an important step, but research on teacher effectiveness shows that meeting these requirements does not predict or ensure that a teacher will be successful at increasing student learning (Goldhaber and Brewer, 2000; Hanushek, 1997; Toch and Rothman, 2008). Thus, while the NCLB requirements set minimum standards for entry into teaching of core academic subjects, they have not driven strong improvements in what matters most: the effectiveness of teachers in raising student achievement.

**Most of the current teacher evaluation systems that are used around the country fail to provide feedback and support in order to help teachers improve or differentiate effective from ineffective teachers.** High-quality teacher evaluations are based on: clear performance standards; multiple, distinct rating options; regular monitoring; frequent and regular feedback; training for evaluators; professional development linked to the performance standards; and intensive support for teachers who fall below the performance standards (Weisberg et al., 2009). However, these elements are not the norm. Three different studies of typical teacher evaluations used in districts found that these evaluations were not designed or used to provide feedback in order to help teachers to improve or to guide teacher professional development (Mathers et al. 2008). While teachers’ effectiveness in increasing student learning varies significantly, the majority of school districts across the country do not evaluate teachers in a manner that distinguishes effective teachers from ineffective teachers or take student achievement into account in the evaluation (Kane, 2009). A recent study of 12 districts in four states showed that, in districts with binary evaluation ratings (generally “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”), more than 99 percent of teachers received a satisfactory rating; in districts with a broader range of ratings, 94 percent of teachers received one of the top two ratings and less than one percent received an unsatisfactory rating (Weisberg et al., 2009).

**Most educators are compensated based on their years of experience and the courses they have taken, with no recognition or reward for performance.** The traditional pay schedule used in most school districts rewards teachers based on their years of classroom experience and their years of higher education. In many districts teachers move up on the salary

## **Alignment of Effective Teacher Evaluations with Professional Development, Career Ladders, and Pay-for-Performance at Edison High School**

*Minneapolis, Minnesota*

Edison High School in Minneapolis, Minnesota, uses the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) to place regular teacher evaluation—and several complementary program components that are aligned with the evaluation—at the heart of school improvement. Edison is an urban, high-need school in which approximately 88 percent of the students are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch and 89 percent are minorities. A few years ago, the school was found to be in the bottom 25th percentile of the district's high schools in terms of student academic performance. The staff chose to become a TAP school in order to receive the following benefits that would help them to raise student achievement:

- ▶ A standards-based evaluation system that identifies areas of strength and development for all teachers;
- ▶ A strong professional development program that helps all teachers to improve and that is linked to the standards;
- ▶ A structure to analyze data in order to set goals for the school and for each student;
- ▶ A career ladder that provides teachers with opportunities to advance, including the opportunity to become a Master teacher and/or a Mentor teacher; and
- ▶ A performance-pay bonus system.

Through the standards-based evaluation system, teachers are held accountable for meeting teaching standards that are based on effective instruction and for increasing student achievement. Classroom evaluations are conducted multiple times during the year by trained and certified evaluators (administrators, Master teachers, and Mentor teachers) using clearly defined rubrics. Since implementing TAP, Edison has increased teacher retention and has witnessed an increase in the student graduation rate. Prior to TAP the school experienced a 70 percent teacher turnover over a two-year period, but during the 2008–09 school year, the school lost only one staff person due to layoffs. The graduation rate went from 61 percent in 2006 to 77 percent in 2007 (Daniels, 2009).

schedule and receive pay increases for additional years of teaching and for completing graduate courses and degrees, regardless of the courses' relevance to their teaching. It is important to note that research shows that there is little relationship between length of service and performance after the first three to five years of teaching and no evidence that teachers with master's degrees perform better (with the exception of secondary mathematics teachers with master's degrees in mathematics) (Goldhaber and Brewer, 2000; Hanushek et al., 2005; Miller et al., 2007; Rivkin et al., 2005).

### **Most teacher advancement and**

**compensation systems offer no incentives for experienced, well-qualified teachers to teach in challenging schools or shortage areas.** In the 2009–10 school year, fewer than 10 states offered such incentives (Education Week, 2010). In a national survey conducted in 2007–08, only 6 percent of districts reported providing incentives to teach in challenging locations, and only 15 percent of districts reported providing incentives to teach in shortage fields (Aritomi and Coopersmith, 2009). In addition, studies show that teachers do not have adequate opportunities for advancement unless they leave the classroom. Among those who leave teaching for new professions outside of K–12 education,

58 percent say that their new profession offers greater opportunities for advancement than K–12 teaching (Marvel et al., 2006).

**Teachers lack sufficient opportunities for on-the-job learning and the time and tools to improve.** Studies suggest that effective teacher learning focuses on academic content (Kennedy, 1998; Yoon et al., 2007), and emerging research suggests that effective teacher learning and instructional improvement also involve teachers actively working together and with experts on a regular basis to examine student work and achievement data, identify effective instructional strategies, and establish a cycle of continuous improvement of teaching and learning (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Gallimore et al., 2009; Garet et al., 1999; National Staff Development Council, 2010; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). For example, a recent study of 15 Title I schools found in nine schools where grade-level teams of teachers met regularly with the help of instructional leadership teams to discuss student learning problems, devise solutions, and test the solutions in their classrooms, student test scores rose to surpass the district averages after five years. The instructional leadership teams who led the teacher meetings consisted of teacher representatives, a reading coach, the school principal, and a researcher (Gallimore et al., 2009).

**However, as noted earlier, most teachers do not participate in these types of professional development experiences and problem-solving activities** (U.S. Department of Education, 2009b). Teachers and other school staff rarely receive the data and feedback they need in order to improve instruction (Jerald, 2009). In addition, educators are rarely provided the time to analyze student-achievement data on a regular basis; among a nationally representative sample of districts, 92 percent recently reported that time is a major barrier to these collaborative

discussions about student achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

**High-poverty and high-minority schools are least likely to have qualified and effective teachers.** A recent study of North Carolina teachers found that more effective teachers were more likely to transfer out of schools with higher percentages of low-income and African-American students to schools with lower percentages of these student groups, leaving less effective teachers concentrated in higher-need schools (Goldhaber et al., 2009). Compared with classes in low-poverty schools, core academic classes in high-poverty secondary schools are twice as likely to be taught by a teacher without a major or certification in the assigned subject (Jerald, 2002). Another study of North Carolina data found that districts with high proportions of minority students typically had higher proportions of novice teachers when compared to districts with smaller proportions of such students (Clotfelter et al., 2005).

#### *An Effective Principal in Every School*

**Effective principals are key to strengthening teaching and schools, but there has been an insufficient investment in recruiting, preparing, and supporting great principals, particularly for high-poverty schools.** Second only to classroom instruction, school leadership is the most important school-based variable affecting student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004). The school leader affects student achievement in many ways, including playing a critical role in creating a school culture focused on learning and high expectations (Murphy et al., 2006). The school leader also affects the quality of the instructional staff through hiring decisions and professional development activities (Papa et al., 2003). Teachers cite a principal's support and effectiveness as a leading factor that contributes to their decision to remain in teaching (Futernick, 2007). Yet, despite the critical role of

## What States Can Do to Strengthen Principal Leadership

Our proposal that SEAs use 2 percent of Title II, Part A, funds to improve the effectiveness of school leaders recognizes the critical role states can play in this area. Over the past decade, a number of states have made significant improvements in how they recruit, prepare, license, place, support, evaluate, and compensate principals. For example:

**Evaluation.** Delaware has been on the cutting edge of reform in the area of administrator evaluations. It is the only state that has developed a mandatory statewide process and tool for evaluating school and district administrators. After several years of program pilots and studies, the evaluation system is now in place throughout the state. The system, known as the Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II), is directly aligned with the 2008 revised ISLLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) standards on school leadership, which Delaware adopted in 2009. One key component of the evaluation, mandated by state law, is student achievement—school and district leaders are assessed on whether their students have actually made academic progress (State of Delaware, 2010; Augustine et al., 2009; J. Wilson, e-mail communication, March 2, 2010).

**Preparation and Licensure.** Iowa adopted the Iowa Standards for School Leaders that provide a concrete vision for developing leaders who will support improved instruction and student learning. The standards serve as the basis for accrediting all principal and superintendent preparation programs in the state. Iowa also adopted behavior-based leadership standards and a two-tiered licensure system under which novice principals and superintendents receive one year of mentoring support through a state-funded program. Principals must pass a summative evaluation to gain their full license at the end of their first year as a principal (Augustine et al., 2009).

principals, federal investments in school leadership, primarily through a school leadership program funded at \$29.2 million in FY 2010, has been minimal. In fact, high-poverty and high-minority schools are more likely to be led by principals who are weaker on various quality measures (including leadership ratings from staff and years of experience) than those in lower-

poverty schools (Clotfelter et al., 2007; Horng et al., 2009). In a survey by Public Agenda, 69 percent of principals and 80 percent of superintendents describe the leadership training offered by schools of education to be “out of touch with the realities of today’s districts” (Farkas et al., 2001).



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aritomi, Paola, and Jared Coopersmith (2009). *Characteristics of Public School Districts in the United States: Results From the 2007–08 Schools and Staffing Survey* (NCES 2009–320). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved February 22, 2010, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009320.pdf>.
- Augustine, Catherine, Gabriella Gonzalez, Gina Schuyler Ikemoto, Jennifer Russell, Gail Zellman, Louay Constant, Jane Armstrong, and Jacob Dembosky (2009). *Improving School Leadership: The Promise of Cohesive Leadership Systems*. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation. Retrieved April 23, 2010, from [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND\\_MG885.pdf](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG885.pdf).
- Bayonas, Holly Gottschall (2009). *Guilford County Schools Mission Possible Program: Southern Guilford High School Treatment Year 2 (2007–08) (Progress Report)*. Greensboro: University of North Carolina at Greensboro, SERVE Center. Retrieved February 22, 2010, from [http://www.gcsnc.org/depts/mission\\_possible/pdf/report/Southern%20Guilford%20High%20Year%202%20Report-Final.pdf](http://www.gcsnc.org/depts/mission_possible/pdf/report/Southern%20Guilford%20High%20Year%202%20Report-Final.pdf).
- Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H., Vigdor, J., & Wheeler, J. (2007). *High-Poverty Schools and the Distribution of Teachers and Principals* (Working Paper 1). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER), Urban Institute. Retrieved February 19, 2010, from [http://www.caldercenter.org/PDF/1001057\\_High\\_Poverty.pdf](http://www.caldercenter.org/PDF/1001057_High_Poverty.pdf).
- Daniels, L. (2009). *Teacher Equity: Effective Teachers for All Children*. Testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://www.tapsystem.org/newsroom/newsroom.taf?page=features&id=70>.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda, Ruth Chung Wei, Alethea Andree, Nikole Richardson, and Stelios Orphanos (2009). *Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher Development in the U.S. and Abroad: Technical Report*. Dallas: National Staff Development Council and The School Redesign Network at Stanford University.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda (1997). *The Right to Learn: A Blueprint for Creating Schools That Work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Education Week (2010). *Education Counts: Teaching Profession*. Bethesda, Md.: Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. Retrieved February 19, 2010, from <http://www.edcounts.org/>.
- Elfers, Ana, Tom Stritikus, Kristin Calaff, Kerry Von Esch, Audrey Lucero, Michael Knapp, Margaret Plecki (2009). *Building Systems of Support for Classroom Teachers Working With Second Language Learners: A Report Prepared for the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession*. Seattle: University of Washington, College of Education. Retrieved February 14, 2010, from <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/ELLStudy-July2009.pdf>.
- Farkas, Steve, Jean Johnson, Ann Duffett, and Tony Foleno (2001). *Trying to Stay Ahead of the Game: Superintendents and Principals Talk About School Leadership*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Futernick, Ken (2007). *A Possible Dream: Retaining California Teachers So All Students Can Learn*. Sacramento: California State University.
- Gallimore, Ronald, Bradley Ermerling, William Saunders, and Claude Goldenberg (2009). Moving the

- learning of teaching closer to practice: Teacher education implications of school-based inquiry teams. *The Elementary School Journal*, 109(5):537–553.
- Goldhaber, Dan, and Dominic Brewer (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2):129–145.
- Goldhaber, Dan, Betheny Gross, and Daniel Player (2009). *Teacher Career Paths, Teacher Quality, and Persistence in the Classroom: Are Schools Keeping Their Best?* CALDER Working Paper No. 29. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.
- Goldhaber, Dan, and Jane Hannaway (2009). *Creating a New Teaching Profession*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Hanushek, Eric (1997). Assessing the effects of school resources on student performance: An update. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19(2):141–164.
- Hanushek, Eric (2009). Teacher deselection. In Dan Goldhaber and Jane Hannaway (eds.), *Creating a New Teaching Profession*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press. Retrieved on February 23, 2010, from <http://edpro.stanford.edu/hanushek/admin/pages/files/uploads/Hanushek%202009%20CNTP%20ch%208.pdf>.
- Hanushek, Eric, John Kain, Daniel O'Brien, and Steven Rivkin (2005). *The Market for Teacher Quality*. NBER Working Paper No. 11154. Cambridge, Mass.: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Holcombe, Amy, and Lisa Sonricker (2008, November). The cumulative effect: Raising teacher quality in high school math classrooms. Mission Possible presentation at the Education Trust National Conference. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from [http://www.guilford.k12.nc.us/depts/mission\\_possible/presentations.htm](http://www.guilford.k12.nc.us/depts/mission_possible/presentations.htm).
- Hornig, Eileen, Demetra Kalogrides, and Susanna Loeb. (2009). *Principal Preferences and the Unequal Distribution of Principals Across Schools*. CALDER Working Paper No. 36. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.
- Jackson, Clement Kirabo, and Elias Bruegmann (2009). Teaching students and teaching each other: The importance of peer learning for teachers. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 1(4):85–108.
- Jerald, Craig (2002). *All Talk, No Action: Putting an End to Out-of-Field Teaching*. Washington, D.C.: The Education Trust.
- Jerald, Craig (2009). *Aligned by Design*. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress.
- Kane, Thomas (2009, October 30). Identifying effective teaching. Presentation made on behalf of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation at the Center for American Progress.
- Kennedy, Mary (1998). *Form and Substance in Inservice Teacher Education*. Research Monograph No. 13. Madison: National Institute for Science Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Krueger, Alan, and Diane Whitmore (2001). *Would Smaller Classes Help Close the Black-White Achievement Gap?* Princeton: Princeton University.
- Leithwood, Kenneth, Karen Seashore Louis, Stephen Anderson, and Kyla Wahlstrom (2004). *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved February 22, 2010,

from

<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/WF/Knowledge%20Center/Attachments/PDF/ReviewofResearch-LearningFromLeadership.pdf>.

- Marvel, John, Deanna Lyter, Pia Peltola, Gregory Strizek, and Beth Morton (2006). *Teacher Attrition and Mobility: Results From the 2004–05 Teacher Follow-up Survey*. (NCES 2007–307). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Mathers, Carrie, Michelle Oliva, and Sabrina Laine (2008). *Improving Instruction Through Effective Teacher Evaluation: Options for States and Districts*. Washington, D.C.: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- MetLife (2010). *The MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, Collaborating for Student Success, Part 1: Effective Teaching and Leadership*. New York: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. Retrieved February 22, 2010, from [http://www.metlife.com/assets/cao/contributions/foundation/american-teacher/MetLife\\_Teacher\\_Survey\\_2009\\_Part\\_1.pdf](http://www.metlife.com/assets/cao/contributions/foundation/american-teacher/MetLife_Teacher_Survey_2009_Part_1.pdf).
- Miller, Raegan, Richard Murnane, and John Willett (2007). *Do Teacher Absences Impact Student Achievement? Longitudinal Evidence From One Urban School District*. NBER Working Paper No. 13356. Cambridge, Mass.: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w13356>.
- Mitgang, Lee (2003). *Beyond the Pipeline: Getting the Principals We Need, Where They Are Needed Most*. New York: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from [http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content\\_storage\\_01/0000019b/80/1b/96/df.pdf](http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/1b/96/df.pdf).
- Mosteller, Frederick (1995). The Tennessee study of class size in the early school grades. *Critical Issues for Children and Youths*, 5(2):113–127.
- Murphy, Joseph, Stephen Elliott, Ellen Goldring, and Andrew Porter (2006). *Learning-Centered Leadership: A Conceptual Foundation*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- National Staff Development Council. Standards for staff development. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://www.nsd.org/standards/index.cfm>.
- Odden, Allan, and Jim Kelly (2008). *What is SMHC?* Madison: Strategic Management of Human Capital.
- Papa, Frank, Hamilton Lankford, and James Wyckoff (2003). *Hiring Teachers in New York's Public Schools: Can the Principal Make a Difference?* Albany: University at Albany, State University of New York.
- Ready, Douglas (2008). *Class-Size Reduction: Policy, Politics, and Implications for Equity*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College.
- Rivkin, Steven, Eric Hanushek, and John Kain (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2):417–458.
- Sanders, William, and June Rivers (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.
- Toch, Thomas, and Robert Rothman (2008). *Rush to Judgment: Teacher Evaluation in Public Education*. Washington, D.C.: Education Sector. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from

[http://www.educationsector.org/usr\\_doc/RushToJudgment\\_ES\\_Jan08.pdf](http://www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/RushToJudgment_ES_Jan08.pdf).

- U.S. Department of Education (2010). *Use of Education Data at the Local Level: From Accountability to Instructional Improvement*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/index.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education (2009a). *Findings From the 2008–09 Survey on the Use of Funds Under Title II, Part A*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/resources.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education (2009b). *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume VIII—Teacher Quality Under NCLB: Final Report*. By Beatrice Birman, Andrea Boyle, Kerstin Carlson Le Floch, Amy Elledge, Deborah Holtzman, Mengli Song, Kerri Thomson, Kirk Walters, and Kwang-Suk Yoon. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education (2009c). *A Summary of Highly Qualified Teacher Data*. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/resources.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education (1999). *Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons From the Eisenhower Program*. By Michael Garet, Beatrice Birman, Andrew Porter, Laura Desimone, Rebecca Herman, and Kwang-Suk Yoon. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Planning and Evaluation Service.
- Wallace Foundation (2006). *Leadership for Learning: Making the Connections Among State, District, and School Policies and Practices*. New York: Author. Retrieved on February 23, 2010, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/WF/Knowledge%20Center/Attachments/PDF/FINALWallaceCLSPerspective.pdf>.
- Waters, Tim, Robert Marzano, and Brian McNulty (2003). *Balanced Leadership: What 30 Years of Research Tells Us About the Effect of Leadership on Student Achievement*. Aurora, Colo. Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://www.mcrel.org/products/144/>.
- Weisberg, Daniel, Susan Sexton, Jennifer Mulhern, and David Keeling (2009). *The Widget Effect: Our National Failure to Acknowledge and Act on Differences in Teacher Effectiveness*. New York: The New Teacher Project. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from [http://widgeteffect.org/downloads/TheWidgetEffect\\_execsummary.pdf](http://widgeteffect.org/downloads/TheWidgetEffect_execsummary.pdf).
- Yoon, Kwang-Suk, Teresa Duncan, Silvia Lee, Beth Scarloss, and Kathy Shapley (2007). *Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement*. (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL\\_2007033.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL_2007033.pdf).

# TEACHER AND LEADER INNOVATION FUND

## OUR APPROACH

- ▶ **Systemic reforms.** Competitive grants for states and districts that seek to advance significant reforms to improve teacher and leader effectiveness and equitable distribution.
- ▶ **Building on Teacher Incentive Fund.** Builds on successes and lessons from existing Teacher Incentive Fund by connecting compensation reform to broader workforce strategies, including improved use of evaluation results for decision-making and site-based staffing that enhances school effectiveness.
- ▶ **Rethinking systems.** Supports human-resources reform, such as earlier hiring timelines that enable districts to staff high-need and low-performing schools more effectively and efficiently.

**The current generation of differentiated compensation systems for educators shows promising results in terms of teacher retention; however, more investment in these programs and more research on how they can be most effective are needed.** Studies of two different performance pay programs showed an association between improved teacher retention rates and compensation programs that offer performance bonuses to teachers (Bayonas, 2009; Chait and Miller, 2009; Glazerman et al., 2009). Research also suggests that educators are willing to participate in these programs when the performance ratings are based largely on comprehensive evaluations of classroom practice and are aligned with classroom coaching and other professional development (Toch and Rothman, 2008). However, the research to date does not highlight the particular features of compensation programs that are associated with positive outcomes. For example, many such pay programs include professional development and aligned evaluation in addition to performance bonuses. Therefore, more research is needed to identify the particular components of alternative compensation systems that are associated with successful programs. The U.S. Department of Education is conducting two evaluations of the Teacher Incentive Fund program that will contribute to the understanding of how and why

performance pay programs may lead to changes in teaching and learning.

**Research shows that some districts—particularly large urban districts—suffer from highly ineffective human-capital management systems in which hiring is extremely delayed and thus schools are not able to hire their first-choice teachers** (Levin and Quinn, 2003; Levin et al., 2005). A study of three large urban districts and one mid-size district showed that between approximately 30 and 60 percent of teaching applicants withdrew from the hiring process, often to accept jobs with generally wealthier, more suburban districts that made offers earlier. The majority of those who withdrew (50 to 70 percent) cited the late hiring time line in the urban districts as the reason they took other jobs. Most importantly, the applicants who withdrew from the hiring process had significantly higher undergraduate GPAs, were 40 percent more likely to have a degree in their teaching field, and were significantly more likely to have completed education coursework than new hires (Levin and Quinn, 2003). A similar study of five urban school districts found that, on average, 40 percent of school-level vacancies were filled by voluntary transfers or excess teachers over whom schools had either no choice at all or

limited choice; many principals reported that they did not want to hire many of these teachers (Levin et al., 2005). In addition, the centralized hiring process in some districts often means that newly hired teachers do not know where they will work until after they are hired and often have not even met the school staff with whom they will be working.

**When staff at individual schools have more direct involvement in the process of hiring new teachers and applicants have the opportunity to interview directly with principals and other school staff, the newly hired teachers are more likely to be a better fit for the schools and more likely to be satisfied in their new jobs** (Levin et al., 2005; Liu, 2005). For example, if newly hired teachers are able to engage in personal interviews with the staff at a particular school and gain a comprehensive and accurate preview of the teaching job, they are more likely to be satisfied once they are employed (Liu, 2005). “Mutual consent” (or “school-based”) hiring is a promising approach to the decentralized hiring of teachers under which individual schools have more authority and autonomy to recruit, interview, and hire new staff, and candidates have a greater voice in choosing where they will work. This approach has the potential to produce high-functioning school teams that are more likely to work together to improve student learning. However, implementation of such an approach is a sea change in operating procedures for districts, and takes a tremendous amount of coordination across schools (Thomas and King, 2007). Revamped human resource departments and

management systems must help lead and support such efforts.

**The recent experience of some large school districts in making dramatic changes in their human capital management systems shows that improved hiring practices are possible.**

For example, four of the nation’s largest districts—Long Beach, Chicago, New York City, and Fairfax County, Virginia—have reformed their human capital systems to enhance their ability to efficiently hire teachers and school leaders (Strategic Management of Human Capital, 2008). All four districts have increased their use of technology in order to improve the efficiency and accuracy of their recruitment and screening procedures (Strategic Management of Human Capital, 2008).

**Tenure and licensure are important milestones in educators’ careers, but states and districts do not always take performance into account in making these decisions.** Only 15 states require evidence of a teacher’s effectiveness when granting relatively new teachers a professional license after the probationary or provisional licensure period (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2010). A recent report noted that 47 states award tenure “virtually automatically” (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2010). This should be a concern to all educators and policymakers.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bayonas, Holly Gottschall (2009). *Guilford County Schools Mission Possible Program: Southern Guilford High School Treatment Year 2 (2007–08) (Progress Report)*. Greensboro: University of North Carolina at Greensboro, SERVE Center. Retrieved February 22, 2010, from [http://www.gcsnc.org/depts/mission\\_possible/pdf/report/Southern%20Guilford%20High%20Year%202%20Report-Final.pdf](http://www.gcsnc.org/depts/mission_possible/pdf/report/Southern%20Guilford%20High%20Year%202%20Report-Final.pdf).
- Chait, Robin, and Raegan Miller (2009). *Paying Teachers for Results: A Summary of Research to Inform the Design of Pay-for-Performance Programs for High-Poverty Schools*. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress. Retrieved February 19, 2010, from [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/05/pdf/performance\\_pay.pdf](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/05/pdf/performance_pay.pdf).
- Glazerman, Steven, Allison McKie, and Nancy Carey (2009). *An Evaluation of the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) in Chicago: Year One Impact Report*. Washington, D.C.: Mathematica. Retrieved on February 23, 2010, from [http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/pdfs/education/TAP\\_rpt.pdf](http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/pdfs/education/TAP_rpt.pdf).
- Goldhaber, Dan, and Emily Anthony (2003). *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Institute for Urban and Minority Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.
- Levin, Jessica, Jennifer Mulhern, and Joan Schunck (2005). *Unintended Consequences: The Case for Reforming the Staffing Rules in Urban Teachers Union Contracts*. New York: The New Teacher Project.
- Levin, Jessica, and Meredith Quinn (2003). *Missed Opportunities: How We Keep High-Quality Teachers Out of Urban Classrooms*. New York: The New Teacher Project.
- Levine, Arthur (2006). *Educating School Teachers*. Washington, D.C.: The Education Schools Project.
- Liu, Edward (2005, April). *Hiring, Job Satisfaction, and the Fit Between New Teachers and Their Schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- National Council on Teacher Quality (2010). *2009 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: National Summary*, Washington D.C.: National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Strategic Management of Human Capital (2008). *Strategic Management of Human Capital: Cross-Case Analysis*. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://www.smhc-cpre.org/download/34/>.
- Thomas, David, and Caroline King (2007). Reinventing human resources at the school district of Philadelphia. In Stacey Childress, Richard Elmore, Allen Grossman, and Susan Moore Johnson (eds.), *Managing School Districts for High Performance*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Education Press.
- Toch, Thomas, and Robert Rothman (2008). *Rush to Judgment: Teacher Evaluation in Public Education*. Washington, D.C.: Education Sector. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from [http://www.educationsector.org/usr\\_doc/RushToJudgment\\_ES\\_Jan08.pdf](http://www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/RushToJudgment_ES_Jan08.pdf).

This page intentionally left blank.



# TEACHER AND LEADER PATHWAYS

## OUR APPROACH

- ▶ **Significant investment in effective preparation.** Competitive grants to support the creation and expansion of high-performing pathways that prepare teachers and school leaders to succeed in persistently low-performing schools.
- ▶ **High standards for programs.** Requires evidence-based practices such as clinical experiences and tracking of graduates' performance over time.
- ▶ **New emphasis on principals.** Major new investment in recruiting and preparing principals able to turn around and transform persistently low-achieving schools.
- ▶ **Focus on district and state needs.** To ensure that teacher and leader preparation programs meet the needs of high-need schools and districts, provides grants to districts and states, which may partner with institutions of higher education or nonprofits.

**Many teacher preparation programs—traditional and alternative routes—are not preparing educators to succeed in today's classrooms.** Many teachers are ill prepared by their teacher education programs (Levine, 2006). For example, teacher preparation programs frequently fail to provide candidates with the competencies that principals and districts say teachers need, and many programs fail to provide prospective teachers with high-quality and intensive clinical experiences (Levine, 2006; Walsh and Jacobs, 2007). One survey of teacher education alumni found that 62 percent who responded reported that their pre-service teacher training in schools of education did not prepare them for “classroom realities” (Levine, 2006).

**Many teacher preparation programs are not highly selective and do not set high standards for completion (Hess, 2001; Walsh and Jacobs, 2007).** A study of 49 alternative certification programs across 11 states found that about one-quarter of the programs accept all, or nearly all, of their applicants (Walsh and Jacobs, 2007). Other research shows that average SAT scores of college graduates who passed certification exams in order to teach the

elementary grades, special education, or physical education were far below the average SAT scores of all college graduates (Gitomer, 2007). Although several states, including Florida, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Texas, have implemented or are beginning to launch statewide efforts to track the effectiveness of graduates of teacher preparation programs, this information is not yet in widespread use for improving teacher preparation programs (Loadman, 2007; National Council on Teacher Quality, 2010; Noell et al., 2008; Matus, 2009).

**While teacher preparation programs—both traditional and alternative—often fail to adequately prepare new teachers, promising models and program components do exist** (Berry et al., 2008; Boyd et al., 2009; Levine, 2006). Recent research suggests that pathways into teaching may be more effective when they focus on the work in the classroom and provide opportunities for teachers to study what they will be doing as first-year teachers. For example, teachers who came from programs in which they engaged in actual teaching practices, or engaged in a “capstone project” – often resulting in a portfolio of work that was produced in K–12

classrooms during the pre-service education component – were more likely to produce positive student achievement gains during their first year of teaching than were teachers who did not engage in these learning experiences (Boyd et al., 2009).

**There is an urgent need to prepare more principals and school leadership teams to be equipped for the particular challenges of turning around and transforming persistently low-performing schools.** Research indicates that low-performing organizations are more likely to improve with the right leader at the helm (Kowal et al., 2009). In addition, principals who lead turnaround efforts need specific competencies that are not necessarily the same as those required by principals leading schools that have a history of continual success, making it difficult for districts to find the leaders needed to successfully transform persistently low-performing schools (Kowal et al., 2009).

**Leadership preparation is most promising when it is: aligned with leadership standards; focuses on instruction; uses selective and purposeful recruitment; includes a strong clinical component with school-based internships; and integrates school-based experiences with classroom reading and discussion** (Augustine et al., 2009; Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; New Leaders for New Schools, 2009). Programs such as the University of Virginia's School Turnaround Specialist Program and the New York City Leadership Academy have demonstrated promising approaches to recruiting and preparing leaders with the competencies needed to lead dramatic improvements in student performance in struggling schools.

**Examples of programs to develop and prepare transformational principals include:**

- ▶ *The New York City Leadership Academy, a nonprofit organization that provides pre-service preparation and in-service support to increase the supply and quality of NYC principals.* Each year its graduates fill 20 to 40 percent of NYC's principal vacancies. The Leadership Academy's preparation program for aspiring principals includes: (1) an intense summer experience involving a comprehensive school turn-around simulation; (2) a 10-month residency under the guidance of a successful mentor principal; and (3) a planning summer that supports graduates as they transition into school leadership positions (Corcoran, Schwartz, and Weinstein, 2009; J. Lewis, e-mail communication, March 3, 2010).
- ▶ *The University of Virginia School Turnaround Specialist Program utilizes a systemic approach to change by working with school, district, and state-level leadership teams in order to help them build the internal capacity necessary to support and sustain effective school turnarounds.* Through several intensive summer sessions, a cohort of principals, along with the district-based teams and, when possible, state-based teams, on which they depend, prepare to turn around a struggling school. Once placed in their turnaround schools, the principals receive on-going support, including regular visits by turnaround experts and a mid-year two-day session with their cohort peers for reflection, sharing, and midterm corrections. The data indicate that most schools led by program graduates demonstrate strong and sustained student-achievement gains, measured by the percentage of students scoring at the "proficient" level on the state assessments (University of Virginia School Turnaround Specialist Program, 2008).

### Examples of teacher pathways:

- ▶ *An Urban Teacher Residency Program (UTR).* UTRs are teacher preparation programs that combine master's level coursework with a rigorous full-year classroom apprenticeship to a trained mentor teacher. UTRs work to meet district needs for teaching candidates, often focusing on recruiting candidates of color and high-need areas such as math, science, English Learners, and special education. Program participants train in cohorts, and commit to teaching for at least three years within the district. Early indications show that teacher residency model is promising. Graduates of residency programs stay in teaching longer than the average teacher. After three years, 85 percent of Academy of Urban School Leadership graduates in Chicago and 86 percent of Boston Teacher Residency graduates are still teaching. In addition, 98 percent of Boettcher Teachers Program graduates in metro-Denver are still teaching (Berry et al., 2008; Urban Teacher Residency United, 2010.).
- ▶ *A university-based teacher education program that incorporates attributes associated with effective programs and meets specific district needs.* This approach is exemplified by Alverno College in Milwaukee. The education division of Alverno College enrolls approximately 350 undergraduate students and 130 graduate students who are preparing to become teachers; most Alverno-trained teachers move into jobs in the Milwaukee Public Schools. The overall five-year teacher retention rate for Alverno graduates is 85 percent. Liberal arts faculty are heavily involved in teaching in the Alverno education division and the college has an “outcome- or ability-based curriculum” in which all teacher-education candidates must demonstrate mastery of certain knowledge and skills. The program requires extensive fieldwork that involves working and observing in schools prior to the student teaching experience, and all students do their student teaching in at least one urban school (Levine, 2006).
- ▶ *A partnership with an alternative-certification route, such as Teach for America (TFA) or one of the Teaching Fellow programs affiliated with The New Teacher Project.* For example, the New York City Teaching Fellows program is an alternative-certification route that recruits mid-career professionals, recent college graduates, and retirees to teach in New York City's hardest-to-staff schools and in some of the hardest-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. Fellows complete a short but intensive pre-service training program during the summer that involves hands-on teaching in a New York City classroom, master's degree coursework, and “Student Achievement Framework (SAF)” sessions during which Fellows learn instructional design and classroom-management skills from an experienced teacher. Fellows who complete this training are eligible to be hired in the NYC public schools. While teaching, each Fellow works toward a master's degree in education, specializing in the subject that he or she teaches, which is subsidized by the NYC Department of Education program. Fellows have continuing access to online resources through the program, and they also receive support from school-based mentors and constructive feedback from monthly classroom observations by a university field consultant. More than 9,000 Fellows currently teach in New York City's public schools and comprise 11 percent of all teachers in the city, including 26 percent of all math teachers and 22 percent of all special education teachers. The program successfully attracts a diverse teaching staff—41 percent of Fellows who began the program in 2009 identified themselves as black or Latino (NYC Teaching Fellows, 2010; L. Reu, e-mail communication, March 2, 2010).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Augustine, Catherine, Gabriella Gonzalez, Gina Schuyler Ikemoto, Jennifer Russell, Gail Zellman, Louay Constant, Jane Armstrong, and Jacob Dembosky (2009). *Improving School Leadership: The Promise of Cohesive Leadership Systems*. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation. Retrieved April 23, 2010, from [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND\\_MG885.pdf](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG885.pdf).
- Berry, Barnett, Diana Montgomery, Rachel Curtis, Mindy Hernandez, Judy Wurtzel, and Jon Snyder (2008). *Creating and Sustaining Urban Teacher Residencies: A New Way to Recruit, Prepare, and Retain Effective Teachers in High-Needs Districts*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The Center for Teaching Quality, and the Aspen Institute. Retrieved February 22, 2010, from [http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content\\_storage\\_01/0000019b/80/3e/b8/0e.pdf](http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/3e/b8/0e.pdf).
- Boyd, Donald, Pamela Grossman, Hamilton Lankford, Susanna Loeb, and James Wyckoff (2009). Teacher preparation and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 31(4):416–440. Retrieved February 22, 2010, from <http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/4/416>.
- Corcoran, Sean, Amy Ellen Schwartz, and Meryle Weinstein (2009). *The New York City Aspiring Principals Program: A School-Level Evaluation*. New York: Institute for Education and Social Policy. Retrieved February 22, 2010, from <http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/scmsAdmin/uploads/003/852/APP.pdf>.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda, Michelle LaPointe, Debra Meyerson, and Margaret Terry Orr (2007). *Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Executive Summary*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Gitomer, Drew (2007). *Teacher Quality in a Changing Policy Landscape: Improvements in the Teacher Pool*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.
- Hess, Frederick (2001). *Tear Down This Wall: The Case for a Radical Overhaul of Teacher Certification*. Washington, D.C.: Progressive Policy Institute.
- Kowal, Julie, Emily Ayscue Hassel, and Bryan Hassel (2009). *Successful School Turnarounds: Seven Steps for District Leaders*. Naperville, Ill.: Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. Retrieved on February 23, 2010, from <http://www.centerforcrsri.org/files/CenterIssueBriefSept09.pdf>.
- Levine, Arthur (2006). *Educating School Teachers*. Washington, D.C.: The Education Schools Project.
- Matus, Ron (2009, November 20). *St. Petersburg Times*, “State rates teacher prep programs.”
- National Council on Teacher Quality (2010). *2009 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: National Summary*, Washington D.C.: Author.
- New Leaders for New Schools (2009). *Principal Effectiveness: A New Principalship to Drive Student Achievement, Teacher Effectiveness, and School Turnarounds*. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from [http://www.nlms.org/documents/uef/principal\\_effectiveness\\_nlms.pdf](http://www.nlms.org/documents/uef/principal_effectiveness_nlms.pdf).
- Noell, George, Bethany Porter, R. Maria Patt, and Amanda Dahir (2008). *Value Added Assessment of Teacher Preparation in Louisiana, 2004–2005 to 2006–2007*. New Orleans: Louisiana State University, Department of Psychology. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from

[http://www.tulane.edu/cowen\\_institute/LAValueAdded.htm](http://www.tulane.edu/cowen_institute/LAValueAdded.htm).

NYC Teaching Fellows (2010). Information retrieved January 26, 2010, from <http://www.nycteachingfellows.org>.

Urban Teacher Residency United (2010). Information retrieved March 3, 2010, from <http://www.utrUnited.org>.

University of Virginia School Turnaround Specialist Program (2008). *2008 Annual Report Excerpts*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from [http://www.darden.virginia.edu/html/standard.aspx?menu\\_id=626&id=19294&styleid=3](http://www.darden.virginia.edu/html/standard.aspx?menu_id=626&id=19294&styleid=3).

Walsh, Kate, and Sandi Jacobs (2007). *Alternative Certification Isn't Alternative*. Washington, D.C.: Thomas B. Fordham Institute and the National Council on Teacher Quality. Retrieved on February 23, 2010, from [http://www.nctq.org/p/publications/docs/Alternative\\_Certification\\_Isnt\\_Alternative\\_20071124023109.pdf](http://www.nctq.org/p/publications/docs/Alternative_Certification_Isnt_Alternative_20071124023109.pdf).

This page intentionally left blank.