

Preparing and Credentialing the Nation's Teachers

The Secretary's 10th Report on Teacher Quality

August 2016



Preparing and Credentialing the Nation's Teachers

The Secretary's 10th Report on Teacher Quality

August 2016

This report was produced under U.S. Department of Education Contract No. ED-OPE-11-C-0024. Freddie Cross served as the Department contracting officer's representative. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement of any product, commodity, service, or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Education

John B. King, Jr.
Secretary

Office of Postsecondary Education

Lynn B. Mahaffie
Delegated Duties of Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education

August 2016

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, *Preparing and Credentialing the Nation's Teachers: The Secretary's 10th Report on Teacher Quality*, Washington, D.C., 2016.

This report is available on the Department's website:
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/index.html> or at <https://title2.ed.gov>.

Availability of Alternate Formats

Requests for alternate format documents such as Braille or large print should be submitted to the Alternate Format Center by calling 202-260-0852 or by contacting the 504 coordinator via e-mail at om_eeos@ed.gov.

Notice to Limited English Proficient Persons

If you have difficulty understanding English, you may request language assistance services for Department information that is available to the public. These services are available free of charge. If you need more information about interpretation or translation services, please call 1-800-LEARN (1-800 872-5327) (TTY: 1-800-437-0833), e-mail us at Ed.Language.Assistance@ed.gov, or write to U.S. Department of Education, Information Resource Center, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202.

Data presented in this publication are from states' and jurisdictions' required Title II reports to the U.S. Department of Education in 2012, 2013, and 2014. Respondents provided data on numerous check points regarding teacher preparation and credentials, and received technical assistance as needed. Data in this report may be inconsistent with data published in earlier reports, as respondents are able to revise their previous submissions. Prior reports are available at <https://title2.ed.gov>.

Contents

List of Figures.....	v
List of Tables	vii
Executive Summary	ix
Chapter 1. Teacher Preparation Providers and Programs.....	1
Traditional Teacher Preparation Programs	5
Alternative Route Teacher Preparation Programs	7
Chapter 2. Teacher Preparation Program Participants	11
Enrollment Characteristics	11
Program Completers	17
Most Common Teacher Preparation Subject Areas	18
Top State Teacher Producers by Enrollment and Program Type	20
Top State Teacher Producers by Completers and Program Type.....	23
Chapter 3. Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) Offering Teacher Preparation Programs	26
IHEs Offering Teacher Preparation Programs by Type and Sector	26
Characteristics of IHEs and Enrollment in Teacher Preparation Programs	27
Largest IHE Teacher Preparation Programs by Student Enrollment	29
Enrollment in IHE-Based Teacher Preparation Programs and in Host IHEs ⁷	32
Teacher Preparation Programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.....	33
<i>Title II</i> of the HEA Teacher Quality Partnership Discretionary Grant Program Awards.....	35
Chapter 4. State Standards for Teacher Credentials	40
State Policy and Standards for Teachers	40
National Association Standards.....	44
Chapter 5. Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs	47
Teacher Preparation Provider Assurances	47
State Criteria for Assessing Teacher Preparation Program Performance	49
Identifying Low-Performing Teacher Preparation Programs and Those At Risk of Being Identified as Low-Performing	52
Chapter 6. Assessments Required for an Initial Teaching Credential	61
State Assessment Requirements.....	61
Test Takers	62
State Minimum Passing Scores and Scaled Scores	65
State Summary Pass Rates.....	69

Contents (continued)

Chapter 7. State Initial Credentials for Teachers	71
Initial Credentials	
Issued by States	71
Initial Credentials Issued to Teachers Prepared in Another State.....	81
Credential Areas	82
Credential Degree Requirements	84
Emergency License Types	88
Appendix A: Data Notes and Considerations	90
Data Quality and Verification Processes.....	90
Enrollment	91
Program Completers and Pass Rates	91
Quality Control and Continuous Improvement	92

List of Figures

Figure 1.1. Number and percentage of teacher preparation providers, by provider type: 2014.....	2
Figure 1.2. Teacher preparation providers reported, by provider type and state: 2014	3
Figure 1.3. Number and percentage of teacher preparation programs, by provider type: 2014.....	4
Figure 1.4. States with and without approved alternative routes to teaching certification: 2014.....	8
Figure 2.1. Percentage enrollment in teacher preparation programs, by program type: AY 2012 – 13.....	12
Figure 2.2. Enrollees in teacher preparation programs, by program type and gender, and gender of k – 12 students nationwide: AY 2012 – 13	13
Figure 2.3. Percentage of enrollees in teacher preparation programs, by race/ethnicity and program type, and k – 12 students, by race/ethnicity: AY 2012 – 13	16
Figure 2.4. Number of program completers, by traditional and alternative routes: AY 2007 – 08 through AY 2012 – 13.....	18
Figure 2.5. The five states with the highest enrollment in teacher preparation programs, by percentage of nationwide enrollment: AY 2012 – 13	21
Figure 2.6. Top five teacher-producing states, by percentage of total teacher preparation program completers nationwide: AY 2012 – 13	24
Figure 3.1. Percentage of individuals enrolled in two- and four-year teacher preparation programs based at IHEs, by program type: AY 2012 – 13	27

List of Figures *(continued)*

Figure 3.2. Percentage of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs based at IHEs, by sector and program type: AY 2012 – 13.....	28
Figure 3.3. Percentage of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs and of programs at IHEs, by sector: AY 2012 – 13	29
Figure 3.4. Percentage of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs based at IHEs compared to the percentage of all students enrolled at the host IHEs, by race/ethnicity: AY 2012 – 13	32
Figure 3.5. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by type: FY 2009 and FY 2010.....	38
Figure 3.6. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by awardees: FY 2009 and FY 2010	39
Figure 3.7. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by geographic focus of teacher preparation: FY 2009 and FY 2010	39
Figure 5.1. Criteria used in state assessments of teacher preparation program performance, by number of states reporting: 2014	50
Figure 5.2. States that have never identified any and those that have identified at least one teacher preparation program as at-risk or low-performing as of 2014.....	53
Figure 5.3. Number of teacher preparation programs designated as at-risk, by program type: 2014	57
Figure 5.4. Number of teacher preparation programs designated as low-performing, by program type: 2014	57
Figure 5.5. Number of at-risk and low-performing teacher preparation programs reported by states: 2005 through 2014.....	60
Figure 6.1. States that do and do not require tests for an initial teaching credential: AY 2012 – 13	62
Figure 6.2. Total number of teacher preparation program completers tested for an initial teacher credential, by program route: AY 2000 – 01 through AY 2012 – 13.....	63
Figure 6.3. Percentage of initial teacher credential test takers, by program type: AY 2008 – 09 through AY 2012 – 13.....	64
Figure 6.4. National average percentage of points required to pass initial teacher credential assessments (based on state cut scores) and average percentage of points scored by test takers (based on state average scaled scores*), by program type: AY 2012 – 13	68

List of Figures *(continued)*

Figure 7.1. Number of individuals receiving teacher preparation in one state compared to number earning their initial teaching credential in another state: AY 2000 – 01 through AY 2012 – 13.....	72
Figure 7.2. Number range of individuals receiving an initial teaching credential, by state issued: AY 2012 – 13.....	73
Figure 7.3. Top five states that prepared individuals to earn initial teaching credentials, by number earned and percentage of those earned nationwide: AY 2012 – 13.....	80
Figure 7.4. Percentage range of teachers awarded credentials in a different state from the one in which they completed their teacher preparation, by state: AY 2012 – 13	82
Figure 7.5. States requiring content-specific bachelor’s degree standard for an initial teaching certificate at the elementary school level: 2014.....	85
Figure 7.6. States requiring content-specific bachelor’s degree standard for an initial teaching certificate at the middle school level: 2014	86
Figure 7.7. States requiring content-specific bachelor’s degree standard for an initial teaching certificate at the secondary school level: 2014.....	87

List of Tables

Table ES. 1. Data elements in the 2014 state reports on teacher preparation programs and requirements for initial teacher credentialing in grades k – 12, by year of data being reported and by type of reporting	xi
Table 2.1. Number and percentage of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs, by gender, race/ethnicity, and program type: AY 2012 – 13.....	15
Table 2.2. Percentage of teacher preparation program completers, by type of program and most common subject areas: AY 2012 – 13.....	19
Table 2.3. Number and percentage of enrollees in teacher preparation programs, by state, state’s rank, and program type: AY 2012 – 13	22
Table 2.4. Number and percentage of teacher preparation program completers, by state, state’s rank, and program type: AY 2012 – 13	25
Table 3.1. 10 largest traditional teacher preparation programs at IHEs, by state and total enrollment: AY 2012 – 13.....	30
Table 3.2. 10 largest alternative route teacher preparation programs at IHEs, by state and total enrollment: AY 2012 – 13	31

List of Tables

Table 3.3. Number and percentage enrolled in IHE-based teacher preparation programs at HBCUs and non-HBCUs, by program type: AY 2012 – 13	34
Table 3.4. Number and percentage enrolled in IHE-based teacher preparation programs at HBCUs, by program type and sector: AY 2012 – 13	34
Table 3.5. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by state, grantee, and name of partnership: FY 2009 and FY 2010	36
Table 4.1. Number of states responding “yes” to having policies and standards for obtaining initial teaching credentials: 2012, 2013, and 2014.....	42
Table 4.2. Number of states that set teaching standards in specific fields, by field and grade level: 2014	43
Table 4.3. Number of states reporting using, modifying, or referencing standards of national organizations in developing teaching standards, by national organization: 2012, 2013, and 2014.....	45
Table 5.1. Number and percentage of teacher preparation providers responding to assurances regarding their enrollees’ training: 2014	48
Table 5.2. Teacher preparation programs, by state, host institution, program type, program name, risk type, and date designated as at-risk or low-performing: 2014	54
Table 5.3. States identifying at least one teacher preparation program as at-risk or low-performing: 2003 through 2014	58
Table 6.1. Cut scores and average scaled scores on initial teacher credential assessments, gap between the scores, and the number of initial teacher credential assessments, by state: AY 2012 – 13	66
Table 6.2. Total number of test takers from all teacher preparation programs, number who passed all tests in their area of specialization, and pass rate, by program type: AY 2012 – 13.....	70
Table 7.1. Number of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, by state, location of preparation and percentage change in total number: AY 2011 – 12 and AY 2012 – 13.....	74
Table 7.2. Number and percentage of teacher preparation program completers and of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, by state: AY 2012 – 13	77
Table 7.3. Five most common initial teaching credential subject areas, by teacher preparation program type: AY 2010 – 11, AY 2011 – 12, and AY 2012 – 13	83
Table 7.4. Number of state emergency teaching licenses granted, by license type and characteristics: 2012, 2013, and 2014	89

Executive Summary

Introduction

This 10th report on teacher quality presents information states¹ reported to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) in October 2012, October 2013, and October 2014. *Title II* of the *Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA)*, as amended in 2008 by the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA), requires states to report annually on key elements of their teacher preparation programs and requirements for initial teacher credentialing, kindergarten through 12th grade, on a State Report Card designated by the Secretary.

Under *Title II* of the *HEA*, institutions of higher education (IHEs) that conduct teacher preparation programs, whether traditional² or alternative route³ programs, must annually collect and submit information to their respective states by April 30. While annual *Title II* reporting is required by law, the method of reporting information is determined by the state. The Institutional and Program Report Card (IPRC) is an online tool IHEs and other entities conducting state-approved teacher preparation programs can use to submit

information to the state. States, in turn, report their information to the Department on the State Report Card annually by October 31. The data reported by teacher preparation providers are in large part included in the states' *Title II* reports to the Department.

This report is intended to provide Congress, aspiring teachers, the education community, researchers and policymakers, and the general public with information that Congress has identified as important to a basic understanding of teacher preparation in America. In this regard, this report provides national information and answers questions such as these:

- How many prospective teachers were enrolled in teacher preparation programs during academic year (AY) 2010 – 11, AY 2011 – 12, and AY 2012 – 13?
- What was the demographic composition of these enrollees?
- What are the teacher preparation program enrollment trends over the last three years?

1 For purposes of this report, the term “state” refers to the entities required to report as states, that is, any of the states of the United States, as well as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Freely Associated States (the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau).

2 Traditional teacher preparation programs generally serve undergraduate students who have no prior teaching or work experience and lead, at least, to a bachelor's degree. Some traditional teacher preparation programs may lead to a teaching credential but not to a degree. A traditional teacher preparation program in some of the outlying areas, such as American Samoa or the Republic of the Marshall Islands, may lead to an associate's degree.

3 Alternative route teacher preparation programs primarily serve candidates who have subject-matter knowledge and who are the teachers of record in a classroom while participating in their teacher preparation program. Alternative route teacher preparation programs may be based in an IHE or outside an IHE. For purposes of Title II reporting, each state determines which teacher preparation programs are alternative route teacher preparation programs.

- How many prospective teachers were successful program completers?
- What type of teacher preparation program, traditional or alternative, did the completers attend and in what proportions?
- What state standards and policies guided teacher preparation program development and evaluation?
- Which teacher preparation programs have states reported as low-performing or as at-risk⁴ of being identified as low-performing?
- What state requirements and assessment criteria underpin initial teacher credentialing?
- How many prospective teachers took state assessments in AY 2012 – 13 compared to previous years?
- How many initial credentials did states award to new teachers in AY 2012 – 13 compared to previous years?

Tenth *Title II* Report Contents

Data that states reported to the Department in 2012, 2013, and 2014 are presented in this 10th report. For many data elements, such as the number of individuals enrolled in and completing teacher preparation programs, states reported on AY 2010 – 11 data in 2012, AY 2011 – 12 data in 2013, and AY 2012 – 13 data in 2014. For other data elements, such as the admission requirements for each teacher preparation program and descriptions of the state’s alternative routes to a teacher credential, states reported on the most current information available each year. See table Executive Summary (ES) 1 for a list of data elements included in the State Report Card and the years being reported for each data element.

The 10th report provides a national overview of the state data by key topics collected through the

State Report Cards, including graphics showing *Title II* longitudinal trends over more than a decade of state reporting. Similar to previous reports, the report is organized into chapters, with each summarizing states’ data on *HEA Title II* key elements. The chapters are (I) Teacher Preparation Providers and Programs, (II) Teacher Preparation Program Participants, (III) Institutions of Higher Education Offering Teacher Preparation Programs, (IV) State Standards for Teaching Credentials, (V) Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs, (VI) Assessments Required for an Initial Teaching Credential, and (VII) State Initial Credentials for Teachers.

Design of the State Reporting System

Since 2001, the Department has used a Web-based state reporting system to collect the data required from states under *Title II* of the *HEA*. This Web-based reporting system allows for the collection of consistent information across states.

States report a large portion of their *Title II* information in narrative form, although some data elements call for numeric responses. Table ES.1 highlights the main data elements of the state report and whether they require a narrative or numeric response. A narrative response may include answering questions by checking yes or no, selecting from a list of possible responses, or typing a response in a text box. A numeric response requires that the state enter a number in answering a question or uploading a data file. Data elements may require only narrative responses, only numeric responses, or a combination of both types of responses. States also have the option to provide introductory or supplemental information to provide context for their reports. States’ narrative and numerical data are published on the *Title II* website at: <https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp>.

⁴ States set criteria and definitions for identifying teacher preparation programs as low-performing or at-risk of being identified as low performing. See the definition of low-performing teacher preparation program on p. xii.

Table ES. 1. Data elements in the 2014 state reports on teacher preparation programs and requirements for initial teacher credentialing in grades k – 12, by year of data being reported and by type of reporting

Data element	Year of data being reported	Narrative	Numeric
A list and total count of the traditional and alternative route teacher preparation programs (new data element in 2013 reports)	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	•
For each teacher preparation provider, a description of the requirements for entry into the program and for exit from the program	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	
The number of students enrolled in each teacher preparation provider by gender, race, and ethnicity	AY 2012– 13		•
The number of hours required before student teaching, for student teaching, and for mentoring/induction support, and the number of faculty and prospective teachers participating	AY 2012 – 13		•
The number of teachers prepared by credential area, academic major, and subject area	AY 2012 – 13		•
The total number of teachers receiving an initial credential	AY 2012 – 13		•
The total number of traditional and alternative route teacher preparation program completers	AY 2012 – 13 AY 2011 – 12 AY 2010 – 11		•
Assurances for each teacher preparation provider (new data element in 2013 reports)	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	
A description of each state teacher credential and the requirements to obtain each	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	•
A description of state teacher standards and the alignment of the standards with assessments for teacher credentials and state academic standards	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	
The institutional and state pass rates of traditional and alternative program completers on assessments required for credentials, including the minimum passing score	AY 2012 – 13 AY 2011 – 12 AY 2010 – 11		•
A description of alternative routes to a teaching credential	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	•
A description of criteria for determining low-performing teacher preparation programs and a list of any teacher preparation programs that the state identified as low-performing or at-risk of being identified as low-performing	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	
A description of the extent to which teacher preparation programs addressed shortages of highly qualified teachers, as defined by the <i>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</i> .	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	
A description of the extent to which teacher preparation programs prepared teachers to teach students with disabilities and students who are limited English proficient	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	
A description of the extent to which teacher preparation programs prepared teachers to integrate technology into curricula and instruction	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	
A description of steps the state has taken to improve teacher quality during the past year	Most current information, as reported in 2014	•	

The state reporting system is designed to ensure that states submit complete and accurate data and narrative information in their reports. The reporting system contains internal edit check functions that assist states in identifying missing or incomplete data and increasing reporting accuracy. A *Title II* service center is provided to technically assist states with reporting and affords states numerous opportunities to review, verify, and correct their data during and following the reporting period.

State Participation in 2012, 2013, and 2014 State Reports

Since 2001, the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (Puerto Rico) have participated in *Title II* reporting. The United States Virgin Islands (Virgin Islands) began reporting in 2002. American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia (Micronesia), the Republic of the Marshall Islands (Marshall Islands), the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (Northern Mariana Islands), and the Republic of Palau (Palau) began reporting in 2006. The *HEA* defines all of these jurisdictions as “states,” and for the purposes of this report, the term “state” refers to all of these jurisdictions. Of the 59 states required to report, all but two (Marshall Islands and Micronesia) complied with the reporting requirements by submitting a state report in 2012. All 59 states complied with the reporting requirements by submitting state reports in 2013 and 2014.

Key Terminology

The definitions used in this report are those that the Department established for *Title II* of the *HEA* reporting. Key definitions are included here.

Academic year. A period of 12 consecutive months, starting September 1 and ending August 31.

Alternative route to a teaching credential.

An overarching pathway through which an individual can earn an initial teaching credential, which differs from the traditional model of teacher preparation. Each state defines alternative routes to a teaching credential.

Cut score. The minimum score required by the state to pass an assessment for a teacher credential.

Early childhood/early learning. Programs and activities serving children from birth through third grade.

Enrolled student. A student who has been admitted to a teacher preparation program but who has not yet completed the program in the academic year being reported. An individual who completed the program in the academic year being reported is counted as a program completer and not an enrolled student. See program completer.

Initial credential. The first teaching certificate or license issued to an individual. The state defines the specific certificates or licenses classified as an initial credential in each state.

Low-performing teacher preparation program.

A program that a state identifies as low-performing on the basis of criteria it has established for identifying teacher preparation programs with unsatisfactory performance.

Program completer. A person who has met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements. In applying this definition, the fact that an individual has or has not been recommended to the state for an initial credential may not be used as a criterion for determining who is a program completer.

Scaled scores. A scaled score is a conversion of a raw score on a test or version of the test to a common scale that allows for a numerical comparison between test takers. Because most major testing companies use multiple versions of a test, the scale is used to control slight variations from one version of a test to the next. Scaled scores are particularly useful for comparing test scores over time, such as measuring semester-to-semester and year-to-year growth of individual test takers or groups of test takers in a content area. However, within the same test, different content areas are typically on different scales, so a scaled score of 24 in mathematics may not mean the same thing as a scaled score of 24 in reading.

Summary pass rate. The percentage of individuals who passed all tests they took for their area of specialization among those who took one or more tests in their specialization areas.

Teacher preparation program. A state-approved course of study the completion of which signifies that an enrollee has met all the state's educational requirements, or training requirements, or both,

for an initial credential to teach in the state's elementary, middle, or secondary schools. A teacher preparation program may be either a traditional program or an alternative program, as defined by the state, and may be offered within or outside an IHE.

Alternative route teacher preparation programs primarily serve candidates whom states permit to be the teachers of record in a classroom while participating in the route. They may be within an IHE (referred to as "alternative, IHE-based" providers) or outside an IHE (referred to as "alternative, not IHE-based" providers). For purposes of *Title II* of the *HEA* reporting, each state determines which teacher preparation programs are alternative programs.

Traditional teacher preparation programs generally serve undergraduate students who have no prior teaching or work experience and generally lead to at least a bachelor's degree. Some traditional teacher preparation programs may lead to a teaching credential but not to a degree. A traditional teacher preparation program in the outlying areas may lead to an associate's degree.

Teacher preparation provider.⁵ An IHE or other organization offering at least one state-approved teacher preparation program. A teacher preparation provider may be a traditional provider; an alternative, IHE-based provider; or an alternative, not IHE-based provider. For *Title II* of the *HEA* reporting, IHEs offering both traditional and alternative route teacher preparation programs count as two distinct teacher preparation providers.

⁵ In prior years, data reported through *Title II* of the *HEA* counted all traditional teacher preparation programs within an institution as one traditional program and all alternative route teacher preparation programs within an institution as one alternative program. Beginning in 2013, the *Title II* of the *HEA* data collection began collecting data on the individual teacher preparation programs (such as special education, elementary education, secondary English, etc.) offered within each institution or organization. The inclusion of the new key term "teacher preparation provider" helps to distinguish between the institution or organization (teacher preparation provider) and the individual programs within the institution or organization (teacher preparation program).

Selected Findings From 2012, 2013, and 2014 State Reports

Teacher Preparation Providers and Programs

- In 2014, states reported data on 2,171 teacher preparation providers, less than a 1 percent increase from 2,163 providers reported in 2013, and a 1 percent increase from 2,147 providers reported in 2012. For purposes of *Title II* of the *HEA* reporting, the Department counts an IHE with traditional teacher preparation programs and alternative route teacher preparation programs as two distinct teacher preparation providers.
- States reported three types of teacher preparation providers, with 1,497 (69 percent) classified as traditional teacher preparation providers, 473 (22 percent) alternative route teacher preparation providers based at IHEs, and 201 (9 percent) alternative route teacher preparation providers not based at IHEs in 2014. This was similar to the distribution of teacher preparation providers in 2013, when states reported 1,487 (69 percent) classified as traditional teacher preparation providers, 457 (21 percent) alternative route teacher preparation providers based at IHEs, and 219 (10 percent) alternative route teacher preparation providers not based at IHEs in 2013. This was also similar to the distribution of teacher preparation providers in 2012, when states reported 1,480 (69 percent) traditional teacher preparation providers, 446 (21 percent) alternative route teacher preparation providers based at IHEs, and 221 (10 percent) alternative route teacher preparation providers not based at IHEs.
- States also reported on the number of teacher preparation programs⁶ within each teacher preparation provider. States reported a total of 26,589 teacher preparation programs in 2014, a 6 percent increase from 25,000 programs reported in 2013.

Of the 26,589 programs reported in 2014, 18,514 programs (70 percent) were offered by traditional teacher preparation providers; 5,325 (20 percent) were offered by alternative route teacher preparation providers based at IHEs; and 2,750 (10 percent) were offered by alternative route teacher preparation providers not based at IHEs. This was similar to the distribution of teacher preparation programs in 2013, when 17,800 programs (71 percent) were offered by traditional teacher preparation providers; 4,512 (18 percent) were offered by alternative route teacher preparation providers based at IHEs; and 2,688 (11 percent) were offered by alternative route teacher preparation providers not based at IHEs.

Supervised Clinical Experience in Traditional Teacher Preparation Programs

- In 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported average number, of hours required before student teaching in traditional teacher preparation programs was 100, and the median average number of hours required before student teaching in traditional teacher preparation programs was 125. These were unchanged from 2013.
- In 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported average number, of hours required for student teaching in traditional teacher preparation programs was 600, and the median average number of hours required for student teaching in traditional teacher preparation programs was 525. This was also unchanged from 2013.

6 See Key Terminology for the definitions of teacher preparation provider and teacher preparation program. The definition of teacher preparation program was revised beginning with the 2012 State Report Cards.

Supervised Clinical Experience in Alternative Route Teacher Preparation Programs

- In 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported average number, of hours required for mentoring and induction support in alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs was zero. This was unchanged from 2013. The median average number of hours required for mentoring and induction support in alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs was 15, an increase from 12 in 2013.
- In 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported average number, of hours required for mentoring and induction support in alternative route teacher preparation programs not based at IHEs was zero. This was unchanged from 2013. The median average number of hours required for mentoring and induction support in alternative route teacher preparation programs not based at IHEs was 40, an increase from 38 in 2013.

Teacher Preparation Program Participants

Enrollment in Teacher Preparation Programs

- During AY 2012 – 13, a total of 499,800 individuals were enrolled in teacher preparation programs, a decrease of 20 percent from 623,190 enrolled individuals in AY 2011 – 12. This continued a trend of decreasing enrollment, following a 9 percent decrease between AY 2010 – 11 (684,801 individuals enrolled) and AY 2011 – 12. For purposes of *Title II* of the HEA reporting, “enrolled student” is defined as an individual who has been admitted into a teacher preparation program, but has not yet completed the program. In applying this definition, individuals who completed the program within the academic year being reported are counted as program completers and are not included in the enrollment count.
 - More than 89 percent (447,116 individuals) were enrolled in traditional teacher preparation programs.

- More than 5 percent (25,135 individuals) were enrolled in alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs.
- Nearly 6 percent (27,549 individuals) were enrolled in alternative route teacher preparation programs not based at IHEs.
- In AY 2012 – 13, 76 percent of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs were female, and 24 percent were male. This distribution was the same in AY 2011 – 12.
- In AY 2012 – 13, 73 percent of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs identified as white; 11 percent identified as Hispanic or Latino; and 10 percent identified as black or African American. This distribution was nearly identical to AY 2011 – 12, when 74 percent of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs identified as white; 11 percent identified as Hispanic or Latino; and 9 percent identified as black or African American.

Teacher Preparation Program Completers

- Teacher preparation programs prepared a total of 192,459 completers in AY 2012 – 13. This represented a decrease of 5 percent from the previous academic year (203,175 program completers in AY 2011 – 12) and continued a trend of decreasing numbers of program completers. Between AY 2010 – 11 (216,630 program completers) and AY 2011 – 12, there was a 6 percent decrease in program completers.
 - Traditional teacher preparation programs prepared 163,613 completers in AY 2012 – 13. This represented a decrease of 6 percent from the previous academic year (174,206 traditional teacher preparation program completers in AY 2011 – 12) and continued a trend of decreasing numbers of traditional program completers. Between AY 2010 – 11 (179,742 traditional program completers) and AY 2011 – 12, there was a 3 percent decrease in traditional teacher preparation program completers.

- Alternative teacher preparation programs based at IHEs prepared 13,296 program completers in AY 2012 – 13. This represented a decrease of 8 percent from the previous academic year (14,465 alternative, IHE-based teacher preparation program completers in AY 2011 – 12) and continued a trend of decreasing numbers of alternative, IHE-based program completers. Between AY 2010 – 11 (16,993 alternative, IHE-based program completers) and AY 2011 – 12, there was a 15 percent decrease in alternative, IHE-based teacher preparation program completers.
- Alternative teacher preparation programs not based at IHEs prepared 15,550 program completers in AY 2012 – 13. This represented an increase of 7 percent from the previous academic year (14,504 alternative, not IHE-based teacher preparation program completers in AY 2011 – 12). Between AY 2010 – 11 (19,895 alternative, not IHE-based program completers) and AY 2011 – 12, there was a 27 percent decrease in alternative, not IHE-based teacher preparation program completers.

Top State Teacher Producers

In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that reported the greatest number of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs were unchanged from AY 2011 – 12:

- New York (47,872 or 10 percent of all students);
- Arizona (42,251 or 8 percent of all students);
- Texas (33,767 or 7 percent of all student);
- Pennsylvania (23,546 or 5 percent of all students); and
- Ohio (21,607 or 4 percent of all students).

- In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that reported the greatest number of teacher preparation program completers were unchanged from AY 2011 – 12:
 - Texas (20,828 or 11 percent of all program completers);
 - New York (18,046 or 9 percent of all program completers);
 - California (11,080 or 6 percent of all program completers);
 - Pennsylvania (10,372 or 5 percent of all program completers); and
 - Illinois (8,534 or 4 percent of all program completers).

Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) Offering Teacher Preparation Programs

- The two IHEs with the highest number of individuals enrolled in their traditional teacher preparation programs in AY 2012 – 13 were Grand Canyon University (20,045 individuals enrolled) and University of Phoenix (10,890 individuals enrolled). These two providers were also the top two IHEs with the highest number of individuals enrolled in their traditional teacher preparation programs in AY 2011 – 12 and AY 2010 – 11. Both IHEs offer online programs.
- The alternative route teacher preparation program at the University of West Florida had the highest enrollment of alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs in AY 2012 – 13 (420 individuals enrolled). The alternative route teacher preparation program at the University of North Carolina-Charlotte had the highest enrollment of alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs in AY 2011 – 12 (2,086 individuals enrolled).

State Standards for Teacher Credentials

- In 2014, all states and jurisdictions except Palau reported they had standards that prospective teachers must meet in order to attain an initial teacher credential.
- In 2014, 48 states, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands reported that they had a policy that aligns teacher credentialing standards with challenging academic content standards for k – 12 students.
- In 2014, 44 states, Puerto Rico, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands reported that they had a policy that aligns teacher credentialing standards with early learning standards for early childhood education programs.

Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs

- Twelve states and Puerto Rico reported teacher preparation programs that were low-performing or at-risk of low performance (at-risk) in 2014. Of the 46 states and jurisdictions that did not identify any programs as low-performing or at-risk in 2014, 30 of those states and jurisdictions have never identified any programs as being low-performing or at-risk.
- A total of 45 programs were classified as low-performing or at-risk in 2014. This was a decrease from 2013, when a total of 59 programs were classified as low-performing or at-risk.
- Programs identified as low-performing or at-risk represented less than 3 percent of the total number of teacher preparation programs reported in 2014.

Assessments Required for a Teaching Credential

- In AY 2012 – 13, all states and jurisdictions except Montana, Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and Palau assessed candidates for an initial teaching credential through state testing. This was unchanged from the prior academic year.
- In AY 2012 – 13, the national summary pass rate for teacher preparation program completers was 95 percent. This was a minor decrease from AY 2011 – 12, when the national summary pass rate for teacher preparation program completers was 96 percent.

Initial Credentials for Teachers

- States reported a total of 263,425 persons receiving an initial teaching credential in AY 2012 – 13, a 5 percent increase from the prior year (251,747 in AY 2011–12).
- Of the 263,425 persons receiving an initial teaching credential in AY 2012 – 13,
 - 79 percent (207,540 persons) were prepared in the same state in which they earned their initial credential; and
 - 21 percent (55,885 persons) were prepared in a different state from which they earned their initial credential.

1

Teacher Preparation Providers and Programs

This chapter presents an overview of the teacher preparation providers offering programs that are available to ensure teachers enter the classroom with the skills they need to succeed. Regardless of a teaching candidate's choice of a traditional teacher preparation provider, an alternative route teacher preparation provider based at an institution of higher education (IHE), or an alternative route teacher preparation provider not based at an IHE, it is expected that a teaching candidate will have gained the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to effectively teach the nation's diverse student population.

Following the amendments to the *HEA* enacted in 2008, states were required to report more data on traditional and alternative route teacher preparation providers than they had in previous years. For all traditional and alternative route teacher preparation providers, states began reporting data describing their programs, including the teacher preparation provider type, admissions requirements, and supervised clinical experience. Beginning in 2013, states began reporting on the individual teacher preparation programs (such as special education, elementary education, secondary English, etc.) offered within each teacher preparation provider, as well as the exit requirements from the programs.

- In 2014, states reported data on 2,171 teacher preparation providers, a slight increase from 2,163 teacher preparation providers reported


in 2013, and a 1 percent increase from 2,147 teacher preparation providers reported in 2012. For *Title II* of the *HEA* reporting, the Department counts an IHE with both a traditional teacher preparation program and an alternative route teacher preparation program as two teacher preparation providers.

- States reported three types of teacher preparation providers: traditional providers, alternative providers based at IHEs, and alternative providers not based at IHEs. Of the teacher preparation providers reported in 2014,
 - 69 percent (1,497 providers) were classified as traditional teacher preparation providers;
 - 22 percent (473 providers) were classified as alternative route teacher preparation providers based at IHEs; and

- 9 percent (201 providers) were classified as alternative route teacher preparation providers not based at IHEs (see figure 1.1).
- The classification of teacher preparation providers in 2014 was similar to the classification of teacher preparation providers in 2013, when

states reported 1,487 (69 percent) traditional teacher preparation providers, 457 (21 percent) alternative route teacher preparation providers based at IHEs, and 219 (10 percent) alternative route teacher preparation providers not based at IHEs.

Figure 1.1. Number and percentage of teacher preparation providers, by provider type: 2014




NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- Figure 1.2 shows the distribution of teacher preparation providers by provider type in 2014. In this figure, IHEs that have both traditional and alternative route teacher preparation programs are displayed only once.

Figure 1.2. Teacher preparation providers reported, by provider type and state: 2014




NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- States also reported on the number of teacher preparation programs within each teacher preparation provider. States reported a total of 26,589 teacher preparation programs in 2014. Of these,
 - 70 percent (18,514 programs) were in traditional teacher preparation providers;
 - 20 percent (5,325 programs) were in alternative route teacher preparation providers based at IHEs; and
 - 10 percent (2,750 programs) were in alternative route teacher preparation providers not based at IHEs (see figure 1.3).

Figure 1.3. Number and percentage of teacher preparation programs, by provider type: 2014



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Traditional Teacher Preparation Programs



Traditional teacher preparation programs generally serve undergraduate students who have no prior teaching or work experience and generally lead to at least a bachelor's degree. Some traditional teacher preparation programs may lead to a teaching credential but not to a degree.

States report on characteristics of the teacher preparation programs, including the requirements for admission into the programs, the requirements for exit from the programs, and the supervised clinical experience requirements of the program.

Number of Traditional Teacher Preparation Programs

- In 2014, states reported 18,514 teacher preparation programs within the 1,497 traditional teacher preparation providers.
- The average traditional teacher preparation provider offered 12 teacher preparation programs.

Traditional Teacher Preparation Program Admission Requirements

- States report on whether teacher preparation programs require the following elements for admission into the program: transcript; fingerprint check; background check; minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed; minimum grade point average (GPA); minimum

GPA in content area coursework; minimum GPA in professional education coursework; minimum ACT score; minimum SAT score; minimum basic skills test score; subject area or academic content test or other subject matter verification; recommendation(s); essay or personal statement; or interview. In responding, states were instructed to indicate only if an element was required for admission into the teacher preparation program, rather than required for admission into the IHE.

- For traditional undergraduate programs in 2014,
 - the three most commonly reported requirements for admission into traditional undergraduate teacher preparation programs were minimum GPA; transcript; and minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed. This was unchanged from 2013 and 2012.
 - of the traditional undergraduate teacher preparation programs that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for admission into the program, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 2.5.
- For traditional postgraduate programs in 2014,
 - the three most commonly reported requirements for admission into traditional postgraduate teacher preparation programs were transcript, minimum GPA, and recommendation(s). This was unchanged from 2013 and 2012.
 - of the traditional postgraduate teacher preparation programs that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for admission into the program in 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 3.0.


Traditional Teacher Preparation Program Exit Requirements

- States report on whether teacher preparation programs require certain elements for exiting the program, using the same list described above for admission requirements.
- In 2014, the three most commonly reported requirements for exiting traditional undergraduate teacher preparation programs were minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed; minimum GPA; and minimum GPA in professional education coursework.
- Of the traditional undergraduate teacher preparation programs that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for exiting the program in 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 2.5.
- In 2014, the three most commonly reported requirements for exiting traditional postgraduate teacher preparation programs were minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed; minimum GPA; and minimum GPA in professional education coursework.
- Of the traditional postgraduate teacher preparation programs that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for exiting the program in 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 3.0.

Supervised Clinical Experiences in Traditional Teacher Preparation Programs

- The 2008 amendments to *HEA* require states to report, for each teacher preparation program, the required number of hours of supervised clinical experience and numbers of faculty and students participating. “Supervised clinical experience” is a general term, and, in practice, typically refers to participation in classroom activities before student teaching and for student teaching. Two levels of commonly accepted preservice supervised clinical experience reported here are (1) classroom observation and participation, such as tutoring; small, medium, and large group activity; peer-to-peer practice teaching; and numerous other interactive teacher and student formats, but without responsibility for a classroom and (2) student teaching with responsibility for a classroom. Supervised clinical experience is defined by the state and traditional teacher preparation programs.
- In 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported average number of hours, required before student teaching in traditional teacher preparation programs was 100, and the median average number of hours required before student teaching in traditional teacher preparation programs was 125. These were unchanged from 2013 and 2012.
- In 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported average number of hours, required for student teaching in traditional teacher preparation programs was 600, and the median average number of hours required for student teaching in traditional teacher preparation programs was 525. These were unchanged from 2013 and 2012.

Alternative Route Teacher Preparation Programs



In past decades, teacher shortages in critical subjects and low numbers of minority and male candidates prompted states to develop alternative ways to prepare individuals who already held a bachelor's degree and had expertise in a subject area. Some states approved innovative teacher preparation programs targeting these candidates as alternatives to four-year undergraduate programs that dominated teacher credentialing programs in many states until the 1990s.

Through *HEA Title II*, states report data on the approved alternative route teacher preparation programs in their respective states. Alternative route teacher preparation programs typically serve candidates whom states permit to be the teachers of record in a classroom while working toward obtaining an initial teaching credential. However, for purposes of *HEA Title II* reporting, each state determines which teacher preparation programs are classified as alternative programs.

States also report on the alternative routes to a teaching credential offered in the


state. Alternative routes to a teaching credential may vary from alternative route teacher preparation programs. Alternative routes to a teaching credential are state-approved overarching alternative pathways through which an individual can earn a teaching credential, while alternative route teacher preparation programs are specific and structured programs through which an individual receives the training and preparation necessary to earn a teaching credential. In addition, alternative routes to a teaching credential are defined as such by the state and vary significantly from one state to another. In some states, such as California, alternative routes to a teaching credential provide a state-approved framework or model that allows many different institutions or organizations to offer alternative route teacher preparation programs using the approved model. In other states, such as Texas, an alternative route to a teaching credential is an overarching pathway that includes myriad models and types of alternative route teacher preparation programs.

Alternative Routes to a Teaching Credential

In 2014, 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands reported having approved alternative routes to a teaching credential (see figure 1.4). This was unchanged from 2013 and 2012.

- North Dakota, Ohio, Wyoming, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and Palau did not have approved alternative routes to a teaching credential in 2014.

Figure 1.4. States with and without approved alternative routes to teaching certification: 2014



NOTE: For purposes of HEA Title II reporting, alternative routes to a teaching credential are defined as such by the state. The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state Title II report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). Higher Education Act Title II reporting system.

Number of Alternative Route Teacher Preparation Programs

- In 2014, states reported 5,325 teacher preparation programs within the 473 alternative, IHE-based teacher preparation providers.
- The average alternative, IHE-based teacher preparation provider offered 11 teacher preparation programs.
- In 2014, states reported 2,750 teacher preparation programs within the 201 alternative, not IHE-based teacher preparation providers.
- The average alternative, not IHE-based teacher preparation provider offered 14 teacher preparation programs.

Alternative Route Teacher Preparation Program Admission Requirements

- States report on whether teacher preparation programs require any of the following elements for admission into the program: transcript; fingerprint check; background check; minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed; minimum GPA; minimum GPA in content area coursework; minimum GPA in professional education coursework; minimum ACT score; minimum SAT score; minimum basic skills test score; subject area or academic content test or other subject matter verification; recommendation(s); essay or personal statement; or interview.
- In 2014, the three most commonly reported requirements for admission into undergraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, IHE-based providers were minimum GPA; minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed; and transcript. This was unchanged from 2013 and 2012.
- Of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, IHE-based providers that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for admission into the program in 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 2.5.
- In 2014, the three most commonly reported requirements for admission into postgraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, IHE-based providers were transcript; minimum GPA; and minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed. This was unchanged from 2013 and 2012.
- Of the postgraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, IHE-based providers that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for admission into the program in 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 2.5.
- In 2014, the three most commonly reported requirements for admission into postgraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, not IHE-based providers were transcript; subject area or academic content test or other subject matter verification; and minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed. This was unchanged from 2013 and 2012.
- Of the postgraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, not IHE-based providers that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for admission into the program in 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 2.5.

Alternative Route Teacher Preparation Program Exit Requirements

- States report on whether teacher preparation programs require certain elements for exiting the program, using the same list described above for admission requirements.
- In 2014, the three most commonly reported requirements for exiting undergraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, IHE-based providers were minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed; minimum GPA; and minimum GPA in content area coursework.
- Of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, IHE-based providers that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for exiting the program in 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 2.5.
- In 2014, the three most commonly reported requirements for exiting postgraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, IHE-based providers were minimum GPA; minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed; and subject area or academic content test or other subject matter verification.
- Of the postgraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, IHE-based providers that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for exiting the program in 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 3.0.
- In 2014, the three most commonly reported requirements for exiting postgraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, not IHE-based providers were subject area or academic content test or other subject matter verification; minimum number of courses, credits, or semester hours completed; and recommendation.
- Of the postgraduate teacher preparation programs in alternative, not IHE-based providers that reported having a minimum GPA requirement for exiting the program in 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported minimum GPA required, was 3.0.

Supervised Clinical Experiences in Alternative Route Teacher Preparation Programs

- Since most alternative route teacher preparation programs primarily serve candidates who are the teacher of record in the classroom while participating in the program, alternative route teacher preparation programs typically do not have the same supervised clinical experience requirements as traditional teacher preparation programs. While traditional teacher preparation programs often include a significant student teaching requirement, alternative route teacher preparation program candidates may instead engage in a form of mentoring or induction support as a part of the program.
- In 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported average number of hours, required for mentoring and induction support in alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs was zero. This was unchanged from 2013. The median average number of hours required for mentoring and induction support in alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs was 15. This was an increase from 12 in 2013.
- In 2014, the mode, or most commonly reported average number of hours, required for mentoring and induction support in alternative route teacher preparation programs not based at IHEs was zero. This was unchanged from 2013. The median average number of hours required for mentoring and induction support in alternative route teacher preparation programs not based at IHEs was 40. This was an increase from 38 in 2013.

2

Teacher Preparation Program Participants

As required by Title II of the HEA, states report on the characteristics of teacher preparation program participants. For all traditional and alternative route teacher preparation providers, states report data on total enrollment, enrollment disaggregated by gender and race/ethnicity, the total number of program completers, and the number of program completers disaggregated by the subject area for which they were prepared to teach.

Enrollment Characteristics


As required by *Title II*, states report the number of teacher candidates enrolled in each state-approved teacher preparation provider. These data include the number of individuals enrolled by program type, by gender, and by race/ethnicity. When comparing the teacher preparation program enrollment data that states reported to the national k – 12 student population gathered by the Department's

National Center for Education Statistics, the data show little demographic overlap of teacher preparation programs' enrollees and k – 12 populations of students. In the aggregate, the gender and race/ethnicity of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs differ from k – 12 students nationwide.



- During academic year (AY) 2012 – 13, a total of 499,800 individuals were enrolled in teacher preparation programs, a decrease of 20 percent from 623,190 enrolled individuals in AY 2011 – 12. This continued a trend of decreasing enrollment, following a 9 percent decrease between AY 2010 – 11 (684,801 individuals enrolled) and AY 2011 – 12.
- Of the individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs in AY 2012 – 13, more than 89 percent (447,116 individuals) were enrolled in traditional teacher preparation programs; more than 5 percent (25,135 individuals) were enrolled in alternative programs based at institutions of higher education (IHEs); and nearly 6 percent (27,549 individuals) were enrolled in alternative programs not based at IHEs (see figure 2.1).

Figure 2.1. Percentage enrollment in teacher preparation programs, by program type: AY 2012 – 13




NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. There were 499,800 total enrollees in teacher preparation programs in AY 2012 – 13.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Enrollment by Gender

- Seventy-six percent of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs in AY 2012 – 13 were female, and 24 percent were male. By contrast, 49 percent of k – 12 students nationwide were female, and 51 percent were male in AY 2012 – 13 (see figure 2.2).
- The proportion of males and females enrolled in teacher preparation programs varied by program type.
 - In traditional teacher preparation programs, 77 percent of individuals enrolled were female, and 23 percent were male.
 - In alternative programs based at IHEs, 69 percent of individuals enrolled were female, and 31 percent were male.
 - In alternative programs not based at IHEs, 66 percent of individuals enrolled were female, and 34 percent were male (see figure 2.2).

Figure 2.2. Enrollees in teacher preparation programs, by program type and gender, and gender of k – 12 students nationwide: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Data on enrollment by gender and race/ethnicity were not available for all teacher preparation programs; some teacher preparation programs provided only the total number of students enrolled. Thus, the sum of the number of students enrolled by gender and race/ethnicity will not equal the total number of individuals enrolled.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Common Core of Data System (CCDS).

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

- Similar to the disparity between the gender of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs and the gender of k – 12 students nationwide, the race/ethnicity of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs are very different from the race/ethnicity of the k – 12 student population nationwide (see table 2.1 and figure 2.3).
 - Seventy-three percent of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs in AY 2012–13 were white, while only 51 percent of k – 12 students in AY 2012 – 13 were white.
 - Individuals identifying as Hispanic or Latino were underrepresented in teacher preparation programs. While 24 percent of k – 12 students were Hispanic or Latino in AY 2012 – 13, only 11 percent of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs identified as Hispanic or Latino (see figure 2.3).
 - Individuals identifying as black or African American were also underrepresented in teacher preparation programs. While 16 percent of k – 12 students were black or African American in AY 2012 – 13, only 10 percent of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs identified as black or African American (see figure 2.3).
- While there are disproportionately more white individuals and fewer racial and ethnic minorities enrolled in teacher preparation programs as compared to the k – 12 student population nationwide, a higher proportion of individuals enrolled at alternative route providers were racial and ethnic minorities as compared to traditional programs in AY 2012 – 13.
 - Sixteen percent of individuals enrolled in alternative, IHE-based programs and 18 percent in alternative, not IHE-based programs were black or African-American, compared to 9 percent in traditional teacher preparation programs (see table 2.1).
 - Eighteen percent of individuals enrolled in alternative, not IHE-based programs were Hispanic/Latino, compared to 11 percent in traditional teacher preparation programs (see table 2.1).


Table 2.1. Number and percentage of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs, by gender, race/ethnicity, and program type: AY 2012 – 13

Selected characteristics	Program type							
	All programs		Traditional		Alternative IHE based		Alternative not IHE based	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Students enrolled by gender								
Female	374,239	76%	339,674	77%	17,111	69%	17,454	66%
Male	119,712	24%	102,952	23%	7,861	31%	8,899	34%
Students enrolled by race/ethnicity								
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,714	1%	3,380	1%	212	1%	122	1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,965	3%	12,457	3%	906	4%	602	3%
Black or African American	46,338	10%	38,607	9%	3,837	16%	3,894	18%
Hispanic/Latino of any race	51,364	11%	44,890	11%	2,506	11%	3,968	18%
White	345,300	73%	317,174	74%	15,227	65%	12,899	59%
Two or more races	10,860	2%	9,887	2%	591	3%	382	2%

NOTE: Data on enrollment by gender and race/ethnicity were not available for all teacher preparation programs. Some teacher preparation programs provided only the total number of students enrolled; thus, the sum of the number of students enrolled by characteristic will not equal the total. Percentages may not sum to 100. The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Common Core of Data System (CCDS).

Figure 2.3. Percentage of enrollees in teacher preparation programs, by race/ethnicity and program type, and k – 12 students, by race/ethnicity: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Data on enrollment by gender and race/ethnicity were not available for all teacher preparation programs; some teacher preparation programs provided only the total number of students enrolled. Thus, the sum of the number of students enrolled by gender and race/ethnicity will not equal the total number of individuals enrolled. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Common Core of Data System (CCDS).

Program Completers



States reported on the total number of program completers from each teacher preparation provider in their state. For purposes of *HEA Title II* reporting, a program completer is defined as a person who has met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements. In applying this definition, the fact that an individual has or has not been recommended to the state for an initial credential may not be used as a criterion for determining who is a program completer.

- Teacher preparation programs prepared a total of 192,459 completers in AY 2012 – 13. This represented a decrease of 5 percent from the previous academic year (203,175 program completers in AY 2011 – 12) and continued a trend of decreasing numbers of program completers. Between AY 2010 – 11 (216,630 program completers) and AY 2011 – 12, there was a 6 percent decrease in program completers (see figure 2.4).

Traditional Teacher Preparation Programs

- Traditional teacher preparation programs prepared 163,613 completers in AY 2012 – 13. This represented a decrease of 6 percent from the previous academic year (174,206 traditional teacher preparation program completers in AY 2011 – 12) and continued a trend of decreasing numbers of traditional program completers. Between AY 2010 – 11


(179,742 traditional program completers) and AY 2011 – 12, there was a 3 percent decrease in traditional teacher preparation program completers (see figure 2.4).

- In AY 2012 – 13, 85 percent of all program completers were from traditional teacher preparation programs. This was a slight decrease from AY 2011 – 12, when 86 percent of all program completers were from traditional teacher preparation programs, and an increase from AY 2010 – 11, when 83 percent of all program completers were from traditional teacher preparation programs.

Alternative Route Teacher Preparation Programs

- Alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs prepared 13,296 program completers in AY 2012 – 13. This represented a decrease of 8 percent from the previous academic year (14,465 alternative, IHE-based teacher preparation program completers in AY 2011 – 12) and continued a trend of decreasing numbers of alternative, IHE-based program completers. Between AY 2010 – 11 (16,993 alternative, IHE-based program completers) and AY 2011 – 12, there was a 15 percent decrease in alternative, IHE-based teacher preparation program completers (see figure 2.4).
- Alternative route teacher preparation programs not based at IHEs prepared 15,550 program completers in AY 2012 – 13. This represented an increase of 7 percent from the previous academic year (14,504 alternative, not IHE-based teacher preparation program completers in AY 2011 – 12). Between AY 2010 – 11 (19,895 alternative, not IHE-based program completers) and AY 2011 – 12, there was a 27 percent decrease in alternative, not IHE-based teacher preparation program completers (see figure 2.4).
- In AY 2012 – 13, 7 percent of completers came from alternative programs based at IHEs, and 8 percent came from alternative programs not based at IHEs.

Figure 2.4. Number of program completers, by traditional and alternative routes: AY 2007 – 08 through AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Most Common Teacher Preparation Subject Areas



In addition to reporting the total number of program completers from each teacher preparation provider, states also report their program completers disaggregated by the subject areas in which program completers are prepared to teach. Across all program types, elementary education and special education were the two most common subject areas in which program completers were prepared to teach.

- Across all programs and program types, the most common subject area for teacher preparation was elementary education. In traditional programs, 42 percent of program completers studied to teach elementary education. In comparison, in alternative, IHE-based programs, 24 percent of program completers studied to teach elementary education, and in alternative, not IHE-based programs, 26 percent of program completers studied to teach elementary education (see Table 2.2).
- Special education was the second most common subject area for teacher preparation. In traditional programs, 16 percent of program completers studied to teach special education. Alternative route programs more commonly prepared teachers to teach special education; in alternative, IHE-based programs, 20

percent of program completers studied to teach special education, and in alternative, not IHE-based programs, 17 percent of program completers studied to teach special education (see Table 2.2).

- In both traditional and alternative, not IHE-based programs, the third most common subject area for teacher preparation was early childhood

education. In both traditional and alternative, not IHE-based programs, 13 percent of program completers studied to teach early childhood education. In alternative, IHE-based programs, only 7 percent of program completers from alternative, IHE-based programs studied to teach early childhood education (see Table 2.2).

Table 2.2. Percentage of teacher preparation program completers, by type of program and most common subject areas: AY 2012 – 13

Traditional		Alternative IHE based		Alternative not IHE based	
Subject	Percent of Program Completers	Subject	Percent of Program Completers	Subject	Percent of Program Completers
Elementary Education	42%	Elementary Education	24%	Elementary Education	26%
Special Education	16%	Special Education	20%	Special Education	17%
Early Childhood Education	13%	English/Language Arts	9%	Early Childhood Education	13%
English/Language Arts	9%	Mathematics	8%	Mathematics	12%
Mathematics	7%	Early Childhood Education	7%	English/Language Arts	11%
English as a Second Language	6%	Social Studies	5%	General Science	8%
Social Studies	5%	General Science	4%	English as a Second Language	7%

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Program completers may be reported in more than one subject area. For example, a program completer prepared in both elementary education and mathematics is counted in each subject area. Additionally, not all subject areas are included in this table; only the seven most common subject areas for each program type are displayed. Thus, percentages are not expected to equal 100 percent. Subject areas in bold are high-need subject areas. Alternative programs prepare a higher proportion of teachers in high-need subject areas; including science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) subjects.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.


Top State Teacher Producers by Enrollment and Program Type



States reported on the total number of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs in their state. New York led the nation in the number of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs, accounting for 10 percent of all enrolled students nationwide, followed by Arizona at 8 percent. Texas accounted for 7 percent of all enrolled students nationwide and led the nation in individuals enrolled in alternative route teacher preparation programs, accounting for 13 percent of individuals enrolled in alternative programs based at IHEs and 41 percent of individuals enrolled in alternative programs not based at IHEs.

- In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that enrolled the greatest number of individuals in teacher preparation programs were (see figure 2.5)
 - New York (47,872 or 10 percent of all students);
 - Arizona (42,251 or 8 percent of all students);
 - Texas (33,767 or 7 percent of all students);
 - Pennsylvania (23,546 or 5 percent of all students); and
 - Ohio (21,607 or 4 percent of all students).

Figure 2.5. The five states with the highest enrollment in teacher preparation programs, by percentage of nationwide enrollment: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that enrolled the greatest number of individuals in traditional teacher preparation programs were (see table 2.3)
 - New York (45,312 or 10 percent of all traditional students);
 - Arizona (41,474 or 9 percent of all traditional students);
 - Pennsylvania (22,948 or 5 percent of all traditional students);
 - Ohio (21,607 or 5 percent of all traditional students); and
 - Texas (19,163 or 4 percent of all traditional students).
- In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that enrolled the greatest number of individuals in alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs were (see table 2.3)
 - Texas (3,369 or 13 percent of all alternative, IHE-based students);
 - New York (2,560 or 10 percent of all alternative, IHE-based students);
 - Florida (2,393 or 10 percent of all alternative, IHE-based students);
 - Louisiana (1,531 or 6 percent of all alternative, IHE-based students); and
 - North Carolina (1,526 or 6 percent of all alternative, IHE-based students).

- In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that enrolled the greatest number of individuals in alternative route teacher preparation programs not based at IHEs were (see table 2.3)
 - Texas (11,235 or 41 percent of all alternative, non-IHE-based students);
 - North Carolina (3,449 or 13 percent of all alternative, non-IHE-based students);
 - New Jersey (2,373 or 9 percent of all alternative, non-IHE-based students);
 - Louisiana (856 or 3 percent of all alternative, non-IHE-based students); and
 - Maryland (778 or 3 percent of all alternative, non-IHE-based students).

Table 2.3. Number and percentage of enrollees in teacher preparation programs, by state, state's rank, and program type: AY 2012 – 13

Rank	Traditional			Alternative IHE based			Alternative not IHE based		
	State	Enrollees	%	State	Enrollees	%	State	Enrollees	%
1	New York	45,312	10%	Texas	3,369	13%	Texas	11,235	41%
2	Arizona	41,474	9%	New York	2,560	10%	North Carolina	3,449	13%
3	Pennsylvania	22,948	5%	Florida	2,393	10%	New Jersey	2,373	9%
4	Ohio	21,607	5%	Louisiana	1,531	6%	Louisiana	856	3%
5	Texas	19,163	4%	North Carolina	1,526	6%	Maryland	778	3%
6	California	17,950	4%	California	1,367	5%	South Carolina	726	3%
7	Illinois	17,303	4%	New Mexico	1,224	5%	Massachusetts	688	2%
8	Massachusetts	14,890	3%	Alabama	1,195	5%	Florida	645	2%
9	Michigan	14,189	3%	Arkansas	1,195	5%	Georgia	617	2%
10	Virginia	12,574	3%	Indiana	1,183	5%	Missouri	543	2%
	All other states	219,706	49%	All other states	7,592	30%	All other states	5,639	20%

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.


Top State Teacher Producers by Completers and Program Type



States reported on the total number of program completers in their state. Texas led the nation in preparing the highest number of program completers, with 11 percent of all program completers nationwide, followed by New York with 9 percent of all program completers nationwide. Texas was by far the largest producer of alternative program completers, accounting for 16 percent of all program completers from alternative programs based at IHEs, and 48 percent of all program completers from alternative programs not based at IHEs. New York was the largest producer of traditional teacher preparation program completers nationwide, accounting for 10 percent of all traditional teacher preparation program completers.

- In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that prepared the greatest number of teacher preparation program completers were (see figure 2.6)
 - Texas (20,828 or 11 percent of all program completers);
 - New York (18,046 or 9 percent of all program completers);
 - California (11,080 or 6 percent of all program completers);
 - Pennsylvania (10,372 or 5 percent of all program completers); and
 - Illinois (8,534 or 4 percent of all program completers).

Figure 2.6. Top five teacher-producing states, by percentage of total teacher preparation program completers nationwide: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that prepared the greatest number of traditional teacher preparation program completers were (see table 2.4)
 - New York (16,976 or 10 percent of all traditional completers);
 - Texas (11,203 or 7 percent of all traditional completers);
 - Pennsylvania (9,897 or 6 percent of all traditional completers);
 - California (9,527 or 6 percent of all traditional completers); and
 - Illinois (8,084 or 5 percent of all traditional completers).
- In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that prepared the greatest number of program completers from alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs were (see table 2.4)
 - Texas (2,182 or 16 percent of all alternative, IHE-based completers); California (1,208 or 9 percent of all alternative, IHE-based completers); Florida (1,146 or 9 percent of all alternative, IHE-based completers);
 - New York (1,070 or 8 percent of all alternative, IHE-based completers); and
 - Louisiana (914 or 7 percent of all alternative, IHE-based completers).

- In AY 2012 – 13, the five states that prepared the greatest number of program completers from alternative route teacher preparation programs not based at IHEs were (see table 2.4)
 - Texas (7,443 or 48 percent of all alternative, not IHE-based completers);
 - New Jersey (1,654 or 11 percent of all alternative, not IHE-based completers);
 - Florida (645 or 4 percent of all alternative, not IHE-based completers);
 - Oklahoma (523 or 3 percent of all alternative, not IHE-based completers); and
 - Georgia (450 or 3 percent of all alternative, not IHE-based completers).

Table 2.4. Number and percentage of teacher preparation program completers, by state, state’s rank, and program type: AY 2012 – 13

Rank	Traditional			Alternative IHE based			Alternative not IHE based		
	State	Completers	%	State	Completers	%	State	Completers	%
1	New York	16,976	10%	Texas	2,182	16%	Texas	7,443	48%
2	Texas	11,203	7%	California	1,208	9%	New Jersey	1,654	11%
3	Pennsylvania	9,897	6%	Florida	1,146	9%	Florida	645	4%
4	California	9,527	6%	New York	1,070	8%	Oklahoma	523	3%
5	Illinois	8,084	5%	Louisiana	914	7%	Georgia	450	3%
6	Ohio	6,667	4%	Indiana	698	5%	North Carolina	371	2%
7	Arizona	5,638	3%	Mississippi	592	4%	Louisiana	363	2%
8	Georgia	5,296	3%	Tennessee	553	4%	California	345	2%
9	Florida	5,055	3%	North Carolina	538	4%	Maryland	338	2%
10	North Carolina	4,604	3%	Alabama	507	4%	Colorado	293	2%
	All other states	80,666	49%	All other states	3,888	29%	All other states	3,125	20%

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

3

Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) Offering Teacher Preparation Programs

Most of the teacher preparation program providers in the United States are institutions of higher education (IHEs), and, consequently, most teacher preparation programs offered in the United States are based in IHEs. Teacher preparation programs based in IHEs can be traditional or alternative route programs leading to an initial state teaching credential or license.

IHEs Offering Teacher Preparation Programs by Type and Sector



IHEs that offer teacher preparation programs vary by institution type, sector, and the populations they serve. IHE-based teacher preparation program providers may be two- or four-year institutions, public, private not-for-profit, or private for-profit institutions, and may be minority-serving institutions.


- In academic year (AY) 2012 – 13, a total of 1,541 IHEs offered teacher preparation programs. Of those, 429 (28 percent) offered both traditional and alternative route programs. Counting all traditional programs at a single IHE as a single program and all alternative route

programs at a single IHE as a single program, IHEs offered a total of 1,970 programs in AY 2012 – 13. These data represent a slight increase from the two prior years. In AY 2010 – 11, a total of 1,517 IHEs offered teacher preparation programs; 27 percent offered both traditional and alternative route programs; and a total of 1,926 programs were offered. In AY 2011 – 12, 1,522 IHEs offered teacher preparation programs; 28 percent offered both traditional and alternative route programs; and a total of 1,944 programs were offered.

- In AY 2012 – 13, nearly all (99 percent) of the IHEs offering teacher preparation programs were four-year institutions, the same as in AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12.
- In AY 2012 – 13, nearly all of the individuals enrolled in traditional teacher preparation programs attended four-year institutions. Approximately 1 percent of traditional enrollees attended a two-year institution (see figure 3.1).

- Among individuals enrolled in alternative, IHE-based programs, 7 percent were enrolled in two-year institutions, and 93 percent were enrolled in four-year institutions in AY 2012 – 13 (see figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1. Percentage of individuals enrolled in two- and four-year teacher preparation programs based at IHEs, by program type: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: This figure is based on data for the 1,851 IHE-based teacher preparation programs that had data available.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system. U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

- In AY 2012 – 13, 60 percent of IHEs offering teacher preparation programs were private not-for-profit institutions; 38 percent were public institutions; and 2 percent were private for-profit institutions. The distribution was similar in both AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12.


Characteristics of IHEs and Enrollment in Teacher Preparation Programs



IHEs offering state-approved traditional or alternative route teacher preparation programs may be public or private institutions. The private institutions may be not-for-profit or for-profit. In AY 2012 – 13, the majority of students enrolled in teacher preparation programs were enrolled in a traditional program offered at a four-year public IHE.

- In AY 2012 – 13, of the individuals enrolled in traditional teacher preparation programs, 60 percent attended public institutions; 34 percent attended private not-for-profit institutions; and 5 percent attended private for-profit institutions (see figure 3.2). This represents a change from AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12. In AY 2010 – 11, 65 percent of individuals enrolled in traditional teacher preparation programs attended public institutions, and in AY 2011 – 12, 67 percent did so.
- Of the individuals enrolled in alternative, IHE-based programs; 69 percent attended public institutions; 30 percent attended private not-for-profit institutions; and 1 percent attended private for-profit institutions (see figure 3.2). This represents a change from AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12. In AY 2010 – 11, 62 percent of individuals enrolled in alternative, IHE-based programs attended public institutions, and in AY 2011 – 12, 61 percent did so.

Figure 3.2. Percentage of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs based at IHEs, by sector and program type: AY 2012 – 13




NOTE: This figure reflects data states reported for the 1,851 teacher preparation programs that had data available for this figure.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

- Teacher preparation programs housed at private institutions tended to be smaller programs, on average, than teacher preparation programs housed at public institutions. While 59 percent of all IHE-based teacher preparation programs are housed at private institutions, those programs enroll 39 percent of the individuals enrolled in IHE-based teacher preparation programs (see figure 3.3). This distribution was very similar in AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12.
- Conversely, 41 percent of IHE-based teacher preparation programs are located within public institutions and enroll 61 percent of the individuals enrolled in IHE-based teacher preparation programs (see figure 3.3). This distribution was very similar in AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12.

Figure 3.3. Percentage of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs and of programs at IHEs, by sector: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: This figure reflects data states reported for the 1,851 teacher preparation programs that had data available for this figure.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system. U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Largest IHE Teacher Preparation Programs by Student Enrollment

Traditional teacher preparation programs enroll far more individuals than their alternative route teacher preparation program counterparts. Enrollment in the largest traditional teacher preparation programs far exceeded that of enrollment in the largest IHE-based alternative route teacher preparation programs. The two traditional teacher preparation programs with the highest enrollment both offer online programs, and their enrollment far exceeded that of other traditional teacher preparation programs.

- A total of 1,497 IHEs offered traditional teacher preparation programs in AY 2012 – 13, an increase from 1,487 in AY 2011 – 12 and 1,480 in 2010 – 11. As the number of IHEs offering traditional preparation programs increased, however, student enrollment in these programs decreased — from 648,744 in AY 2011 – 12, to 593,457 in AY 2011 – 12, and to 447,116 in AY 2012 – 13.
- In AY 2012 – 13, the two IHEs with the highest number of individuals enrolled in their traditional teacher preparation programs were Grand Canyon University (20,045 individuals enrolled) and University of Phoenix (10,890 individuals enrolled) (see table 3.1). Both IHEs also had the two largest traditional teacher preparation programs in AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12. Additionally, both IHEs offer online programs.

- A total of 473 IHEs offered alternative route teacher preparation programs in AY 2012 – 13, up from 457 in AY 2011 – 12 and 446 in AY 2010 – 11. Student enrollment in these programs followed the same pattern seen in traditional teacher preparation programs, decreasing from 36,978 in 2010 – 11, to 32,276 in 2011 – 12, and to 25,135 in 2012 – 13.
- In AY 2012 – 13, the alternative route teacher preparation program at the University of West Florida had the highest enrollment of alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs (420 individuals enrolled). The Relay School of Education had the second highest IHE-based alternative route teacher preparation program enrollment, with 407 individuals

enrolled (see table 3.2). In AY 2011 – 12, the alternative route teacher preparation program at the University of North Carolina Charlotte had the highest enrollment of alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs (2,086 individuals enrolled). In AY 2010 – 11, the alternative route teacher preparation program at the University of Nevada Las Vegas had the highest enrollment of alternative route teacher preparation programs based at IHEs. In both AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12, the alternative route teacher preparation program at Teachers College at Columbia University had the second highest enrollment of IHE-based alternative route teacher preparation programs.

Table 3.1. 10 largest traditional teacher preparation programs at IHEs, by state and total enrollment: AY 2012 – 13

State	Program	Total enrollment
Arizona	Grand Canyon University	20,045
Arizona	University of Phoenix AZ	10,890
Arizona	Arizona State University Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College	3,613
Idaho	Brigham Young University Idaho	3,541
Utah	Brigham Young University	3,470
Illinois	Illinois State University	3,408
Virginia	Liberty University	3,133
Kentucky	Western Kentucky University	3,070
New York	CUNY Queens College	2,834
Massachusetts	Bridgewater State University	2,779

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Table 3.2. 10 largest alternative route teacher preparation programs at IHEs, by state and total enrollment: AY 2012 – 13

State	Program	Total enrollment
Florida	University of West Florida	420
New York	Relay School of Education	407
New York	CUNY Hunter College	389
North Carolina	University of North Carolina–Pembroke	373
New York	Pace University NYC	336
New Mexico	Santa Fe Community College	311
North Carolina	North Carolina Central University	311
Alabama	University of Alabama at Birmingham	296
New York	Long Island University Brooklyn	292
Arkansas	University of Central Arkansas	289

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.


SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Enrollment in IHE-Based Teacher Preparation Programs and in Host IHEs⁷

Teacher preparation programs based at IHEs had a demographic makeup that differs from that of the institutions where the teacher preparation programs are based (host IHEs). In other words, teacher preparation programs seem to attract a slightly different demographic than the institution as a whole. In general, teacher preparation programs had a higher proportion of white individuals enrolled than did the institutions as a whole. Minorities comprised a smaller percentage of enrollees in teacher preparation program enrollment than in host IHEs.

- Of the individuals enrolled in IHE-based teacher preparation programs, 74 percent identified as white, compared to 63 percent at their host IHEs (see figure 3.4). This distribution was similar in AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12.
- Of the IHE-based teacher preparation program participants, 9 percent identified as black or African American, compared to 13 percent at their host IHEs (see figure 3.4). This distribution was similar in AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12.
- Of the individuals in IHE-based teacher preparation programs, 10 percent identified as Hispanic or Latino, compared to 14 percent at their host institutions (see figure 3.4). This distribution was similar in AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12.
- Of the individuals in IHE-based teacher preparation programs, 2 percent identified as Asian, compared to 6 percent at their host IHEs (see figure 3.4). This distribution was similar in AY 2010 – 11 and AY 2011 – 12.

Figure 3.4. Percentage of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs based at IHEs compared to the percentage of all students enrolled at the host IHEs, by race/ethnicity: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: TPPs are teacher preparation programs. Host IHEs are the IHEs at which the TPPs are based. This figure includes data for the 1,851 IHE-based teacher preparation programs that had data available. Percentages may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

⁷ The host IHE is the institution where the teacher preparation program is based. For example, for teacher preparation programs within the University of Maryland's College of Education, the host IHE is the University of Maryland.

Teacher Preparation Programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) are “...any historically black college or university that was established prior to 1964, whose principal mission was, and is, the education of black Americans, and that is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Secretary [of Education] to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation.”⁸ *Title III of HEA* provides financial assistance to HBCUs that includes establishing teacher preparation programs.

- During AY 2012 – 13, 75 HBCUs offered teacher preparation programs. Programs at these HBCUs enrolled 2 percent of the individuals enrolled in IHE-based teacher preparation programs (see table 3.3).
- Alternative, IHE-based programs had a higher percentage of students enrolled in HBCUs than traditional programs. Among individuals enrolled in IHE-based alternative route teacher preparation programs, 4 percent were enrolled in HBCUs, compared to 2 percent among individuals enrolled in traditional teacher preparation programs (see table 3.3).
- Of the individuals enrolled in all IHE-based teacher preparation programs nationally who identified as black or African American, 16 percent were enrolled in HBCUs.
- The majority of HBCU-based teacher preparation programs (57 percent) were housed at public institutions, while 43 percent were based in private not-for-profit institutions. Of the individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs at HBCUs, 83 percent were enrolled at public institutions, compared to 17 percent enrolled in private not-for-profit institutions (see table 3.4).

⁸ For more information on the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, go to: <http://www.ed.gov/edblogs/whhbcu/one-hundred-and-five-historically-black-colleges-and-universities/>.

Table 3.3. Number and percentage enrolled in IHE-based teacher preparation programs at HBCUs and non-HBCUs, by program type: AY 2012 – 13

Selected characteristics	Program type					
	All programs IHE based		Traditional IHE based		Alternative IHE based	
	Enrollment	Percent	Enrollment	Percent	Enrollment	Percent
HBCU	7,415	2%	6,490	2%	925	4%
Not HBCU	422,654	98%	400,449	98%	22,205	96%
Total	430,069	100%	406,939	100%	23,130	100%

NOTE: This figure reflects data states reported for the 1,851 teacher preparation programs that had data available.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.
U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Table 3.4. Number and percentage enrolled in IHE-based teacher preparation programs at HBCUs, by program type and sector: AY 2012 – 13

IHE Sector	Program type					
	All programs IHE based at HBCUs		Traditional IHE based		Alternative IHE based	
	Enrollment	Percent	Enrollment	Percent	Enrollment	Percent
Public	6,138	83%	5,294	82%	844	91%
Private not-for-profit	1,277	17%	1,196	18%	81	9%
Private for-profit	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	7,415	100%	6,490	100%	925	100%

NOTE: This figure reflects data states reported for the 1,851 teacher preparation programs that had data available.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Title II of the HEA Teacher Quality Partnership Discretionary Grant Program Awards



Title II of HEA also authorizes the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) program,⁹ which funds eligible partnerships designed to improve teacher preparation. The TQP program offers competitive grants to partnerships comprised at a minimum of (1) institutions of higher education along with their schools or divisions of education and arts and sciences and (2) high-need Local Education Agencies and high-need schools they serve to conduct two kinds of programs. One TQP component offers funding to reform the pre-baccalaureate teacher preparation program (or teacher preparation program offered in a

fifth year after participants had received their bachelor's degree), and then to provide support for teachers placed in the partnership's high need schools. The other TQP component offers funding for a teaching residency program in which participants are selected to work alongside teacher mentors in those schools while they earn a master's degree and become certified. The *HEA* requires the Department to annually report information about the funded projects in the *Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality*.

- The Department awarded 40 TQP grants in fiscal year (FY) 2009 and FY 2010 (see table 3.5). A new cohort of TQP grants was awarded in FY 2014. However, as the 2014 TQP grants had not yet been implemented at the time of the data collections included in this report, information on the 2014 grant awards is not provided.
- There were three types of TQP grants awarded in FY 2009 and FY 2010:
 1. Projects that create or enhance teacher residency programs primarily focused on preparing elementary education, mathematics, science, and special education teachers;
 2. Projects that reform all pre-baccalaureate or fifth-year licensing programs at the participating IHEs; and
 3. Projects that both (a) create or enhance teacher residency programs and (b) reform pre-baccalaureate or fifth-year licensing programs.
- Of the 40 TQP grants awarded between FY 2009 and FY 2010, 19 were for creating or enhancing teacher residency programs; 12 were for reforming pre-baccalaureate or fifth-year licensing programs; and 9 were for projects that covered both purposes (see figure 3.5).

⁹ Project abstracts and other information are available at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/awards.html>.

Table 3.5. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by state, grantee, and name of partnership: FY 2009 and FY 2010

State	Grantee	Name of partnership
2009		
Arizona	Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University	PDS NEXT
California	California State L.A. University Auxiliary Services, Inc.	Los Angeles Urban Teacher Residency Program
	California State University, Bakersfield	California Partnership for Teacher Quality Programs
	California State University, Dominguez Hills	California State University, Dominguez Hills Urban Teacher Residency
	The CSU, Chico Research Foundation	Co-STARS: Collaboration for Student and Teacher Achievement in Rural Schools
	The Regents of the University of California	Los Angeles Urban Teacher Residency (LA-UTR)
Georgia	Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc.	NET-Q: Network for Enhancing Teaching Quality
	Kennesaw State University	Vertically Articulated Professional Development Schools
Illinois	Illinois State University	Teacher Education and Assessment Continuum for High-need Educators and Resources + Principal Leadership in Urban Schools (TEACHER + PLUS) Project
	National Louis University	Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL)
	The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois	Chicago Teacher Partnership Program
Indiana	Trustees of Indiana University	Urban Education Excellence: STEM Teaching Residency with Dual Licensure in Special Education
Kansas	MidAmerica Nazarene University	Preparing Educators for Rural Kansas
	Wichita State University	Wichita Teacher Quality Partnership
Kentucky	Western Kentucky University Research Foundation, Inc.	GSKyTeach
Louisiana	Louisiana State University and A&M College	Central Louisiana Academic Residency for Teachers
Missouri	Curators, Univ. of Missouri— on behalf of UMKC	Institute for Urban Education Change Agents for Urban School Excellence

Table continued on next page

Table 3.5. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by state, grantee, and name of partnership: FY 2009 and FY 2010 (continued)

State	Grantee	Name of partnership
2009		
North Carolina	East Carolina University	Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Comprehensive Data-Driven School-University Approach to P-16 Reform
New Jersey	Montclair State University	Newark-Montclair Urban Teacher Residency Program
	William Paterson University	Garden State Partnership for Teacher Quality
New York	Bard College	Bard College Rural Teacher Residency Program
	Research Foundation of CUNY on behalf of Hunter College of CUNY	New Visions for Public Schools–Hunter College Urban Teacher Residency
	Teachers College, Columbia University	Teaching Residents at Teachers College, Columbia University (TR@TC)
Ohio	Ohio State University Research Foundation	Apprenticeships Supported by Partnerships for Innovation and Reform in Education (ASPIRE)
South Carolina	Winthrop University	Network of Sustained, Collaborative, Ongoing Preparation for Educators (NetSCOPE)
South Dakota	Mid Central Education Cooperative	South Dakota Partnership for Teacher Quality
Texas	Texas State University– San Marcos	Teaching Residency Program for Critical Shortage Areas
Virginia	Old Dominion University Research Foundation	Old Dominion University Teacher Immersion Residency
2010		
California	The University Corporation California State University Northridge	A Teaching Residency Program in Special Education: Improving Achievement of Students with Disabilities in High-Need Schools
Colorado	School District No. 1, City and County of Denver, State of Colorado	Denver Teacher Residency
Iowa	Iowa Department of Education	Iowa Teacher Quality Partnership Grant Project
Illinois	Governors State University	Chicago Southland Region Teacher Quality Partnership
	University of Chicago	Chicago Urban Teacher Education Program
Massachusetts	Boston Plan for Excellence/ Boston Teacher Residency	Boston Teacher Residency Partnership

Table continued on next page

Table 3.5. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by state, grantee, and name of partnership: FY 2009 and FY 2010 (continued)

State	Grantee	Name of partnership
North Carolina	University of North Carolina at Greensboro	Project ENRICH: Educational Network for Renewal, Innovation, Collaboration and Help
New Mexico	Questa Independent Schools	Land of Enchantment Teacher Quality Partnership (LETQP)
New York	Research Foundation of CUNY on behalf of Lehman College	Mathematics Achievement with Teachers of High-need Urban Populations
Texas	National Math and Science Initiatives, Inc.	The Teacher Preparation Reform Consortium
Virginia	Virginia Commonwealth University	Richmond Teacher Residency Program
Washington	Heritage University	Heritage 105 Project

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Teacher Quality Partnership Grants (2015). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/awards.html>

Figure 3.5. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by type: FY 2009 and FY 2010




NOTE: Residency grants are those awarded for creating or enhancing teacher residency programs; pre-baccalaureate or fifth year grants are those awarded for reforming pre-baccalaureate or fifth-year licensing programs; both residency and pre-baccalaureate or fifth year grants are grants awarded to programs for both purposes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Teacher Quality Partnership Grants (2015). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/awards.html>

- TQP grants can be awarded to various fiscal agents, including IHEs, local education agencies, state education agencies, and non-profit organizations. Of the 40 TQP grants awarded in FY 2009 and FY 2010, 34 were awarded to IHEs; three were awarded to non-profit organizations; two were awarded to local

educational agencies; and one was awarded to a state educational agency (see figure 3.6). However, TQP grants are, by definition, partnerships. As such, regardless of the fiscal agent, the required members of the partnerships are involved in the project.

Figure 3.6. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by awardees: FY 2009 and FY 2010




SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Teacher Quality Partnership Grants (2015). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/awards.html>

- TQP grants can be focused on preparing teachers for rural, urban, or both types of school districts. Of the 40 TQP grants awarded in FY 2009 and FY 2010, 27 were awarded to programs focusing on urban school districts;

10 were awarded to programs focusing on rural school districts; and 3 were awarded to programs focusing on both urban and rural school districts (see figure 3.7).

Figure 3.7. Teacher Quality Partnership grant awards, by geographic focus of teacher preparation: FY 2009 and FY 2010



SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Teacher Quality Partnership Grants (2015). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/awards.html>

4

State Standards for Teacher Credentials

As required by Title II of HEA, states report on their standards for teacher credentials. As part of the teacher credentialing process, states set standards for prospective teachers to meet in order to be eligible for an initial teaching credential. These standards define the skills and abilities teachers need to possess in order to effectively prepare their students for success.

State Policy and Standards for Teachers



In 2014, the majority of states reported the existence of some degree of standards that prospective teachers must meet in order to obtain initial teaching credentials. Most states also reported having specific standards for early childhood education programs, as well as for academic content standards for k – 12 students.

- In 2014, all states and jurisdictions except Palau reported they had standards that prospective teachers must meet in order to attain an initial teacher credential. Palau did not report on standards that prospective teachers must meet in order to attain an initial teacher credential, as it does not have an approved teacher licensing system in place. This was unchanged from 2013 and an increase of two jurisdictions from 2012 (see table 4.1).
- States reported as follows on k–12 student standards:
 - In 2014, 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands reported that they had challenging academic content standards for k –12 students that specify what students are expected to know and

- be able to do, contain coherent and rigorous content, and encourage the teaching of advanced skills. This was unchanged from 2013 and an increase of two jurisdictions from 2012 (see table 4.1).
- In 2014, 48 states, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands reported that they had a policy that aligns teacher credentialing standards with challenging academic content standards for k–12 students. This was an increase from 2013, when 47 states, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, and Northern Mariana Islands reported that they had a policy that aligns teacher credentialing standards with challenging academic content standards for k–12 students (see table 4.1).
 - States reported as follows on early learning standards:
 - In 2014, 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands reported that they had early learning standards for early childhood education programs. In 2013, 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands reported that they had early learning standards for early childhood education programs (see table 4.1).
 - In 2014, 44 states, Puerto Rico, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands reported that they had a policy that aligns teacher credentialing standards with early learning standards for early childhood education programs. This was a change from 44 states, Puerto Rico, Guam, and Northern Mariana Islands in 2013 (see table 4.1).

Table 4.1. Number of states responding “yes” to having policies and standards for obtaining initial teaching credentials: 2012, 2013, and 2014

Policies or standards	Number of states responding “yes” in 2012	Number of states responding “yes” in 2013	Number of states responding “yes” in 2014
Has the state developed standards that prospective teachers must meet in order to attain an initial teacher credential?	56	58	58
Has the state established challenging academic content standards for k – 12 students that specify what children are expected to know and be able to do, contain coherent and rigorous content, and encourage the teaching of advanced skills?	56	58	58
Has the state established early learning standards for early childhood education programs?	52	54	54
Has the state established a policy that aligns teacher credentialing standards with the assessments required for a teacher credential?	52	52	52
Has the state established a policy that aligns teacher credentialing standards with the challenging academic content standards for k –12 students?	51	51	53
Has the state established a policy that aligns teacher credentialing standards with early learning standards for early childhood education programs?	47	47	47
Has the state established policy that aligns teacher credentialing assessments with the challenging academic content standards for k – 12 students?	47	47	47
Has the state established policy that aligns teacher credentialing assessments with early learning standards for early childhood education programs?	43	43	42
Are there other steps being taken to develop or implement teacher standards and align teacher preparation, credentialing, licensure, or assessment standards with content standards for students?	47	50	49

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Palau did not submit a *Title II* report in 2014. The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2013. Marshall Islands and Micronesia did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2012.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- In 2014, 45 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Marshall Islands, and Northern Mariana Islands, have set teacher standards at all levels across all fields (see table 4.2).
- In 2014, 44 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Marshall Islands, and Northern Mariana Islands have set teacher standards at all levels in special education (see table 4.2).
- In 2014, 39 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Northern Mariana Islands set teacher standards at all levels in the arts (see table 4.2).
- At the early childhood level, in 2014, 31 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Marshall Islands, and Northern Mariana Islands set teacher standards in special education (see table 4.2).
- At the secondary level, in 2014, 39 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Marshall Islands, and Northern Mariana Islands set teacher standards in mathematics (see table 4.2).
- At the secondary level, in 2014, 38 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Marshall Islands, and Northern Mariana Islands set teacher standards in science (see table 4.2).

Table 4.2. Number of states that set teaching standards in specific fields, by field and grade level: 2014

Field	2014 Grade level					
	All levels*	Early childhood	K-3	4-6	Middle grades	Secondary grades
Across all fields*	50	43	40	40	44	46
Arts	42	20	27	27	27	27
Bilingual education, ESL	41	19	26	26	28	27
Civics and government	11	8	14	17	26	31
Economics	10	4	11	15	25	32
English or language arts	28	25	32	32	40	43
Foreign languages	36	15	27	27	28	31
Geography	14	10	20	21	27	31
History	16	11	21	21	31	35
Mathematics	26	26	32	32	41	44
Science	24	24	30	32	41	43
Social studies	22	21	29	31	40	43
Special education	49	35	33	33	33	34
Technology in teaching	36	21	25	24	30	31
Career and technical education	11	6	8	13	31	41

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

* States that reported having teacher standards at all levels and across all fields have a broad set of k–12 teaching standards that apply to all levels and fields. A state that reported having teacher standards at all levels and across all fields does not necessarily have subject-specific or grade-level-specific teacher standards in each field and grade level.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

National Association Standards



States reported using standards recommended by national organizations when developing their standards for teaching credentials. The majority of states from 2012 to 2014 reported using, modifying, or referencing national standards in the development of their state teacher standards. While states referenced a variety of national organizations, the most commonly referenced standards were those from the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

- In 2014, 46 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Micronesia, and Virgin Islands reported using, modifying, or referencing standards of national organizations in the development of their state teacher standards. This was unchanged from 2013, and an

increase from 2012 when 45 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and Virgin Islands reported using, modifying, or referencing standards of national organizations in the development of their state teacher standards.

- Among the states that provided detail on the standards used, in 2014, 26 states, Virgin Islands, and Guam reported that they used the InTASC standards, and 13 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam reported using the NCATE standards (see table 4.3). In 2013, 23 states and the District of Columbia reported that they used the InTASC standards, and 20 states and the District of Columbia reported using the NCATE standards (see table 4.3). In 2012, 27 states and Virgin Islands reported that they used the InTASC standards, and 19 states and the District of Columbia reported using the NCATE standards (see table 4.3).
- Other organizations mentioned included the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), among other content-specific groups (see table 4.3).

Table 4.3. Number of states reporting using, modifying, or referencing standards of national organizations in developing teaching standards, by national organization: 2012, 2013, and 2014

National organization	2012	2013	2014
	Number of states referencing organization (N=49)	Number of states referencing organization (N=51)	Number of states referencing organization (N=51)
Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)	28	24	28
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)	20	21	15
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)	10	8	10
Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)	6	7	8
National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)	6	6	7
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)	5	5	6
National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)	4	3	6
National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS)	4	3	6
National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)	4	3	7
American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)	4	3	5
Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI)	3	3	5
International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)	3	3	6
American Association for Health Education (AAHE)	3	3	4
International Reading Association (IRA)	3	3	4
Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)	3	3	3
National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE)	2	2	3
Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)	2	2	2
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD)	2	2	3
National Middle School Association (NMSA)	2	2	3
American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE)	1	1	1
American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)	1	1	0

Table continued on next page

Table 4.3. Number of states reporting using, modifying, or referencing standards of national organizations in developing teaching standards, by national organization: 2012, 2013, and 2014 (*continued*)

National organization	2012	2013	2014
	Number of states referencing organization (N=49)	Number of states referencing organization (N=51)	Number of states referencing organization (N=51)
American Library Association (ALA)	1	1	2
Association for Childhood Education (ACE)	1	1	1
Educational Testing Service–Pathwise	1	1	0
National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)	1	1	2
National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD)	1	1	1
National Dance Education Organization (NDEO)	1	1	1
National Science Education Standards (NSES)	1	1	2
North American Association for Environmental Education (NAAEE)	1	1	1
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	1	1	3
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)	0	0	6
Association for Middle Level Education (AMLE)	0	0	1
American School Counselor Association (ASCA)	0	0	1
Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)	0	0	1
National Art Education Association (NAEA)	0	0	1
National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC)	0	0	1
National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)	0	0	1
Council on Technology and Engineering Teacher Education (CTETE)	0	0	1
American Association for Agricultural Education (AAAE)	0	0	1

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state report in 2013 and 2014. Marshall Islands and Micronesia did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2012. As of July 2013, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) formed with the consolidation of NCATE and TEAC. Furthermore, table 4.3 tallied states that mentioned both NCATE and CAEP separately. Additionally, some states reported using, modifying, or referencing national standards in the development of their state teacher standards but did not mention the specific national organizations.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

5

Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs

Following the amendments to HEA enacted in 2008, states have been required to report more information on their Title II reports evaluating teacher preparation programs. Under the current reporting system, states establish the criteria they use to complete these regular evaluations. States report information on assessing teacher preparation program performance for traditional and alternative programs and identified the programs they determine to be low-performing or at-risk of being classified as low-performing (at-risk). Beginning in 2013, states also began reporting whether the teacher preparation providers in the state were in compliance with seven assurances as identified in table 5.1.

Teacher Preparation Provider Assurances

- Teacher preparation providers were generally successful in linking their training to the needs of the local schools and districts.
 - Nearly all teacher preparation providers (99.3 percent) gave the assurance that their training for prospective teachers responds to the identified needs of the local educational agencies or states where the institution's graduates are likely to teach, based on past hiring and recruitment trends. States reported that only 15 teacher preparation providers, or less than 1 percent, did not provide this assurance.
 - Nearly all teacher preparation providers (99.7 percent) gave assurance that the training for prospective teachers is closely linked with the needs of schools and the instructional decisions new teachers face in the classroom. States reported that only seven teacher preparation providers, or less than 1 percent, did not provide this assurance.
- Of the teacher preparation providers who indicated that they prepare special education teachers, 95.3 percent gave the assurance that these prospective teachers receive coursework in core academic subjects and are trained to provide instruction in core academic subjects. States reported 69 providers (4.7 percent) that did not provide this assurance.

- On an assurance to gauge how many general education teachers receive training to provide instruction to limited English proficient students, 93.9 percent of the providers reported in the affirmative; 131 providers (6.1 percent) did not. This assurance received the lowest proportion of affirmative responses from teacher preparation providers.
- Most teacher preparation providers gave assurance that general education teachers receive training to instruct children with disabilities (98.3 percent), as well as assurance that general education teachers receive training to instruct children from low-income families (98.2 percent).
- Similarly, most teacher preparation providers (98.5 percent) gave assurance that prospective teachers receive training on how to effectively teach in urban and rural schools, as applicable.

Table 5.1. Number and percentage of teacher preparation providers responding to assurances regarding their enrollees' training: 2014

Assurance	Number and percent of responses	
	Yes	No
Training provided to prospective teachers responds to the identified needs of the local education agencies or states where the institution's graduates are likely to teach, based on past hiring and recruitment trends.	2,152 (99.3 percent)	15 (0.7 percent)
Training provided to prospective teachers is closely linked with the needs of schools and the instructional decisions new teachers face in the classroom.	2,161 (99.7 percent)	7 (99.7 percent)
Prospective special education teachers receive coursework in core academic subjects and receive training in providing instruction in core academic subjects.*	1,401 (95.3 percent)	69 (4.7 percent)
General education teachers receive training in providing instruction to children with disabilities.	2,127 (98.3 percent)	36 (1.7 percent)
General education teachers receive training in providing instruction to limited English proficient students.	2,032 (93.9 percent)	131 (6.1 percent)
General education teachers receive training in providing instruction to children from low-income families.	2,123 (98.2 percent)	40 (1.8 percent)
Prospective teachers receive training on how to effectively teach in urban and rural schools, as applicable.	2,135 (98.5 percent)	33 (1.5 percent)

* There were 701 teacher preparation providers that indicated their program did not prepare special education teachers. The percentages for this assurance includes only the 1,401 teacher preparation providers that indicated they prepared special education teachers by responding "yes" or "no."

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

State Criteria for Assessing Teacher Preparation Program Performance



Under the current reporting system, states set their own criteria for evaluating the performance of all three types of teacher preparation programs. In their State Report Cards, states are required to provide a description of their criteria for assessing the performance of their programs. In 2014, 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands described their criteria for assessing the performance of traditional teacher preparation programs. Thirty-four states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico described their criteria for assessing the performance of alternative route programs, which was unchanged from 2013. Some states do not have alternative route teacher preparation programs, and thus do not have criteria to assess the performance.

- States reported on the criteria¹⁰ used in assessing teacher preparation program performance in 2014 (see figure 5.1).
 - Thirty-eight states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands reported using a determination of passing rates on state credentialing assessments in the academic content areas. For example, a state may require programs to achieve an 80 percent
- passing rate for their program completers taking state credentialing assessments. This was unchanged from 2013 and 2012.
 - Forty-four states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico reported using indicators of teaching skills of the program's teaching candidates. This was an increase from 43 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico in 2013 and an increase from 42 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico in 2012.
 - Twenty-one states, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands had criteria that included progress in increasing the percentage of highly qualified teachers in the state, as defined and measured by the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. This was a decrease from 22 states, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands in 2013 and 2012.
 - Twenty-four states and Puerto Rico used criteria that included the teacher preparation program's progress toward increasing professional development opportunities for new and existing teachers. This was an increase from 23 states and Puerto Rico in 2013 and from 22 states and Puerto Rico in 2012.
 - Thirty states and Puerto Rico reported including progress in improving student academic achievement. This was an increase from 29 states and Puerto Rico in 2013 and 27 states and Puerto Rico in 2012.
 - Twenty-seven states, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands had criteria that included progress in raising standards for entry into the teaching


¹⁰ States responded to these criteria with a “yes” or “no” response, and did not provide additional information regarding how they defined or implemented the criteria.

profession. This was an increase from 26 states, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands in 2013 and 23 states, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands in 2012.

- Twenty-two states and Puerto Rico reported that they had other criteria for assessing

the performance of teacher preparation programs. Examples of other criteria include program requirements for supervised clinical experiences, program accreditation status, and the qualifications and performance of the program’s faculty.

Figure 5.1. Criteria used in state assessments of teacher preparation program performance, by number of states reporting: 2014



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. However, in 2014, 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands described their criteria for assessing the performance of traditional teacher preparation programs. Thirty-four states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico described their criteria for assessing the performance of alternative route programs, which was unchanged from 2013. Some states do not have alternative route teacher preparation programs, and thus do not have criteria to assess the performance.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- States provided narrative responses to the following open-ended inquiries made with the goals of identifying and assisting low-performing teacher preparation programs and those at-risk for low performance:
 - Provide a list of the criteria your state has defined for classifying traditional teacher preparation programs as “low-performing” or “at-risk of being low-performing.”
 - Provide a list of the criteria your state has defined for classifying alternative routes to a teacher credential as “low-performing” or “at-risk of being low-performing.”
 - Provide a description of the procedures your state uses to identify and assist (through the provisions of technical assistance) low-performing traditional teacher preparation programs.
 - Provide a description of the procedures your state uses to identify and assist (through the provisions of technical assistance) low-performing alternative routes to a teacher credential.
- While all states must adopt criteria for identifying low-performing teacher preparation programs and those at risk for low performance, 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands provided a detailed description of their criteria. Based on the data provided, states can be classified into two groups: those that used a single criterion and those that used multiple criteria.
 - Twenty states, the District of Columbia, and Virgin Islands reported using a single criterion. Among those entities, the three criteria reported most frequently were
 - program approval or accreditation status (typically based on multiple criteria);
 - program pass rates on state credentialing assessments; and
 - program completion rates.
 - Of the 27 states and Puerto Rico using multiple criteria, some states required programs to meet all of the criteria, while other states required programs to meet some number or combination of criteria. Criteria included
 - pass rate data;
 - program approval or accreditation status;
 - minimum number of hours required for student teaching;
 - student-to-faculty ratio;
 - program completion rates;
 - partnerships with elementary and secondary schools;
 - satisfaction surveys of new teachers, instructional support staff, administrators, and local school system staff; and
 - academic content major requirements.
 - Nine states have different criteria for traditional and alternative programs, and two states are currently developing their criteria for either traditional or alternative programs.
- In some states, the assessment of teacher preparation programs occurs in multiyear cycles as part of the state accreditation or approval process.
 - In some states, programs are reviewed by a specialized accrediting agency such as CAEP.
 - The accreditation process might include onsite visits, progress reports from testing contractors and the teacher preparation program, reviews of program documentation, and adherence to improvement plans.
 - Other activities include reviews of outcomes data and annual reports and formal and informal program evaluation data collected from program graduates and principals or administrators supervising program graduates.

Identifying Low-Performing Teacher Preparation Programs and Those At Risk of Being Identified as Low-Performing




As *Title II* of the *HEA* requires, each state must establish criteria for assessing teacher preparation programs and identifying low-performing teacher preparation programs and those at-risk of being identified as low-performing (at-risk).¹¹ Teacher preparation programs that do not meet the criteria established by the state may be classified by the state as “at-risk of being identified as low-performing” or “low-performing.”

- In 2014, 12 states and Puerto Rico reported teacher preparation programs that were low-performing or at-risk. Of the 38 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands that did not identify any programs as low-performing or at-risk in 2014, 22 of those states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands have never identified any programs as being low-performing or at-risk (see figure 5.2).
- A total of 45 programs were classified as low-performing or at-risk in 2014. Twenty-four of these programs were identified as at-risk, and 21 were designated as low-performing (see table 5.2).
- Of the 45 programs identified by states as low-performing or at-risk, 28 were based in IHEs that participate in the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant program¹² authorized under *Title IV* of the *HEA*, which provides grant aid to eligible students enrolled in high-quality teacher preparation programs (see table 5.2).
- Forty-three of the 45 low-performing or at-risk teacher preparation programs were traditional teacher preparation institutions, and two were alternative route teacher preparation programs based at an IHE (see table 5.2).

¹¹ For details on each state’s criteria, visit <https://title2.ed.gov>. States report both the name of the IHE, if the teacher preparation program is IHE based, and the teacher preparation program that has been identified as low-performing or at-risk. This can be the entire teacher preparation program or a specific portion of the teacher preparation program.

¹² For more information on the TEACH Grant program, go to: <http://studentaid.ed.gov/types/grants-scholarships/teach>.

Figure 5.2. States that have never identified any and those that have identified at least one teacher preparation program as at-risk or low-performing as of 2014



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. This map illustrates states that have never identified at least one teacher preparation program as at-risk or low-performing since the beginning of *Title II*, HEA reporting in 2001.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Table 5.2. Teacher preparation programs, by state, host institution, program type, program name, risk type, and date designated as at-risk or low-performing: 2014

State	Institution name	Program type	Program	Risk type	Date designated
California	California State University, Monterey Bay*	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	10/24/2104
California	Hebrew Union College	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	10/24/2014
Georgia	Clark Atlanta University*†	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	10/29/2014
Georgia	Piedmont College*	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	10/29/2014
Indiana	Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne*	Traditional	Initial	At-risk	10/8/2013
Indiana	Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne*	Alternative, IHE-based	Advanced	At-risk	10/8/2013
Indiana	Oakland City University	Traditional	Initial and Advanced	At-risk	10/8/2013
Kansas	Haskell Indian Nations University	Traditional	‡	At-risk	5/3/2013
Michigan	Concordia University	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	7/22/2013
Michigan	Rochester College	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	7/25/2014
Michigan	University of Michigan–Flint*	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	7/25/2014
Ohio	Central State University*†	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	7/1/2012
Oklahoma	Northwestern Oklahoma State University*	Traditional	Advanced Programs	At-risk	12/12/2013
Oklahoma	Southwestern Oklahoma State University	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	12/12/2013
Puerto Rico	American University of Puerto Rico, Recinto de Bayamon*	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	10/31/2014
Puerto Rico	Caribbean University–Recinto de Carolina	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	10/31/2014
Puerto Rico	Caribbean University–Recinto de Ponce	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	10/30/2010
South Carolina	Francis Marion University*	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	10/31/2013
South Carolina	The Citadel	Traditional	Entire Program	At-risk	10/31/2012
Texas	East Texas Baptist University*	Traditional	‡	At-risk	2/8/2013
Texas	Texas A&M University–San Antonio	Traditional	‡	At-risk	2/8/2013

Table continued on next page

Table 5.2. Teacher preparation programs, by state, host institution, program type, program name, risk type, and date designated as at-risk or low-performing: 2014 (continued)

State	Institution name	Program type	Program	Risk type	Date designated
Texas	Texas College	Traditional	Entire program	At-risk	4/9/2010
Texas	University of Phoenix (at San Antonio)	Alternative, IHE-based	‡	At-risk	2/8/2013
Washington	Western Governors University–Washington	Traditional	Professional Certificate School Counselor Program	At-risk	1/20/2012
California	Pacific Oaks College	Traditional	Entire Program	Low-performing	8/7/2014
Connecticut	Southern Connecticut State University*	Traditional	Entire Program	Low-performing	9/3/2014
New York	Boricua College*	Traditional	Multi-Subject Content Specialty Test (CST)	Low-performing	10/14/2013
New York	Canisius College of Buffalo*	Traditional	Gifted Education CST	Low-performing	10/14/2013
New York	CUNY Brooklyn College*	Traditional	Social Studies CST	Low-performing	10/31/2014
New York	CUNY Herbert H. Lehman College*	Traditional	Multi-Subject CST and Students with Disabilities	Low-performing	10/31/2014
New York	CUNY Medgar Evers College	Traditional	Multi-Subject CST and Students with Disabilities	Low-performing	10/14/2013
New York	CUNY Queens College*	Traditional	English Language Arts CST	Low-performing	10/31/2014
New York	Dowling College Oakdale*	Traditional	Physical Education CST	Low-performing	10/31/2014
New York	Five Towns College	Traditional	Music CST	Low-performing	10/14/2013
New York	Medaille College–Amherst Campus*	Traditional	Social Studies CST	Low-performing	10/14/2013

Table continued on next page

Table 5.2. Teacher preparation programs, by state, host institution, program type, program name, risk type, and date designated as at-risk or low-performing: 2014 (continued)

State	Institution name	Program type	Program	Risk type	Date designated
New York	Rochester Inst. of Technology*	Traditional	Deaf and Hard of Hearing CST	Low-performing	10/14/2013
New York	Sage Colleges (The)–Troy*	Traditional	Physical Education CST	Low-performing	10/14/2013
New York	St. Francis College	Traditional	Physical Education CST	Low-performing	10/14/2013
New York	St. John Fisher College*	Traditional	Social Studies CST	Low-performing	10/31/2014
New York	SUC Buffalo*	Traditional	English Language Arts CST	Low-performing	10/14/2013
New York	SUC Old Westbury*	Traditional	Students with Disabilities CST	Low-performing	10/31/2014
Texas	Paul Quinn College*†	Traditional	‡	Low-performing	4/8/2011
Texas	Sul Ross State University–Alpine*	Traditional	‡	Low-performing	2/8/2013
Texas	Texas A&M University–Texarkana*	Traditional	‡	Low-performing	5/2/2014
Texas	University of Texas–Pan American*	Traditional	‡	Low-performing	5/2/2014

* Of the 45 programs identified by states as low-performing or at-risk, 28 are housed in IHEs that participate in the TEACH Grant program, which provides scholarship aid to high-achieving students attending high-quality teacher preparation programs. For more information on the TEACH Grant program, go to: <http://studentaid.ed.gov/types/grants-scholarships/teach>.

† Of the 45 programs identified by states as low-performing or at-risk, these three are housed at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.


‡ The state did not specify the program name.

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Definitions of the at-risk and low-performing categories were established by each state authority. States report both the name of the IHE, if the teacher preparation program is IHE-based, and the teacher preparation program that has been identified as low-performing or at-risk. This can be the entire teacher preparation program or a specific portion of the teacher preparation program.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2014). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- Of the 24 programs designated as at-risk in 2014, 22 were traditional programs, and 2 were alternative programs based at IHEs. There were no alternative programs not based at an IHE that were considered at-risk in 2014 (see figure 5.3).

Figure 5.3. Number of teacher preparation programs designated as at-risk, by program type: 2014




NOTE: Definitions of the at-risk and low-performing categories were established by each state. The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- All of the 21 programs designated as low-performing in 2014 were traditional programs. There were no alternative programs based at IHEs and alternative programs not based at IHEs that were considered low-performing in 2014 (see figure 5.4).

Figure 5.4. Number of teacher preparation programs designated as low-performing, by program type: 2014



NOTE: Definitions of the at-risk and low-performing categories were established by each state. The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- Under state procedures for assessing the quality of teacher preparation providers, programs identified as low-performing or at-risk accounted for a very small proportion (less than 3 percent) of the total number of programs that prepare teachers.
- Of the 45 low-performing or at-risk teacher preparation programs reported in 2014, 32 were also reported as at-risk or low-performing in one or more previous years, though not necessarily in consecutive years. However, the number of low-performing or at-risk teacher preparation

programs was lower than it has been in recent years. In 2013, states reported that there were 56 low-performing or at-risk teacher preparation programs. In 2012, states reported that there were 50 low-performing or at-risk teacher preparation programs.

- In 2014, 12 states and Puerto Rico identified low-performing or at-risk teacher preparation programs (see table 5.3). Fourteen states and Puerto Rico identified low-performing or at-risk teacher preparation programs in 2013, and 12 states and Puerto Rico did so in 2012.

Table 5.3. States identifying at least one teacher preparation program as at-risk or low-performing: 2003 through 2014

State	At-risk (AR) or low-performing (LP)											
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Alabama							LP					
California						AR	AR	AR	LP			AR, LP
Connecticut					LP	LP			LP	LP	LP	LP
Florida		LP	LP	LP	LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	LP			
Georgia		†	†	AR	AR	AR			AR	AR	AR	AR
Illinois	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR			AR		LP	LP	
Indiana		AR	AR					AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
Iowa				LP								
Kansas	AR	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR				AR	AR	AR
Kentucky		AR	LP	AR	AR, LP	AR, LP	LP					
Louisiana		AR	AR									
Maine		AR		AR	AR			AR	AR	AR	AR	
Maryland	LP			AR								
Michigan					AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR
Mississippi									LP			

Table continued on next page

Table 5.3. States identifying at least one teacher preparation program as at-risk or low-performing: 2003 through 2014 (*continued*)

State	At-risk (AR) or low-performing (LP)											
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Missouri				AR	AR	AR						
New York	AR	AR		LP	LP	LP	LP	LP	LP	LP	LP	LP
North Carolina	LP	LP	LP	LP								
Ohio			AR	AR	AR	AR			AR	AR	AR	
Oklahoma												AR
Oregon										AR	AR	
Puerto Rico					AR, LP	AR, LP	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	
Rhode Island								AR	AR			
South Carolina	AR, LP		AR	AR		AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR	AR
Tennessee	AR	AR	AR									
Texas	LP			LP				AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP	AR, LP
Virginia											AR	
Washington			AR		AR						AR	AR
Total # of states	9	11	11	14	12	12	9	11	13	13	15	13


† The state did not specify the designation of the program. The program was being restructured.

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Guam did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2011. Micronesia did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2007, 2010, or 2011. Marshall Islands did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2009, 2010, or 2011. Table entries indicate, for a given state and year, if one or more teacher preparation programs have been designated as “low-performing” (LP) or “at-risk” of being designated as low-performing (AR), respectively. Definitions of these categories were established by each state. States not included in this table have not identified any teacher preparation program as low-performing or at-risk. Data presented in this report for previous years may not be consistent with data published in earlier reports because states are able to revise their data.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- The number of low-performing or at-risk teacher preparation programs reported by states has fluctuated since 2005, ranging from a low of 16 programs in 2005 to a high of 55 programs in 2013 (see figure 5.5).
 - The number of teacher preparation programs designated as at-risk has fluctuated since 2005, ranging from a low of 12 programs in 2005 to a high of 34 programs in 2012 (see figure 5.5).
 - The number of low-performing teacher preparation programs reported by states has fluctuated since 2005, ranging from a low of 4 programs in 2005 to a high of 23 programs in 2013 (see figure 5.5).

Figure 5.5. Number of at-risk and low-performing teacher preparation programs reported by states: 2005 through 2014



NOTE: Definitions of at-risk and low-performing teacher preparation programs were established by each state. The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2013. Guam did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2011. Micronesia did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2007, 2010, or 2011. Marshall Islands did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2009, 2010, or 2011. Data presented in this report for previous years may not be consistent with data published in earlier reports because states are able to revise their data.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

6

Assessments Required for an Initial Teaching Credential

Previous to the passing of the 2008 amendments to the HEA, states have reported data on state assessments required to receive initial teacher credentials and pass rates on these assessments by students enrolled in institution of higher education (IHE)-based teacher preparation programs. Following the 2008 amendments to the HEA, states also began reporting data on the average scaled score on these assessments, as well as pass rates and scaled scores for students in all non-IHE-based teacher preparation programs.


State Assessment Requirements



Each state independently sets the requirements that candidates must meet in order to receive an initial teaching credential in that state. Most states require that teacher candidates pass assessment tests in order to be eligible for an initial teaching credential. Some programs may require assessments, such as a test of basic skills, as a condition for program entry. Others may require candidates to pass all assessments required for a state credential before they can complete a program. In both of these cases, the programs would report 100 percent pass rates on these assessment categories.

- In academic year (AY) 2012 – 13, 49 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands reported assessing initial teacher candidates through state testing (see figure 6.1).
- Not all states required assessments for an initial credential. As of AY 2012–13, Montana, Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and Palau did not require testing for an initial teacher credential.

Figure 6.1. States that do and do not require tests for an initial teaching credential:
AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Hawaii offers candidates a variety of options for verifying basic skills and content knowledge in order to earn an initial teaching credential. While tests are commonly used to meet the requirements, it is possible to earn an initial teaching credential without taking tests by using other means to verify basic skills and content knowledge. Iowa began requiring assessments for an initial teaching credential in January 2013.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Test Takers


States are required to report the number of students who took assessment tests for an initial teacher credential. Overall, the number of test takers has declined greatly over the past four years, reflecting the trend of decreasing enrollment in teacher preparation programs. While enrollment in teacher preparation programs decreased by 30 percent between AY 2009 – 10 and AY 2012 – 13, the number of test takers decreased by 21 percent in the

same time period. Additionally, there were fewer test takers in AY 2012 – 13 than a decade ago in AY 2002 – 03. The majority of test takers continue to be from traditional programs. The number of test takers from alternative programs has also declined over the past four years, and there were also fewer test takers from alternative programs in AY 2012 – 13 than in AY 2002 – 03.



- Among the AY 2012–13 program completers, there were a total of 167,908 test takers. This was a decrease from 176,678 test takers in AY 2011–12 and 190,457 test takers in AY 2010–11 (see figure 6.2).

Figure 6.2. Total number of teacher preparation program completers tested for an initial teacher credential, by program route: AY 2000 – 01 through AY 2012 – 13




NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2013 and 2014. Marshall Islands and Micronesia did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2012. Data presented in this report for previous years may not be consistent with data published in earlier reports because states are able to revise their data.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- In AY 2012 – 13, 86 percent of test takers were from traditional teacher preparation programs; 7 percent were from alternative, IHE-based programs; and 7 percent were from alternative, not IHE-based programs, the same as in AY 2011 – 12. In AY 2010 – 11, 84 percent of test

takers were from traditional teacher preparation programs; 7 percent were from alternative, IHE-based programs; and 9 percent were from alternative, not IHE-based programs (see figure 6.3).

Figure 6.3. Percentage of initial teacher credential test takers, by program type: AY 2008 – 09 through AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2013 and 2014. Marshall Islands and Micronesia did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2012. Data presented in this report for previous years may not be consistent with data published in earlier reports because states are able to revise their data.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

State Minimum Passing Scores and Scaled Scores



Each state sets the minimum passing score, or cut score, on assessments required for an initial teacher credential. Thus, the cut score can vary for the same assessment if it is used in multiple states. Also, depending on the cut score, receiving a passing score on the assessment may not mean the same thing as having a significant degree of content knowledge.

Most states use a set of assessments developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) called the Praxis Series. Other states work with Pearson to develop assessments aligned to state standards, so assessments offered in different states vary.¹³ Some states use a combination of ETS and Pearson assessments, or assessments from other organizations, such as Language Testing International, the College Board, or the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE).

Beginning in 2011, the Department collected the average scaled score on assessments

required for initial teacher licensure. A scaled score is a conversion of a raw score on a test or version of the test to a common scale that allows for a numerical comparison between test takers. Because most major testing companies use multiple versions of a test, the scale is used to control slight variations from one version of a test to the next. Scaled scores are particularly useful for comparing test scores over time, such as measuring semester-to-semester and year-to-year growth of individual test takers or groups of test takers in a content area. However, within the same test, different content areas are typically on different scales, so a scaled score of 24 in mathematics may not mean the same thing as a scaled score of 24 in reading, even when those tests are part of the same series. Average scaled scores allow for analysis and comparison across different assessments and scoring rubrics of the minimum cut scores in relation to the average scores of program completers.

- Table 6.1 presents the average cut score for each state, the average score by test takers in each state, and the gap between the cut score and average score by test takers. A small gap between the cut score and the average score by test takers for a given state could suggest a relatively high bar may be being set for prospective teachers in that state. A large gap between the cut score and the average score by test takers for a given state could suggest a relatively low bar may be being set

for prospective teachers in that state. However, it is also possible that a small gap between the cut score and the average score by test takers signals relatively low-performing test takers, and a large gap signals relatively high-performing test takers. Without much more in-depth analysis of these data, there is no way to immediately discern the relationships between difficulty of exams, cut scores, test taker performance, and the ultimate impacts on student achievement in the classroom.

¹³ For information on the cut scores states set on Pearson assessments, see the individual state reports available at <https://title2.ed.gov> and <http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/index.html>.

Table 6.1. Cut scores and average scaled scores on initial teacher credential assessments, gap between the scores, and the number of initial teacher credential assessments, by state: AY 2012 – 13

State	# of assessments	Cut score	Average scaled score	Gap
Alabama	14	42.2%	61.4%	19.2
Alaska	3	60.0%	74.2%	14.2
American Samoa	3	50.0%	43.5%	-6.5
Arizona	25	67.0%	79.1%	12.0
Arkansas	61	54.1%	71.1%	17.0
California	50	58.9%	70.9%	12.0
Colorado	20	52.2%	73.2%	21.0
Connecticut	38	61.0%	72.7%	11.8
Delaware	14	58.2%	73.6%	15.4
District of Columbia	26	55.4%	76.6%	21.1
Florida	26	66.0%	74.8%	8.8
Georgia	44	60.0%	71.7%	11.7
Guam	- -	- -	- -	- -
Hawaii	19	54.7%	73.8%	19.1
Idaho	20	48.2%	70.4%	22.2
Illinois	48	70.0%	82.6%	12.6
Indiana	39	58.7%	72.6%	13.9
Iowa	11	59.6%	73.4%	13.9
Kansas	19	60.2%	75.6%	15.4
Kentucky	29	58.4%	71.7%	13.3
Louisiana	50	57.3%	68.8%	11.5
Maine	14	61.0%	72.7%	11.8
Marshall Islands	—	—	—	—
Maryland	33	61.5%	75.5%	13.9
Massachusetts	24	69.6%	80.1%	10.5
Michigan	25	60.0%	77.0%	17.0
Micronesia	—	—	—	—
Minnesota	42	67.5%	78.7%	11.2
Mississippi	26	56.3%	69.3%	12.9
Missouri	24	60.5%	75.2%	14.7
Montana	—	—	—	—
Nebraska	6	52.5%	70.9%	18.4

Table continued on next page

Table 6.1. Cut scores and average scaled scores on initial teacher credential assessments, gap between the scores, and the number of initial teacher credential assessments, by state: AY 2012 – 13 (continued)

State	# of assessments	Cut score	Average scaled score	Gap
Nevada	15	56.6%	72.4%	15.8
New Hampshire	13	57.9%	71.3%	13.4
New Jersey	57	36.2%	52.0%	15.7
New Mexico	13	70.0%	84.5%	14.5
New York	33	60.0%	77.4%	17.4
North Carolina	14	59.5%	75.4%	15.9
North Dakota	10	55.8%	70.3%	14.5
Northern Mariana Islands	4	49.0%	57.4%	8.4
Ohio	25	57.7%	74.8%	17.1
Oklahoma	15	70.0%	80.9%	10.9
Oregon	22	61.9%	78.9%	17.0
Palau	—	—	—	—
Pennsylvania	47	56.3%	71.2%	15.0
Puerto Rico	9	42.2%	52.7%	10.5
Rhode Island	8	55.1%	72.0%	16.9
South Carolina	31	58.5%	74.9%	16.3
South Dakota	12	51.6%	70.9%	19.4
Tennessee	46	52.0%	71.3%	19.3
Texas	67	70.0%	80.5%	10.5
Utah	19	56.0%	73.4%	17.5
Vermont	10	62.4%	71.3%	8.9
Virgin Islands	1	40.0%	51.0%	11.0
Virginia	23	60.1%	80.6%	20.6
Washington	—	—	—	—
West Virginia	20	56.2%	70.2%	13.9
Wisconsin	20	47.9%	65.6%	17.7
Wyoming	2	59.7%	78.3%	18.6
National	1,289	60.2%	74.4%	14.3

—Assessments were not included if they had fewer than 10 test takers or if multiple records for the same assessment provided conflicting data (for example, two different state average scaled scores for the same state, assessment, and program type combination) or if the data were erroneous (for example, if the cut score or state average scaled score was not within the range of the minimum and maximum score).

NOTE: Data in this table represent weighted averages from a total of 1,289 assessments across all programs and program types. Data for each assessment record were weighted by the number of test takers to calculate the overall weighted averages. Percentages in the cut score column are the weighted averages of the percentage of points needed out of the of points available to a test taker to pass each assessment offered in the state. Percentages in the average score column are the weighted averages of the average scale score for each assessment out of the points available to test takers on the assessment.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- While state minimum cut scores vary from state to state, they are significantly lower than the average score by test takers for nearly all states and program types, suggesting that the bar may be set relatively low across the board. The national average state minimum cut score is set at 60.2 percent of the possible points that can be earned on an assessment. The average score by test takers is 74.4 percent of the possible points that can be earned on an assessment. The gap between the average state minimum cut score

and the average score by test takers is 14.3 percentage points (see table 6.1).

- While the state minimum cut scores were similar across teacher preparation program types nationwide, they were slightly lower for alternative programs. The average points scored by test takers were also similar across teacher preparation program types, but they were slightly lower in alternative, not IHE-based programs (see figure 6.4).

Figure 6.4. National average percentage of points required to pass initial teacher credential assessments (based on state cut scores) and average percentage of points scored by test takers (based on state average scaled scores*), by program type: AY 2012 – 13



* A scaled score is a conversion of a raw score on a test or version of the test to a common scale that allows for a numerical comparison between test takers. Because most major testing companies use multiple versions of a test, the scale is used to control slight variations from one version of a test to the next. Average scaled scores allow for analysis and comparison across different assessments and scoring rubrics of the minimum cut scores in relation to the average scores of program completers.

NOTE: Data in this table represent weighted averages from a total of 1,289 assessments for all programs; 876 assessments for traditional programs; 180 assessments for alternative, IHE-based programs; and 233 assessments for alternative, not IHE-based programs. Assessments were not included if they had fewer than 10 test takers or if multiple records for the same assessment provided conflicting data (for example, two different state average scaled scores for the same state, assessment, and program type combination) or if the data were erroneous (for example, if the cut score or state average scaled score was not within the range of the minimum and maximum score). Data for each assessment record was weighted by the number of test takers to calculate the overall weighted averages.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

State Summary Pass Rates



The summary pass rate is a single measure of how test takers from each teacher preparation program fared in passing the assessments they took. Specifically, the summary pass rate is the percentage of test takers who passed all tests they took for their area of specialization among those who took one or more tests in their specialization areas. State assessments required for an initial credential vary across states, and cut scores states set, even on the same test, may also vary. States also require testing at different points during a program of teacher preparation from entry to past completion. These shortcomings with the use and calculation of passage rates make them a misleading and untrustworthy indicator that should not be used to make cross-state comparisons or assumptions of program rigor, student success, or other similar measures of quality.

- Over the past three years, once weighted by the number of test takers, the average summary pass rate across all programs has been consistently high, ranging between 95 and 96 percent.
- In AY 2010 – 11, once weighted by the number of test takers, the average summary pass rate across all programs was 96 percent. The average summary pass rate was 96 percent in traditional programs; 98 percent in alternative, IHE-based programs; and 99 percent in alternative, not IHE-based programs.
- In AY 2011 – 12, once weighted by the number of test takers, the average summary pass rate across all programs was 96 percent. The average summary pass rate was 95 percent in traditional programs; 97 percent in alternative, IHE-based programs; and 99 percent in alternative, not IHE-based programs.
- In AY 2012 – 13, once weighted by the number of test takers, the average summary pass rate across all programs was 95 percent. The average summary pass rate was 95 percent in traditional programs; 97 percent in alternative, IHE-based programs; and 98 percent in alternative, not IHE-based programs.
- In AY 2012 – 13, the overall summary pass rate for test takers in alternative route teacher preparation programs, both IHE based and non-IHE based, was higher than the national pass rate, while the overall pass rate for test takers from traditional teacher preparation programs was slightly below the national average (see table 6.2).

Table 6.2. Total number of test takers from all teacher preparation programs, number who passed all tests in their area of specialization, and pass rate, by program type: AY 2012 – 13

Program type	Takers	Passers	Pass rate
Traditional	143,521	136,062	94.8%
Alternative IHE-based	11,022	10,654	96.7%
Alternative not IHE-based	11,745	11,472	97.7%
Total	166,288	158,188	95.1%

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

7

State Initial Credentials for Teachers

States have reported on initial credentials since the inception of Title II of the HEA reporting. The HEA as reauthorized in 2008 expanded the reporting requirements for states to report on the total number of persons receiving an initial credential in state, as well as the total number of persons receiving an initial credential out of the state. In 2010, states first reported on the areas of initial teacher credentials, such as elementary education, special education, or English language arts, as well as the academic majors and subject areas in which teacher preparation program completers were prepared to teach. Credential area designations, academic majors, and subject areas vary across the states and may or may not be directly comparable from one state to another.

When states are unable to hire credentialed teachers to fill all of their teaching positions, they may grant emergency licenses. Policies regarding emergency licenses, including the requirements, duration, and the number of times an individual may renew the license, vary from state to state.

Initial Credentials Issued by States




States reported on the total number of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, as well as the subset of those individuals who were prepared in another state.

- States reported a total of 263,425 persons receiving an initial teaching credential in AY 2012 – 13, a 5 percent increase from the prior year (251,747 in AY 2011 – 12), and a 6 percent decrease from 280,342 in AY 2010 – 11.
- Of the 263,425 persons receiving an initial teaching credential in AY 2012 – 13
 - the majority, 207,540 individuals (79 percent), was prepared in the same state in which they earned their initial credential. This was a similar proportion to AY 2011 – 12, when 197,772

individuals (79 percent) of persons receiving an initial teaching credential were prepared in the same state in which they earned their credential (see figure 7.1).

- fewer than a quarter, 55,885 individuals (21 percent) were prepared in a different state from which they earned their initial credential. This was a similar proportion to AY 2011 – 12, when 53,975 individuals (21 percent) were prepared in a different state from which they earned their credential (see figure 7.1).

Figure 7.1. Number of individuals receiving teacher preparation in one state compared to number earning their initial teaching credential in another state: AY 2000 – 01 through AY 2012 – 13




NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Marshall Islands and Micronesia did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2012. Data presented in this report for previous years may not be consistent with data published in earlier reports because states are able to revise their data. No data are presented for AY 2008 – 09 because the data were not collected consistently in the 2010 *Title II* report.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- In AY 2012 – 13, California, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas each reported preparing more than 10,000 individuals receiving initial teaching credentials (see figure 7.2). This was an increase of one state from AY 2011 – 12, when California, Florida, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas each reported preparing more than 10,000 individuals receiving initial teaching credentials.
- Alaska, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Wyoming, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands each reported preparing fewer than 1,000 individuals receiving initial credentials in AY 2012 – 13 (see figure 7.2).

Figure 7.2. Number range of individuals receiving an initial teaching credential, by state issued: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Palau does not have a formal teacher credentialing system in place.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- Between AY 2011 – 12 and AY 2012 – 13, 22 states, American Samoa, and Guam reported a decrease in the total number of individuals who received initial credentials (see table 7.1).

Table 7.1. Number of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, by state, location of preparation and percentage change in total number: AY 2011 – 12 and AY 2012 – 13

State	AY 2011 – 12			AY 2012 – 13			Percent change in total from AY 2011 – 12 to AY 2012 – 13
	Prepared in state	Prepared in another state	Total	Prepared in state	Prepared in another state	Total	
Alabama	5,157	0	5,157	3,714	0	3,714	-28%
Alaska	211	645	856	261	682	943	10%
American Samoa	105	0	105	50	0	50	-52%
Arizona	4,794	1,581	6,375	4,496	1,645	6,141	-4%
Arkansas	1,249	135	1,384	1,638	116	1,754	27%
California	12,093	3,332	15,425	11,201	3,406	14,607	-5%
Colorado	2,660	827	3,487	3,067	351	3,418	-2%
Connecticut	451	1,778	2,229	1,562	1,101	2,663	19%
Delaware	719	634	1,353	635	608	1,243	-8%
District of Columbia	792	303	1,095	890	286	1,176	7%
Florida	12,210	2,769	14,979	13,993	3,448	17,441	16%
Georgia	6,728	2,759	9,487	6,358	2,509	8,867	-7%
Guam	84	21	105	69	24	93	-11%
Hawaii	728	1,155	1,883	1,281	1,258	2,539	35%
Idaho	873	560	1,433	998	317	1,315	-8%
Illinois	8,177	1,767	9,944	8,777	1,873	10,650	7%
Indiana	2,685	1,404	4,089	3,164	971	4,135	1%
Iowa	1,611	797	2,408	2,436	325	2,761	15%
Kansas	1,261	519	1,780	1,286	582	1,868	5%

Table continued on next page

Table 7.1. Number of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, by state, location of preparation and percentage change in total number: AY 2011 – 12 and AY 2012 – 13 (continued)

State	AY 2011 – 12			AY 2012 – 13			Percent change in total from AY 2011 – 12 to AY 2012 – 13
	Prepared in state	Prepared in another state	Total	Prepared in state	Prepared in another state	Total	
Kentucky	3,063	818	3,881	2,668	561	3,229	-17%
Louisiana	1,783	791	2,574	2,265	870	3,135	22%
Maine	776	224	1,000	707	234	941	-6%
Marshall Islands	47	0	47	87	0	87	85%
Maryland	898	1,713	2,611	1,151	1,928	3,079	18%
Massachusetts	6,607	1,051	7,658	6,272	1,103	7,375	-4%
Michigan	6,575	422	6,997	3,906	589	4,495	-36%
Micronesia	844	0	844	1,015	0	1,015	20%
Minnesota	1,886	1,734	3,620	2,397	1,490	3,887	7%
Mississippi	2,791	704	3,495	1,931	717	2,648	-24%
Missouri	3,941	1,425	5,366	4,702	1,209	5,911	10%
Montana	643	445	1,088	768	637	1,405	29%
Nebraska	1,361	351	1,712	1,441	354	1,795	5%
Nevada	652	741	1,393	702	1,227	1,929	38%
New Hampshire	483	375	858	489	355	844	-2%
New Jersey	15,534	0	15,534	15,042	0	15,042	-3%
New Mexico	1,593	349	1,942	1,141	385	1,526	-21%
New York	21,971	0	21,971	25,084	0	25,084	14%
North Carolina	2,554	2,213	4,767	2,196	2,754	4,950	4%
North Dakota	576	617	1,193	527	678	1,205	1%
Northern Mariana Islands	6	37	43	31	67	98	128%
Ohio	7,230	513	7,743	7,141	928	8,069	4%

Table continued on next page

Table 7.1. Number of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, by state, location of preparation and percentage change in total number: AY 2011 – 12 and AY 2012 – 13 (continued)

Number of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, by location of preparation							Percent change in total from AY 2011 – 12 to AY 2012 – 13
State	AY 2011 – 12			AY 2012 – 13			
	Prepared in state	Prepared in another state	Total	Prepared in state	Prepared in another state	Total	
Oklahoma	1,077	892	1,969	699	1,088	1,787	-9%
Oregon	1,598	759	2,357	1,082	872	1,954	-17%
Palau	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pennsylvania	9,712	1,865	11,577	13,957	2,229	16,186	40%
Puerto Rico	2,135	4	2,139	2,464	20	2,484	16%
Rhode Island	509	462	971	611	207	818	-16%
South Carolina	2,228	342	2,570	2,389	372	2,761	7%
South Dakota	1,229	525	1,754	1,258	570	1,828	4%
Tennessee	1,468	2,821	4,289	2,572	3,020	5,592	30%
Texas	22,305	2,368	24,673	24,641	3,010	27,651	12%
Utah	2,104	312	2,416	2,323	249	2,572	6%
Vermont	478	354	832	538	510	1,048	26%
Virgin Islands	38	45	83	44	65	109	31%
Virginia	1,728	4,281	6,009	2,347	3,541	5,888	-2%
Washington	2,298	258	2,556	1,033	1,377	2,410	-6%
West Virginia	702	714	1,416	447	653	1,100	-22%
Wisconsin	3,461	1,822	5,283	3,327	1,821	5,148	-3%
Wyoming	300	642	942	269	693	962	2%
Total	197,772	53,975	251,747	207,540	55,885	263,425	5%

--Data not available.

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

- Some states, such as Arizona and North Carolina, prepared a larger proportion of teacher preparation program completers compared to the proportion of initial teaching credentials they issued, while others, such as Florida and New Jersey, issued a larger proportion of initial teaching credentials compared to the proportion of teacher preparation program completers they prepared.
 - While Arizona prepared 3.2 percent of the teacher preparation program completers nationwide, it only granted initial teaching credentials to 2.3 percent of the new teachers in AY 2012 – 13 (see table 7.2).
 - North Carolina prepared 2.9 percent of the teacher preparation program completers nationwide, but only granted initial teaching credentials to 1.9 percent of the new teachers in AY 2012 – 13 (see table 7.2).
 - While Florida prepared only 3.6 percent of the teacher preparation program completers nationwide, it granted initial teaching credentials to 6.6 percent of the new teachers in AY 2012 – 13 (see table 7.2).
 - New Jersey prepared 3.2 percent of the teacher preparation program completers nationwide. However, New Jersey granted initial teaching credentials to 5.7 percent of the new teachers in AY 2012 – 13 (see table 7.2).

Table 7.2. Number and percentage of teacher preparation program completers and of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, by state: AY 2012 – 13

State	Program completers		Number of persons receiving an initial credential	
	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
Alabama	2,966	1.5	3,714	1.4
Alaska	218	0.1	943	0.4
American Samoa	106	0.1	50	<0.1
Arizona	6,089	3.2	6,141	2.3
Arkansas	2,350	1.2	1,754	0.7
California	11,080	5.8	14,607	5.5
Colorado	2,839	1.5	3,418	1.3
Connecticut	1,904	1.0	2,663	1.0
Delaware	746	0.4	1,243	0.5
District of Columbia	618	0.3	1,176	0.4
Micronesia	118	0.1	1,015	0.4
Florida	6,846	3.6	17,441	6.6
Georgia	5,746	3.0	8,867	3.4
Guam	149	0.1	93	<0.1
Hawaii	590	0.3	2,539	1.0
Idaho	1,351	0.7	1,315	0.5

Table continued on next page

Table 7.2. Number and percentage of teacher preparation program completers and of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, by state: AY 2012 – 13
(continued)

State	Program completers		Number of persons receiving an initial credential	
	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
Illinois	8,534	4.4	10,650	4.0
Indiana	4,382	2.3	4,135	1.6
Iowa	2,649	1.4	2,761	1.0
Kansas	2,065	1.1	1,868	0.7
Kentucky	3,222	1.7	3,229	1.2
Louisiana	2,586	1.3	3,135	1.2
Maine	728	0.4	941	0.4
Marshall Islands	69	<0.1	87	<0.1
Maryland	2,784	1.4	3,079	1.2
Massachusetts	4,267	2.2	7,375	2.8
Michigan	4,450	2.3	4,495	1.7
Minnesota	2,927	1.5	3,887	1.5
Mississippi	2,305	1.2	2,648	1.0
Missouri	4,609	2.4	5,911	2.2
Montana	808	0.4	1,405	0.5
Nebraska	1,804	0.9	1,795	0.7
Nevada	771	0.4	1,929	0.7
New Hampshire	1,074	0.6	844	0.3
New Jersey	6,236	3.2	15,042	5.7
New Mexico	1,141	0.6	1,526	0.6
New York	18,046	9.4	25,084	9.5
North Carolina	5,513	2.9	4,950	1.9
North Dakota	673	0.3	1,205	0.5
Northern Marianas	31	<0.1	98	<0.1
Ohio	6,667	3.5	8,069	3.1
Oklahoma	2,153	1.1	1,787	0.7
Oregon	1,672	0.9	1,954	0.7
Palau	--	--	--	--
Pennsylvania	10,372	5.4	16,186	6.1

Table continued on next page

Table 7.2. Number and percentage of teacher preparation program completers and of persons receiving an initial teaching credential, by state: AY 2012 – 13
(continued)

State	Program completers		Number of persons receiving an initial credential	
	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
Puerto Rico	1,756	0.9	2,484	0.9
Rhode Island	821	0.4	818	0.3
South Carolina	2,594	1.3	2,761	1.0
South Dakota	696	0.4	1,828	0.7
Tennessee	4,453	2.3	5,592	2.1
Texas	20,828	10.8	27,651	10.5
Utah	2,693	1.4	2,572	1.0
Vermont	476	0.2	1,048	0.4
Virgin Islands	16	<0.1	109	<0.1
Virginia	4,013	2.1	5,888	2.2
Washington	2,428	1.3	2,410	0.9
West Virginia	1,192	0.6	1,100	0.4
Wisconsin	3,965	2.1	5,148	2.0
Wyoming	274	0.1	962	0.4
Total	192,459		263,425	


—Data not available.

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

- The five states that prepared the greatest number of individuals receiving initial teaching credentials in AY 2012 – 13 were (see figure 7.3):
 - Texas (27,651, or 10 percent of all persons receiving initial credentials),
 - New York (25,084, or 10 percent of all persons receiving initial credentials),
 - Florida (17,441, or 7 percent of all persons receiving initial credentials),
 - Pennsylvania (16,186, or 6 percent of all persons receiving initial credentials), and
 - New Jersey (15,042, or 6 percent of all persons receiving initial credentials).

Figure 7.3. Top five states that prepared individuals to earn initial teaching credentials, by number earned and percentage of those earned nationwide: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.


Initial Credentials Issued to Teachers Prepared in Another State



States reported on the total number of persons receiving an initial teaching credential issued in state and out of state for AYs 2009 – 10, 2010 – 11, 2011 – 12, and 2012 – 13. Some states prepare a greater number of teachers than is necessary to meet the teaching needs in their state. Other states do not prepare enough teachers to meet the demand in their state and rely on individuals who were prepared in other states to meet their hiring needs.

- In AY 2012 – 13, 21 percent of individuals received initial credentials in a different state from which they completed their teacher preparation. This was unchanged from AY 2011 – 12.
- Arkansas, Utah, and Puerto Rico reported that less than 10 percent of their students received initial credentials in a different state from which they completed their teacher preparation in AY 2012 – 13 (see figure 7.4). Alabama, New Jersey, New York, American Samoa, Marshall Islands, and Micronesia reported that they did not grant any initial credentials to individuals that were prepared in another state.

Figure 7.4. Percentage range of teachers awarded credentials in a different state from the one in which they completed their teacher preparation, by state: AY 2012 – 13



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. Of the states marked as "less than 10 percent," Alabama, America Samoa, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, New Jersey, and New York reported that they did not grant any initial credentials to individuals that were prepared in another state.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Credential Areas

Title II of HEA requires states to report on the number of individuals who earned an initial teaching credential from each teacher preparation program, disaggregated by the area of credential, such as elementary education or special education. While the areas of credentials vary from state to state, the most common initial credential areas remained fairly consistent across all three program types.



- For the past two academic years, the two most common initial credential areas were elementary education and special education (see table 7.3).
- Forty-seven states, American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands reported that elementary education was their most common initial credential area for traditional programs in AY 2012 – 13. Forty-two states, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, and Puerto Rico reported that elementary education was their most common initial credential area for traditional programs in AY 2011 – 12. Thirty-seven states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported that elementary education was their most common

initial credential area for traditional programs in AY 2010 – 11.

- Eight states reported that special education was their most common initial credential area for alternative, IHE-based programs in AY 2012 – 13. Six states reported that special

education was their most common initial credential area for alternative, IHE-based programs in AY 2011 – 12. Nine states reported that special education was their most common initial credential area for alternative, IHE-based programs in AY 2010 – 11.

Table 7.3. Five most common initial teaching credential subject areas, by teacher preparation program type: AY 2010 – 11, AY 2011 – 12, and AY 2012 – 13

Program type	Academic year		
	2010–11	2011–12	2012–13
Traditional	Elementary education	Elementary education	Elementary education
	Early childhood education	Special education	Special education
	Special education	English language arts	Early childhood
	English language arts	Math	English language arts
	Social studies	Early childhood	Math
Alternative IHE-based	Special education	Elementary education	Elementary education
	Elementary education	Special education	Special education
	Science	English language arts	English language arts
	English language arts	Math	Math
	Math	Early childhood	Early childhood
Alternative not IHE-based	Elementary education	Elementary education	Elementary education
	Special education	Special education	Special education
	Math	Math	Math
	Science	English language arts	English language arts
	English language arts	Science	Science

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2013 and 2014. Marshall Islands and Micronesia did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2012.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.


Credential Degree Requirements



States report on the degree requirements individuals must meet in order to earn an initial teaching credential. States are more likely to require that candidates have a bachelor's degree with a major in a subject area or academic content area for an initial teaching credential at the middle school or secondary level than at the elementary level. However, a growing number of states require that candidates have a subject area or academic content area bachelor's degree for all initial teaching credentials, regardless of the level.

- In 2014, 14 states and Northern Marianas reported requiring a bachelor's degree with a major in a subject area or academic content area for at least one initial credential issued at the elementary level (see figure 7.5).
- In 2014, 20 states, Guam, Northern Marianas, and the Virgin Islands required a bachelor's degree with a major in a subject area or academic content area for at least one initial credential issued at the middle school level (see figure 7.6).
- In 2014, 28 states, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Marianas, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands reported that they required a bachelor's degree with a major in a subject area or academic content area for at least one initial credential issued at the secondary level (see figure 7.7).


Figure 7.6. States requiring content-specific bachelor's degree standard for an initial teaching certificate at the middle school level: 2014



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. A content-specific bachelor's degree does not necessarily imply that the content of the degree is in the same content area as the credential.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Figure 7.7. States requiring content-specific bachelor’s degree standard for an initial teaching certificate at the secondary school level: 2014



NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. A content-specific bachelor’s degree does not necessarily imply that the content of the degree is in the same content area as the credential.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

Emergency License Types



States may be unable to fill all of their teaching positions with teachers holding required state credentials. In order to fill teaching positions in hard-to-staff schools or subject areas, states may grant emergency licenses. Policies regarding emergency licenses vary from state to state. In some states, emergency licenses may be issued to individuals who hold a teaching credential but who are teaching a subject area or grade level outside of their credential's area. Some states may issue emergency licenses to individuals who have content expertise but not a teaching credential in the subject to be taught. The duration of an emergency license and the number of times an individual may renew it also vary from state to state.

- In 2014, 27 states and American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 91 types of limited renewable emergency licenses with an average permitted duration of 1.3 years and an average of 2 renewals. In 2013, the same number of states and jurisdictions reported offering a total of 93 types of limited renewable emergency licenses with an average permitted duration of 1.3 years and 2 renewals. In 2012, 28 states, American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 94 types of limited renewable emergency licenses with an average duration of 1.4 years and 2 renewals (see table 7.4).
 - In 2014, 10 states and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 14 types of unlimited renewable emergency licenses with an average permitted duration of 2.1 years. In 2013, eight states reported offering a total of 12 types of unlimited renewable emergency licenses with an average permitted duration of 2.2 years. In 2012, nine states reported offering a total of 11 types of unlimited renewable emergency licenses with an average permitted duration of 2.1 years (see table 7.4).
 - In 2014, 36 states, the District of Columbia, and Marshall Islands reported offering a total of 148 types of nonrenewable emergency licenses with an average duration of 2.7 years. In 2013, 36 states, the District of Columbia, and Marshall Islands reported offering a total of 145 types of nonrenewable emergency licenses with an average duration of 2.7 years. In 2012, 34 states and the District of Columbia reported offering a total of 140 types of nonrenewable emergency licenses with an average duration of 2.7 years (see table 7.4).
- In 2014, 42 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 253 types of emergency licenses. In 2013, 43 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 250 types of emergency licenses. In 2012, 41 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 245 types of emergency licenses (see table 7.4). For all three years, the average permitted duration of the emergency licenses that states reported was 2.1 years.

Table 7.4. Number of state emergency teaching licenses granted, by license type and characteristics: 2012, 2013, and 2014

Emergency license type for all states	Year		
	2012 (31 states reporting)	2013 (32 states reporting)	2014 (32 states reporting)
Total number of emergency license types	245	250	253
Average duration (in years)	2.1	2.1	2.1
Limited renewable			
Number of limited renewable emergency license types	94	93	91
Average duration (in years)	1.4	1.3	1.3
Average number of times renewable	2	2	2
Unlimited renewable			
Number of unlimited renewable emergency license types	11	12	14
Average duration (in years)	2.1	2.2	2.1
Nonrenewable			
Number of nonrenewable emergency license types	140	145	148
Average duration (in years)	2.7	2.7	2.7

NOTE: The 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, and Virgin Islands submitted a state *Title II* report in 2014. In 2014, 27 states and American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 91 types of limited renewable emergency licenses; 10 states and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 14 types of unlimited renewable emergency licenses; and 36 states, the District of Columbia, and Marshall Islands reported offering a total of 148 types of nonrenewable emergency licenses. In 2013, 27 states and American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 93 types of limited renewable emergency licenses, eight states reported offering a total of 12 types of unlimited renewable emergency licenses, and 36 states, the District of Columbia, and Marshall Islands reported offering a total of 145 types of nonrenewable emergency licenses. Marshall Islands and Micronesia did not submit a state *Title II* report in 2012. In 2012, 28 states, American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported offering a total of 94 types of limited renewable emergency licenses, nine states reported offering a total of 11 types of unlimited renewable emergency licenses, and 34 states and the District of Columbia reported offering a total of 140 types of nonrenewable emergency licenses.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2015). *Higher Education Act Title II* reporting system.

A

Appendix A: Data Notes and Considerations

The HEA requires three annual reports on teacher preparation. First, institutions of higher education report various data to states. These data include program entry and exit requirements, supervised clinical experience requirements, enrollment data, program completer data, and the pass rates on state certification and licensure examinations of students completing their teacher preparation programs. Second, using reports from institutions of higher education, as well as other sources, states report annually on key elements of their approved teacher preparation programs and requirements for initial teacher credentialing, kindergarten through 12th grade. Finally, through the present document, the Secretary of Education reports to Congress on national patterns in these data.

Data Quality and Verification Processes

The HEA *Title II* data collection and reporting system has operated for over 15 years. During that time, the Department has worked with states to improve the accuracy and usefulness of these data by refining the online data collection system. States have worked to eliminate inconsistent responses and reduce incomplete responses. In addition, the Department has provided extensive technical assistance and support via telephone, e-mail, and webinars to assist state *Title II* coordinators in resolving data and reporting

issues. States have many opportunities to review and verify the accuracy of their data reported through *Title II* during all stages of reporting.

Prior to submitting and certifying their State Report Cards within the reporting system, states are provided with system-generated data checks for incomplete or invalid data, as well as system-generated comparisons of their data from the current year to the data they reported the prior year. This comparison is useful in helping states identify areas of concern or major changes in their data. States must resolve any data checks before they are able to certify and submit their reports.

Following the State Report Card data collection, states are granted read-only access to their state reports, allowing them to review their data for any typos or errors. States are allowed to submit any necessary edits or corrections during a two-week state review period.

An additional data quality effort, the state data shuttle provides states with state-level analyses and national data tables for review and verification. This step differs from prior verification steps, as it allows states to see how their state data compare to the national trends and provides new data analyses for states to review (for example, by looking at a state's enrollment trend over time, and by breaking down a state's teacher preparation providers according to type).

In some cases, the Department conducts additional follow-up with states for clarification or explanation of outliers or anomalies. For example, following the 2014 Data Collection, the Department followed up with several states that reported significant drops in enrollment. These enrollment decreases continued an existing downward trend, but the drops were even more significant in the 2014 data. The follow-ups enabled the Department to verify the data and ascertain possible explanations for the decreases.

Despite improvements in the data collection and reporting system, and the many verification steps to confirm the accuracy of the data, challenges remain. In particular, readers should consider the following data notes and data limitations regarding enrollment data, program completers, and pass rates.

Enrollment

Many institutions and states have had trouble reporting their enrollment data correctly. For the purposes of *Title II*, an officially “enrolled student” is one who has been admitted to the teacher preparation program but has not yet completed it for the academic year being reported. However, many institutions mistakenly count as “enrolled students” those who complete the program in the academic year being reported. These students should be classified as “program completers.” In an effort to increase the accuracy of its data, the Department has increased technical assistance efforts on reporting the enrollment data and has allowed states and institutions to correct data from prior years. Additionally, the reporting system has been enhanced by embedding clearer definitions of key reporting terms in relevant pages of the report.

Program Completers and Pass Rates

The HEA also requires institutions of higher education to report the pass rate of their enrolled students and program completers on state assessments required for an initial teaching credential. For *Title II* of the HEA reporting purposes, a program completer is a person who has met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program and is documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements. In applying this definition, the fact that an individual has or has not been recommended to the state for an initial credential may not be used as a criterion for determining who is a program completer.

Some institutions require individuals enrolled in teacher education programs to pass the state licensure assessment in order to complete the program; other institutions do not. Consequently, institutions that require students to pass state assessments for program completion will report 100 percent pass rates, but many institutions without such a requirement will not have 100 percent pass rates. Thus, in comparing pass rates across institutions, one does not gain a clear understanding of which ones may better prepare candidates.

Quality Control and Continuous Improvement

The Department is committed to continually improving the Title II, HEA data collection. Since the 2014 data collection, the Department has continued to refine its outreach and communication efforts with states and teacher preparation programs, as well as its data verification steps and processes. Additionally, beginning in 2015, the Department launched a monitoring effort to more closely explore state data and provide technical assistance to states to improve their state data collection practices and processes.

