

## Massachusetts

### Preparing Teachers for a New Era

*What will it take to prepare a new generation of teachers who are able to work successfully with an increasingly diverse student population and help their students achieve new rigorous learning goals? What are the key features of teacher education programs that can provide the public schools with such teachers? And what are the implications of our best answers to these questions for state policy?* For state policymakers, university leaders, and district officials charged with ensuring that all children are taught by highly qualified teachers, it is imperative to answer these questions about teacher quality. Finding the answers and acting on them require the commitment, collaboration, and coordination of a number of public and private institutions and agencies, and of multiple levels of government. Access to high-quality teacher education programs can affect teachers' productivity, the longevity of their careers, and the quality of the learning opportunities provided for their students.

Through its Teachers for a New Era (TNE) initiative, Carnegie Corporation of New York, with support from the Annenberg and Ford Foundations, is stimulating a thoughtful search for answers by supporting ambitious reforms in selected teacher education programs across the country. Drawing on the wisdom of national professional organizations, reform commissions, and the research community,

Carnegie is challenging these institutions to develop exemplary teacher preparation programs based on three design principles:

**1. Decisions Driven by Evidence.** The new teacher education programs would be guided by a culture of evidence. Program content and pedagogical practice would be based on credible evidence drawn from research literature and from the experience of their students. Program effectiveness would be determined by the impact of graduates on student achievement, and this data would drive the continuous improvement of the programs.

**2. Effective Engagement of Arts and Sciences Faculty.** The education of prospective teachers would include the full engagement of faculty in the disciplines of the arts and sciences (A&S) to ensure teachers obtained the depth of subject-matter understanding and pedagogical content knowledge needed to understand and address students' learning needs. A&S faculty would collaborate with teacher educators to ensure that prospective teachers were well prepared to teach the curricula of the public schools served by the institution.

**3. Emphasis on Teaching as a Clinical Practice Profession.** Teacher education would integrate academically rigorous experiences with immersion in clinical practice. This would entail close cooperation between

#### 2003–2004 Snapshot

Approved Teacher Preparation Programs:	65
Initial Teacher Certificates Issued by the State:	8,664
K–12 Public School Teachers:	68,003

colleges of education and K-12 schools, use of exemplary K-12 teachers as clinical faculty appointed to the colleges of education, and residency programs for beginning teachers over a two-year period of induction.

With support from Carnegie, 11 institutions in 10 states are redesigning their teacher preparation programs according to these three design principles. They are critically reconsidering their use of the knowledge base, their collection and use of evidence, their curriculum and standards, and their school-based relationships in order to produce higher-quality teacher candidates. It is hoped that the accomplishments of these institutions will offer interested policymakers, university leaders, and state education officials blueprints and tools to help them develop improved teacher preparation programs. Such programs will be capable of producing the teachers we need to raise the performance of the public schools and close the achievement gaps that perpetuate social inequities.

Clearly, states have an important role to play in this work. Through leadership, policymaking, resource allocations, and oversight, state governments shape the environments in which public and private teacher preparation programs operate. They can encourage and support efforts by these programs to restructure so as to foster a culture of evidence, engage A&S faculty, and provide prospective teachers with the rich, sustained clinical experiences and support they need.

For each of the 10 states in which TNE institutions operate, CPRE has developed a policy profile that explores the interaction of state policies and programs with the core ideas and practices associated with Carnegie's three design principles. For each state, we first provide a brief description of how the TNE institution is acting on the three design principles. Then we describe the current policy

context for teacher preparation and the state role and policy strategies for improving and ensuring teacher quality. Next we explore specific policies and programs in the state related to the three design principles to identify those that are supportive, those that may need strengthening, and those that need reconsideration by policymakers, state department officials, and teacher preparation institutions. This profile focuses on Massachusetts, and where appropriate we offer concrete examples from the restructuring now under way at Boston College, one of the 11 institutions to receive a TNE grant.

## **Boston College**

Boston College is a private, Jesuit university with 11 schools and colleges. The Lynch School of Education prepares both undergraduate and graduate students for a variety of professional roles in education. The School's teacher education program offers three undergraduate programs and eight graduate degree programs. Last year, the School graduated approximately 280 students from both undergraduate and graduate programs.

In 2003, Boston College received a \$5 million challenge grant from Carnegie Corporation's Teachers for a New Era Initiative. The effort to redesign teacher preparation at Boston College is organized into three teams. These teams are comprised of faculty and staff from A&S and the School of Education, as well as teachers from the Boston Public Schools (BPS).

The Evidence Team (ET) focuses on the first TNE principle, and it is responsible for developing the measures and instruments required to assess Boston College's success at meeting the design principles of TNE. In particular, the ET is developing strategies for gathering data about teacher education's

impact on student (both teacher candidate and PreK–12 pupil) learning. The development of a tracking system is under way that allows the teacher education program to contact students once they have left the program to gather information about them including profession. Examples of instruments being used for gathering evidence include assessment of teacher candidates' classroom performance based on work done during the student teaching period; qualitative case studies of teacher candidates' learning during the teacher preparation program and first year of teaching; value-added assessment of the impact of Boston College teacher education graduates on their pupils' scores on the statewide assessment; and entry, exit, and year-out surveys of teacher candidates' beliefs, attitudes, sense of preparedness, and practices.

A Learning Design Community (LDC) team is addressing the second TNE principle of engagement of A&S faculty by providing an opportunity for A&S and teacher education faculty to work collaboratively in many settings including the University, local schools, and workshops. Through this structure, public school teachers in Boston, Newton, and Brookline work together with Boston College faculty to prepare effective teachers. This work involves curriculum development, including course creation and modification, restructuring of major requirements, mentoring, advising and recruitment. For example, 16 courses were either developed or modified in the 2004–2005 school year to meet TNE objectives. Further collaboration among A&S faculty, education faculty, and school-based professionals is taking place through the mentoring of full-time Boston College student teachers. This includes one-on-one mentoring that pairs A&S faculty with student teachers, as well as content mentoring workshops.

The Clinical Practice Team (CPT) is focusing on the third TNE principle—teaching as a clinical practice profession. Recognizing that teacher candidates and practicing teachers need different supports, the CPT is developing initiatives to meet these different needs. For example, the Boston College TNE induction initiative (Project SUCCESS) provides support for teacher candidates in their last semester of the teacher education program and for graduates of this program in their first years of teaching. Preservice teacher candidates participate in a professional development workshop that focuses on preparing for the job search. First- and second-year teachers participate in a three-day summer institute, monthly meetings during the school year, and professional development workshops. In their third year and beyond, teachers are provided opportunities to participate in a variety of professional development activities. Through Project SUCCESS, school districts have been invited to consider providing credit to teachers who participate in the Boston College TNE induction program. Future work includes the development of an e-mentoring component.

In addition to the induction component, Boston College faculty in A&S and teacher education have further reinforced teaching as a clinical practice by teaching courses in K–12 settings, providing professional development to school-based professionals teaching courses in K-12 settings, co-teaching courses with BPS lead teachers, constructing a model for a Boston College and TNE partnership that supports shared goals, and forming a committee made up of PreK-12 administrators and teachers along with Boston College professors to explore the use of data to inform pupil learning and instruction.

## Education Policy Context

**Governance Landscape.** In Massachusetts, policymaking authority for state education policy rests with the Massachusetts Board of Education (BOE). The governor appoints seven of the nine voting members. The chancellor of higher education, appointed by the Board of Higher Education (BHE), is also a voting member, as is a high school student elected by the state student advisory council. There are 315 school districts and 1,095 public schools. Local school boards for each district are elected, except in Boston, where the mayor appoints members of the school board. In addition, there are 85 regional school boards that are either appointed or elected to represent a specific town.

The Massachusetts Department of Education (DOE) is the state agency responsible for implementing K–12 and teacher quality policies and programs. Its oversight is managed by the BOE. The DOE issues teaching licenses, accredits teacher preparation programs, and distributes induction funds to districts to support the mentoring of beginning teachers.

The BHE is the statewide coordinating agency responsible for overall coordination and broad policy development with respect to the University of Massachusetts and its five campuses, the nine state colleges, and 15 community colleges. The BHE includes 11 voting members and the commissioner of education, who serves as an ex officio, nonvoting member. It should be noted that the Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts is responsible for governing the five-campus university system while the BHE, in addition to its responsibility for overall coordination of all public postsecondary education, has residual governing authority with respect to the state and community colleges.

**Education Reform.** The Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993 was among the earliest state comprehensive education reform efforts. It called for sweeping changes in public education over a seven-year period. Among the major targets for improvements were greater and more equitable funding to schools, stronger accountability for student learning, and statewide standards for students, educators, schools, and districts.

The major changes in accountability brought about by the Education Reform Act included a school council in every school, continuing education for educators, more authority for principals, better-defined roles for school committees, and clear, concise, and measurable statewide standards for students and schools. The capstone was a set of high-stakes tests—the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System—based on the new curriculum standards. It has high stakes in the sense that every student must pass it in order to receive a diploma.

The Massachusetts Education Reform Review Commission (MERRC) was established by the state legislature in 1993 to oversee implementation of the Massachusetts Education Reform Act. MERRC's primary activity was to fund independent research on various education reforms. In addition to its research activities, another aim of MERRC was to facilitate discussion between education researchers and policymakers. Funding for MERRC was discontinued with passage of the Commonwealth's fiscal year 2003 budget, but much of this same work is being continued by the Rennie Center for Education Research and Policy.

The Rennie Center is an independent, nonprofit organization committed to addressing the critical challenges of reforming education in Massachusetts. Its mission is to develop a public agenda that promotes the

improvement of public education in Massachusetts by sponsoring nonpartisan, independent research and cultivating public discourse about efforts to improve public education in Massachusetts. Its reports and policy briefs on a variety of topics—including state capacity, federal policy, use of data, high school reform, labor management, and school choice—are disseminated to policy stakeholders in the public, private, nonprofit and media sectors.

## State Role in Teacher Preparation

Recruiting, preparing, and supporting excellent teachers for students in Massachusetts classrooms are fundamental goals of the governor, legislature, Board of Education and Board of Higher Education.

Since 1982, teacher candidates have been required to earn a bachelor's degree in arts or sciences to be eligible for licensure. Under the 1993 Massachusetts Education Reform Act, lifetime certification was replaced by a two-stage licensure system and by requiring renewal of the highest stage every five years through completion of a specific number of Professional Development Points (or credits). The Education Reform Act also required that educators seeking licensure pass written tests of communication and literacy skills and of subject matter knowledge. The first tests were administered in 1998, and are now known as the Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL). These tests are regularly updated to assure that they are aligned with the state teacher standards, as these may change due to regulatory changes.

Current regulations for educator licensure and preparation program approval were first approved by the BOE in November 2000, became effective in September 2004, and were

amended in April 2005. Among other features, these regulations strengthened academic requirements for teacher licensure as well as knowledge of how to teach reading. The new regulations also clarified non-higher-education and accelerated routes to educator licensure, incorporated performance assessments at various stages of preparation, required induction programs and mentors for all beginning teachers, and strengthened accountability requirements for higher education institutions and other organizations.

State policies which specifically influence teacher education programs and intersect with the TNE principles include teacher licensure regulations, standards for approving teacher preparation programs, and policy on the induction of beginning teachers.

**Teacher Certification Policies.** Teacher licensure in Massachusetts is characterized by a two-tier structure. In the first tier, the state offers three different types of licenses. To obtain a *Preliminary* license, valid for five years, a teacher candidate must hold a bachelor's degree and pass a teacher test. Additional coursework may be required depending on the certificate.

Also in this first tier, teachers may obtain a *Temporary* license, valid for only one year. To qualify for this license, teachers must pass the teacher test in Massachusetts and have taught in another state under a valid license.

An *Initial* license is the third type of certificate in the first tier—and the certificate required to pass on to the second tier of licensure. There are three ways to obtain an Initial license. Teacher candidates can receive a Preliminary license and be employed by a school district as a teacher of record or as an apprentice. In either case the district must have an approved program that will train the teachers within five years to be eligible for an Initial license.

Individuals who have completed an approved college education program may be eligible to go directly to an Initial license. Individuals who received a Temporary license can be employed by a school district for one year, during which time they must complete the teacher test to be eligible for an Initial license. Like the requirements for obtaining a Preliminary or Temporary license, individuals must pass a teacher test.

In 1998, the DOE initiated a new teacher testing system, MTEL. The system includes a test of communication and literacy skills as well as tests of subject-matter knowledge. MTEL has been one of the most controversial changes in licensure requirements. Almost 60 percent of prospective teachers failed the first administration of the teacher test in 1998, raising questions about whether the test is valid and reliable, whether cut scores were set too high, or whether prospective teachers are not meeting a minimum standard established by the state. Pass rates have been increasing since 1998 with an average pass rate of 66 percent in 2006.

To obtain a *Professional* license in the second tier of licensure, individuals must work for three years under an Initial license and must complete a one-year mentor induction program. In addition, teachers must complete either a Performance Assessment Program or a master's degree.

**Program Accreditation Policies.** In Massachusetts, there are several routes to licensure, and all of them are held to the same approval process. These include programs offered by institutions of higher education as well through alternative pathways.

The DOE has the statutory authority to approve programs that prepare candidates for educator licensure in Massachusetts. Such programs may be offered by public and private

higher education institutions, whether or not they also lead to degrees, and other sponsoring organizations.

The fundamental purpose of state approval of educator preparation programs is to assure the public that teachers and other educators who complete these programs in Massachusetts are prepared to educate students according to the learning standards in the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. Programs must also prepare their candidates to meet the professional standards for licensure that are specified in the new regulations, effective in 2005, for educator licensure and preparation program approval.

Through the new regulations for preparation program approval, all programs seeking approval must provide written evidence that they satisfy the state requirements for each program for which approval is sought. The DOE reviews the written information for each proposed program and verifies it through an onsite review. Program approval is granted for a term of five years.

Key requirements for program approval for preparing candidates for an Initial license include the fulfillment of subject-matter coursework, a pre-practicum and a practicum experience, and license-specific assessment of candidate performance during the practicum, as well as knowledge of the appropriate student learning standards in the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and of the Professional Standards for Teachers. For preparing candidates for a Professional license, teacher preparation programs must provide at least 50 hours of content-based seminars beyond the induction year.

All sponsoring organizations with approved programs must also demonstrate an 80 percent pass rate of program completers who take state licensing tests and assessments, MTEL,

required for Initial licensure in the field and at the level of preparation.

District-based licensure programs are offered by a variety of sponsoring organizations. Forty-five school districts, charter schools, educational collaboratives, private training providers, and professional associations are in various phases of design and implementation of district-based programs. Most operate in close partnership with institutions of higher education. In order to receive state approval, district-based licensure programs must undergo a two-step process of informal and formal review. Successful completion of informal review allows a sponsoring organization to serve as a licensing agent for one year. The formal review is then conducted during a program's second year of operation. Successful completion of the formal review confers the status of an approved program, allowing the sponsoring organization to endorse program completers for licensure by the state.

In addition to traditional teacher education programs offered by institutions of higher education and those offered by districts, Massachusetts sponsors a teacher preparation program designed to recruit and train prospective teachers in high-demand subject areas in schools that are difficult to staff. The Massachusetts Initiative for New Teachers (MINT) is an intensive teacher preparation program that provides opportunities for recent college graduates and mid-career professionals. The DOE awards full tuition scholarships to candidates who commit to teach for three years in designated high-need districts. MINT participants earn an Initial license through an intensive summer training initiative, followed by an ongoing support and assessment program during their first year as a teacher of record in a public school. Candidates are prepared through licensure

programs that operate in high-need districts and are approved by the DOE.

University faculty and administrators are aware of the growing diversity of teacher preparation routes available in Massachusetts. Some see the state's authorization of nontraditional routes as creating a double standard for teacher quality and institutional practices in the state.

**Teacher Induction Policies.** In Massachusetts, local school districts are responsible for providing an induction experience for beginning teachers. With the passage of the Education Reform Act of 1993, all school districts in Massachusetts were required to create and administer programs to support beginning educators. Many districts responded by implementing mentoring programs that paired beginning teachers with veteran teachers. The Massachusetts DOE has supported many of these programs with grant funding, and training for mentors and administrators, in order to build the district capacity to sustain these support programs over time.

In 2001, the DOE further emphasized the importance of induction programs to educator development by tying these programs to educator licensure. Under the new licensure regulations that became effective October 2001, participation in an induction program is a requirement for the Professional license for both teachers and administrators. All school districts in Massachusetts are now required to offer induction programs to educators who are new to the district. The new regulations also outlined a set of standards for district induction programs. These standards expanded the idea of support from the mentoring model to a more comprehensive induction model that includes an orientation, a support team and release time for induction activities as well as a mentoring relationship.

However, despite explicit state policy and standards around induction and mentoring, there is a sense among education leaders and policy stakeholders that these supports are not being implemented as intended. There is no specific funding stream for this work and not much accountability for districts to ensure that they are providing induction programs that meet the state requirements. Further, there is little coordination of this effort among school districts.

## Developing a Culture of Evidence

TNE institutions are committed to developing a culture of evidence to guide the improvement of their teacher education programs. High-quality data systems can help institutions locate and track their teacher graduates in the state and examine their effectiveness through the achievement of their students. State leadership is needed in two areas. First, states have a role to play in creating the conditions supportive of a culture of evidence in teacher preparation. Second, the adequacy of state data systems depends upon the commitment of leaders to build an information infrastructure useful to multiple stakeholders, including teacher preparation programs which need access to meaningful data about the location and performance of their graduates across the state.

### Encouraging Evidence-Based Practice.

Massachusetts was among the first states to emphasize the use of data to inform decisions through its Education Reform Act. In addition, through the National Science Foundation's state systemic initiative, districts were encouraged to become "data-driven," especially in mathematics and science, by collecting data on students and teachers, and encouraging educators to use data in the evaluation of their own instruction and the assessment of their students.

### Building High-Quality State Data Systems.

For program improvement purposes, institutions of higher education need help tracking their graduates within the state, and need access to reliable longitudinal data that includes background and performance data for both graduates and K–12 pupils.

The state plays a critical role in providing institutions of higher education with meaningful data that contribute to program improvement. State policies that contribute to this capacity include data collection and management regarding teacher and student information at both the state and local levels.

A major challenge in Massachusetts is developing strong teacher data systems that permit teacher preparation programs to locate and track their graduates across the state. Massachusetts collects a somewhat limited amount of teacher data. However, there is an ambitious plan to build an education data warehouse that links student assessment data with information on teachers and their qualifications. The goal of this system is to give teachers feedback on the performance of their students through an online system. A benefit of this system will be the ability to analyze teacher and preparation program effectiveness.

The state has implemented a State Assigned Student Identifiers (SASID), which is a unique identifier given to each student receiving a publicly funded education in Massachusetts. The SASID number remains with the student throughout his or her educational life in grades PreK-12, even as the student transfers from one district or school to another. However, the state has not linked student assessment data with teachers. BPS has created a system that links teachers to student test scores. Teachers can view the scores for all of their students online and the data system is updated as students move within the district. Principals

have access to data on all students in their schools and grant access to school planning teams. Individual test scores can be compared to aggregate district and state scores. The school system created this capacity for itself. They use an employee identification for teachers, not a social security number, and a BPS identification for students (i.e., BPS created their own student identification system that must be mapped back to state system to use state test scores). The system uses a detailed course code system (building, course, section) that assigns every period of every course to a different number. The system contains data about all courses taught by a teacher and all courses taken by students and allows a match between students and teachers. BPS has not linked their student assessment database with their human resources database on teacher qualifications, because the primary goal of the BPS system is to encourage teachers to use data on their students. Even though BPS has organized data for teacher use, they have not yet organized the database to look at specific programs. There is some interest from regional superintendents in using data to learn more about high-performing schools and teachers, but the BPS system does not yet support these kinds of analyses.

*Teacher Databases.* There are two state databases containing information about teachers. A licensure database has information about preparation and certification, as well as information on where a teacher was prepared and Praxis scores. The second database, the teacher retirement system, provides information about employment status. The data systems are not linked, although the state plans to implement a new system in the fall of 2007 called the Education Personnel Information Management System (EPIMS). The system will be used to collect data from all public school districts and charter schools about demographics, educational background, professional qualifications, and current

employment information, including the specific positions of individual educators. The data collected will be linked with the licensure data the DOE currently maintains.

By assigning a unique identification, the Massachusetts Education Personnel ID (MEPID) to all educators, the DOE will be able to track graduates of educator preparation programs and determine whether they are currently employed in Massachusetts public schools.

The state has passed a bond that includes funds for building a state education database. The state hopes to have this system operational within the next two years. This system would combine a student data system with the new teacher data system, EPIMS.

Based on lessons learned in the development of the student identification system, a unique identifier for all teachers is necessary to create the teacher data system. Social security numbers will not be used as identifiers. The goal of the system is to link teachers to students so that teachers can access background data on their students. The state would like to get a roster of students associated with all teachers and then use that information to provide data to teachers on their students, thus giving teachers and principals online access to their student data, although there are also implications of this work for teacher evaluation.

*Student Databases.* The student data system has been developed with the unique student identifiers. The Student Information Management System (SIMS) is a student-level data collection system that allows the DOE to collect and analyze more accurate and comprehensive information, to meet federal and state reporting requirements, and to inform policy and programmatic decisions.

SIMS is used to collect student-level data on all public school students in Massachusetts. The state has four to five years of data with approximately 50 variables per student including demographic and assessment data.

*Limitations on the Use of Data.* There are some concerns about the development of the education data system. While the primary goal of the new data system will be to help individual teachers, it could also be used to look at systemic issues such as teacher effectiveness, teacher retention, and the relationships between teacher preparation and assignment. Many see this as not far reach to using this data to make decisions about teacher compensation. This is a view that is prevalent among teacher unions in the state.

However, the major barrier to creating this education warehouse is the limited financial capacity to implement it. The state education leaders need funding to demonstrate to the legislature the value, importance, and use of information management.

A second barrier is political opposition. Some will view this data warehouse negatively and see the potential for its misuse. Work is needed to convene a number of stakeholders and constituents that the data will be used constructively and that there will be safeguards against misuse.

The education data system has potential to greatly increase access to data and the ability to use data. The DOE currently has very limited information on the quality of the teaching workforce. But the BOE, DOE, and legislative staff will want to this data to answer policy questions. Until this point, the data have been difficult to compile and validate.

The DOE is also trying to link K-12 with higher education to create a PreK-16 data system. Through a grant from the National

Governors Association, the DOE is collecting higher education information from teacher graduates.

However, until new state databases are in place and operational, institutions of higher education must work with individual districts to locate their graduates in particular schools, access data on student performance data to strengthen state assessments, and link their teachers and their students. Boston College is currently working with a number of schools in the BPS system to develop a joint database of baseline information about its graduates and student performance.

Accessing student and teacher data via districts provides institutions with a short-term solution. Since graduates of most preparation programs are scattered across the state, access to a state-level system will provide a more stable and usable long-term resource.

## **Effective Engagement of Arts and Sciences Faculty**

Cultivating stronger collaborative relationships between A&S faculty and teacher education faculty holds great promise for ensuring that teacher candidates develop strong content knowledge. Like many other states, Massachusetts state policies offer institutions few supports or mechanisms through which to strengthen relationships across these two faculties. New licensure requirements and program approval regulations aim to strengthen teacher content knowledge through closer alignment with K-12 standards, but do not consider directly how ongoing collaboration between A&S faculty and education faculty could be a mechanism for improving the teacher preparation.

### **Ensuring Strong Teacher Content**

**Knowledge.** Since 1982, Massachusetts has required teachers to hold a bachelor's degree in arts or sciences. State officials consider the program approval process another mechanism for gauging the adequacy of teacher content knowledge. In addition, the DOE has run summer content institutes for mathematics and science teachers, which began through the National Science Foundation's state systemic initiative.

### **Facilitating Collaboration with Arts and**

**Sciences Faculty.** One mechanism for ensuring strong teacher content knowledge is through participation of A&S faculty in the teacher preparation program. Again, both state officials and higher education faculty point to the program approval process as the principal policy mechanism for supporting cross-school collaboration within the university for teacher preparation.

Although state policies do not explicitly address the involvement of A&S faculty in the development of teacher content knowledge, both DOE and BOE officials have observed that A&S faculty have become increasingly involved with the training of education students – at least in state colleges and universities. This increased collaboration is attributed in part to the changing institutional cultures norms about collaboration across faculties, and in part to state policy requiring that 50 percent of coursework within a master's program in education must be provided by A&S faculty.

## **Conceptualizing Teaching as a Clinical Practice**

One of the principles of the TNE initiative is that teaching is a clinical practice profession. University faculty should be actively guiding teacher candidates in clinical settings, e.g., schools and classrooms, directly honing

candidate skills to assess student needs and to select effective curriculum and pedagogy. Institutions with a strong conception of teaching as a clinical practice should develop residency or induction programs to support the performance of beginning teachers.

**Encouraging Teaching as a Clinical Skill.** In Massachusetts, as in other states, institutions of higher education are afforded broad authority to define the type, structure, and duration of a teacher candidate's field experience and, by extension, the array of clinical experiences—modeling, observation, teaching, and reflection—that would provide a candidate with opportunities to learn in clinical settings.

There are, however, a set of standards that represent the minimum requirements for clinical experience for individuals seeking licensure in Massachusetts. Prospective teachers must complete a pre-practicum of at least 75 hours and a practicum experience of at least 150 hours. Colleges and universities supporting students in a clinical experience must provide the state with a license-specific assessment of candidate performance during the practicum experience.

Despite these requirements for field experiences, there is recognition by the BOE that more attention should be given to clinical practice in teacher preparation programs.

**Supports for Teacher.** TNE challenges teacher preparation programs to take responsibility for the performance of their graduates by developing two-year residency programs that support their transition into the classroom. In Massachusetts, state policies supporting teacher induction have not directly considered higher education involvement, but there are efforts under way at several institutions of higher education, such as Boston College, to support beginning teachers.

Currently, Massachusetts policymakers require districts to take responsibility for beginning teachers' first year in the classroom. The state provides support to districts but it is not generally considered enough to provide the kinds of support that research suggests new teachers need.

State officials are supportive of institutions of higher education continuing to work with graduates as they enter the classroom. Teacher preparation programs may be well positioned to bridge that gap, providing a stable, continuous resource for beginning teachers. Through their preservice program, teachers have often already developed portfolios and early professional growth plans under the advisement of their program. These products provide a foundation for induction and training choices throughout teachers' professional careers.

The involvement of higher education in induction not only brings familiarity with individual teacher strengths and weaknesses, but continuity in teacher development. It also provides a clear link to professional certification, which is based upon a different but related set of teacher standards. Institutions of higher education would facilitate new teachers' use of these standards as a foundation for their professional growth plans and ongoing conversations about improving instructional practice.

Current state policies and resources provide a mix of opportunities and constraints for Boston College and other interested institutions of higher education seeking to support their graduates during the induction years. A first challenge is the difficulty of locating their graduates in a timely manner. Institutions will most likely need help from both state officials and the district to determine where their teachers are teaching across the state. It is probable that graduates will be

distributed across multiple districts, or that many may even teach outside Massachusetts. In designing services and considering delivery costs, institutions of higher education need to know the distribution of their graduates in the state. Designing services for graduates largely concentrated in a nearby region or cluster of districts may be different from a residency program that must account for graduates scattered across the state.

A second challenge focuses on integrating higher education induction programs with existing district approaches to induction. Through state regulation, beginning teachers participate in district induction programs, although these local programs vary widely in stability, structure, and quality. Institutions of higher education seeking to support graduates in larger districts, such as Boston, will likely encounter stable, structured programs designed to manage sizable annual cohorts of new teachers. Institutions reaching out to graduates in smaller districts may find less formal arrangements. It is possible, in some situations, that institutions may find that their efforts compete with local programs. In other situations their services may complement local programs that are only able to offer minimal support. It is possible that small districts may welcome higher education support as a substitute, while larger districts may wish higher education to take on training responsibilities.

## **Towards Supporting, Spreading, and Sustaining TNE Reforms**

State policies in Massachusetts regarding teacher licensure, program standards, and beginning teacher induction are generally supportive of the TNE principles and the work under way at Boston College. To further strengthen and deepen the move towards a performance-oriented system of teacher preparation, a number of issues require the

attention of policymakers, state officials, higher education leaders, and stakeholder groups responsible for ensuring teacher quality in the state.

**Addressing Higher Education Access to Appropriate Data.** In redesigning teacher certification and the program approval process, state officials have emphasized that evidence of student learning in both the design of teacher preparation programs and classroom-based practice is fundamental. As anticipated, these policies have created a demand across higher education faculty for outcome data regarding student learning and information about teacher characteristics, performance, and practices, as well as the conditions of teaching. However, the availability and adequacy of such data to institutions of higher education could be improved. State data collection policies are influencing how institutions of higher education approach program improvement. Yet the capacity of the state to do so may be limited. In considering this issue,

- What is the fit between data available from state agencies and the emerging research questions and study designs that institutions of higher education hope to pursue?
- How can state data collection be redesigned with the understanding that institutions of higher education are valuable consumers of these data? And further, how can the state ensure that these institutions have access to this data?
- How can the state, institutions of higher education, and local school districts collaborate to develop a comprehensive data system in support of teacher and student learning?

**Expanding the Role of Arts and Sciences Faculties in Teacher Preparation to Strengthen the Quality of Teacher Content Knowledge.** Massachusetts's teacher assessment system and program approval standards represent important steps towards strengthening teacher content knowledge and ensuring alignment with K-12 content standards. These policies recognize that courses outside the education school influence this content. However, a broader role for A&S faculty in teacher preparation could be more fully conceptualized and articulated by state leaders and Massachusetts's teacher preparation community. Higher education leadership is also needed to ensure that A&S involvement in teacher preparation is valued and rewarded. In considering this issue,

- How can higher education leadership promote stronger collaboration across education and A&S faculties and encourage a sense of shared responsibility for teacher quality?
- What adjustments may be needed in the higher education incentive system, such as faculty load, tenure requirements, and the university and college mission, to support this strategic collaboration?
- How can the state formulate policy that encourages this collaboration, beyond initial efforts to require that half of the coursework in an educational master's program be taught by A&S faculty?

**Encouraging a Role for Institutions of Higher Education in the Induction of Beginning Teachers.** Massachusetts policymakers and state officials recognize the importance of supporting beginning teachers' first years in the classroom. Districts are ultimately responsible for the quality of induction; however, the state has supported local programs through modest funding and

the provision of guidelines for induction programs. It is widely acknowledged that the induction of beginning teachers across the state is highly variable and could be strengthened. Institutions of higher education appear uniquely positioned to provide a valuable contribution to supporting teachers in this transition to the classroom. However, the role that institutions of higher education might play needs to be explored with full consideration of higher education capacity and complementary with existing district programs. In considering this issue,

- What are the roles institutions of higher education see for themselves in supporting their graduates as they begin teaching?
- How can the state promote coordination between higher education efforts to support their graduates and existing district induction programs?
- What new resources are needed to support higher education institutions' expansion of their responsibilities to include their graduates' transition to teaching?

## Resources:

Teachers for a New Era (TNE)  
[www.teachersforanewera.org](http://www.teachersforanewera.org)

TNE at Boston College  
[www.tne.bc.edu/](http://www.tne.bc.edu/)

The Rennie Center for Education Research  
and Policy  
[www.renniecenter.org](http://www.renniecenter.org)

Massachusetts Department of Education  
[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)

Massachusetts Board of Higher Education  
<http://www.mass.edu/>

## About CPRE

*The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) studies alternative approaches to education reform in order to determine how state and local policies can promote student learning. Currently, CPRE's work is focusing on accountability policies, efforts to build capacity at various levels within the education system, methods of allocating resources and compensating teachers, instructional improvement, finance, and student and teacher standards. The results of this research are shared with policymakers, educators, and other interested individuals and organizations in order to promote improvements in policy design and implementation.*

*CPRE unites five of the nation's leading research institutions: the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, Stanford University, the University of Michigan, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison.*

For more information about CPRE, visit  
[www.cpre.org](http://www.cpre.org)