

Washington

Approved Teacher Preparation Programs: 22
 Initial Teacher Certificates Issued by the State: 4,953
 K-12 Public School Teachers: 57,632

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 a high-quality teacher education program 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 their graduates on student achievement, and this data would drive the continuous improvement of their 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 to ensure teachers obtained the depth of subject matter understanding and pedagogical content knowledge needed to understand and address students' learning needs. Arts and sciences 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 colleges of education and K-12 schools, use of exemplary K-12 teachers as clinical faculty appointed to the college of education, and

support for 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 arts and sciences faculty, and provide prospective teachers with the rich and 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 Washington, and where appropriate we offer concrete examples from the restructuring now under way at the University of Washington, one of the 11 institutions to receive a TNE grant.

The University of Washington

The University of Washington (UW) is the seventh largest producer of teacher candidates in the state. Through its Master in Teaching program, UW endorses over 150 prospective teachers each year.

In 2003, UW received a \$5 million challenge grant from Carnegie Corporation's Teachers for a New Era initiative. Through its newly established Washington Center for Teaching and Learning (WCTL), TNE at UW is developing a new undergraduate program that will recruit a diverse student body from both its undergraduate population and local community colleges. The reforms are organized around the three principles. One strand of work focuses on the use of evidence to drive course and program improvement for teacher preparation. Drawing on expertise from across the university, the Evidence of Learning Team is developing specialized longitudinal data systems to examine the relationship between PreK-12 student learning and the experiences and practices of its teacher graduates, from preservice through professional certification. A second strand engages arts and sciences faculty in the reconfiguration of academic majors to ensure that teachers who have taken undergraduate courses are ready to teach the state content

standards and are exposed to content-appropriate teaching strategies. Early work is focusing on areas of high need, including mathematics, science, and literacy. A third strand focuses on developing professional learning centers within the university's current network of partner schools. Through a new two-year residency program, UW will provide school-based mentoring by trained practitioners, teleconferencing and on-line study groups led by UW faculty, and training for mentor teachers. A new Master's in Teacher Leadership, which draws upon this online support system, will strengthen the professional growth of individual teachers and the partner schools.

Education Policy Context

Governance Landscape. In Washington, policymaking authority for teacher preparation traditionally rested with the elected *State Board of Education* (SBE). In January 2006, this responsibility shifted to the *Professional Educator Standards Board* (PESB), an appointed board of practicing teachers, administrators, educational staff associates, and university deans that has long served in an advisory role to the SBE. In its prior role, PESB focused primarily on the design of alternative routes to teaching and the implementation of a new teacher testing system. In its new role, PESB will oversee educator preparation and certification and have authority to make policy.

The legislature has provided a few mechanisms for collaboration and coordination between these two policymaking boards. Both SBE and PESB will submit joint biennial reports describing how their policies and programs align to support the state's broader education goals of improved student learning. Also, the elected state superintendent represents an important link as a full voting member of both PESB and SBE. The Office of

the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is responsible for implementing K-12 and teacher quality policies and programs. In terms of teacher preparation, OSPI is responsible for issuing teaching certificates, accrediting teacher preparation programs, and distributing induction funds to districts to support the mentoring of beginning teachers.

The *Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board* (HECB) is also taking a more prominent role in teacher preparation. Through its broad responsibility to authorize new degree and professional licensure programs, HECB is reviewing the growing number of out-of-state and virtual universities seeking authority to operate in Washington. Many of these newly authorized institutions are delivering education-related programs to Washington residents, including teacher preparation.

Conversations are under way among state leaders about how these three boards might best work in concert to address P-16 and teacher quality issues. Recently, HECB created a new advisory council of state education officials, including the state superintendent, to consider teacher preparation issues. Beyond this new council, communication and coordination have not been formalized across these three governance bodies: PESB, SBE, and HECB.

Teacher Preparation. In Washington, twenty-two colleges and universities have been authorized by the SBE to operate teacher preparation programs. In 2003, these accredited institutions graduated over 3,420 teacher candidates, accounting for 69% of new teacher certificates issued by OSPI.

An ongoing issue for policymakers centers on the adequacy of the supply of teachers in the state and the ability of rural districts to attract qualified teachers. Out-of-field teaching has

been a chronic problem in Washington. OSPI estimates that 45% of middle school students are taught by teachers with neither a major nor minor in the subject area they teach. The problem is particularly acute in small, rural districts, which constitute over half of Washington's 269 districts. Districts have reported difficulty in attracting qualified teachers in special education, mathematics, and physics. Although recent market reports suggest teacher shortages are lessening in some areas, because 11% of the current teaching workforce is eligible for retirement by 2009, teacher shortages are expected to worsen in mathematics and English language arts.

To address these shortages, Washington policymakers have expanded and diversified alternative certification and degree options for prospective teachers. Existing pathways are expanded through new satellite or branch campuses of select public Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). These campuses extend existing programs, which include 17 certificate programs in education, to new areas across the state. Other pathways are emerging through stronger articulation agreements between community colleges and accredited teacher preparation programs. In fact, some community colleges have expressed an interest in offering their own teacher certification and/or baccalaureate degree programs. Options are being expanded by the PESB, which has authorized new "targeted" alternative routes through "field-based partnerships" that bring together traditional preparation institutions, select K-12 districts, and regional educational service districts. These highly specialized programs focus on a particular region's staffing needs. Finally, new options for prospective teachers are increasingly being made available through the 39 out-of-state and virtual universities authorized by HECB. At this time, however, only a handful of these institutions offer student teaching and/or

teacher certification programs to Washington residents.

It is difficult to gauge the contributions of these alternative routes and new organizational arrangements to the current pool of certified teachers in Washington. Many traditional university faculty and state administrators see little direct competition; new institutional arrangements appear to cater to nontraditional students by alleviating enrollment barriers associated with tuition costs, commuting hardships, and weekday courses. To date, there has been no market analysis of how the various teacher preparation programs or differing program features are affecting consumer choices or outputs.

The quality of traditional teacher preparation programs is generally perceived to be high by K-12 educators. Annual surveys through OSPI reveal that most beginning teachers express high satisfaction with their teacher preparation experience. Principal responses also reveal an overall satisfaction with the performance of beginning teachers. Although reports of results for individual teacher preparation programs are not available at this time, the overall survey results over the last five years have been increasingly positive about the quality of teachers' preparation offered through Washington IHEs.

State Role in Teacher Preparation

Over the last decade, Washington policymakers, state officials, and IHE faculty have been discussing, designing and implementing a new comprehensive system of teacher development. This system is intended to be performance-based and more closely aligned with K-12 student learning goals. New policies target different stages of the teacher development continuum, from preservice education to teacher induction and certification

renewal. At each developmental stage, Washington teachers are now expected to provide evidence of meeting the teacher standards and mastering related competencies. They must also provide evidence that their instructional practices generate improvements in student learning.

The new teacher education system envisioned by the state is still in transition. Key foundational policies are in place, but important elements are being reviewed, while others are still under development.

Teacher Certification Policies. Washington has created a new teacher licensure system that creates higher hurdles for entering and remaining in the teaching profession. In 2000, policymakers adopted a two-stage performance-based teacher licensure system: (1) a nonrenewable *Residency Certificate* and (2) a renewable *Professional Certificate*. The new system is moving toward requiring teachers to demonstrate their achievement of teaching standards and providing evidence of positive impact on students' learning at multiple points over the course of their teaching career. "Now there is no place in the teacher continuum in this state," explained one state official, "where a teacher can say, 'Okay, I have made it and I don't have to do anything anymore.' We require continuous professional growth throughout the career of the teacher."

To earn a *Residency Certificate*, teacher candidates must hold at least a bachelor's degree in an endorsement area, complete a state-approved teacher preparation program that includes teaching methodology and student teaching internship, and pass a new series of teacher assessments. Teacher candidates must demonstrate their achievement of the state standards, which comprise 26 competencies. They must also earn one or more endorsements in the subject(s) they intend to teach.

The adoption of a teacher testing system is one of the most visible changes in the certification requirements. In 2002, the state began requiring teacher candidates to pass a basic skills assessment, called the *WEST-B*, in reading, writing, and mathematics for admissions to teacher preparation programs. Since September 2005, teacher candidates must demonstrate adequate content knowledge and pedagogy in at least one endorsement area by passing a subject area test, called the *WEST-E/Praxis II*. Passing scores for both standardized tests are set by PESB. Pedagogy is assessed by a common *performance-based pedagogical assessment* during student teaching.

To continue teaching, educators must now earn a *Professional Certificate* within seven years of entering Washington classrooms. As with the *Residency Certificate*, the *Professional Certificate* is performance-based. Teachers must demonstrate achievement of three teacher standards, which consist of 12 competencies. They must also provide evidence of positive impact on student learning. To earn this level of certification, teachers must complete an authorized professional certificate program; at present such programs are offered exclusively through IHEs. The state allows one alternative route through the achievement of National Board Certification issued by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Program Accreditation Policies. In 1997, Washington policymakers also changed the standards by which teacher preparation programs are authorized by OSPI. These preservice program standards reflect the shift towards performance-based teacher licensure and parallel national standards promoted by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). All 22 teacher

preparation programs have incorporated these new standards into their certification programs. At present, 10 teacher preparation programs hold national accreditation through NCATE.

The new elements of Washington's program approval standards appear to be aligned with the TNE principles. First, the standards require IHEs to develop a conceptual framework and curriculum that reflect research-based practices and is performance-oriented. This framework must explicitly support teacher understanding of the Washington content standards for student achievement, known as the *Essential Academic Learning Requirements* (EALRs).

Second, the program standards require IHEs to develop a performance-based program organized around demonstrated mastery of teacher competencies, not course completion. In designing programs, institutions are expected to provide candidates with opportunities to acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for residency certification and to achieve success in meeting these competencies to graduate.

Third, programs must ensure that teacher candidates demonstrate positive effects on student learning. All programs must establish exit criteria for teacher candidates and must assess candidates against professional, state, and institutional standards. In bringing IHE program standards in closer alignment with K-12 education, teachers seeking certification and IHE programs consider the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) an important resource for examining student learning.

Fourth, teacher preparation programs are expected to develop performance-based measures for monitoring program quality and refining program features. Programs are

expected to develop a system for collecting and analyzing data on teacher candidate qualifications and performance over time and to establish routines for reviewing and acting on this information for program improvement purposes.

Institutions are very much in transition. Program improvement has focused on developing processes and assessments that are data-rich and performance-orientated. At some point, state officials intend to assess IHE effectiveness in preparing teachers by the performance of their graduates.

University faculty and administrators are concerned about the growing diversity of teacher preparation routes available to Washington residents. According to one state administrator, only a few out-of-state and online universities have expressed interest in program approval from the state, and only one has pursued this route. Justifiably or not, many university faculty see the state's authorization or lack of oversight of nontraditional routes as creating a double standard for teacher quality and institutional practices in the state—one that devalues the redesign work under way across Washington's traditional teacher preparation programs.

Other Policies Supporting Teacher Quality. Washington's policies on teacher induction are also consistent with TNE's emphasis on teaching as a clinical practice. Since 1984, OSPI has provided funding through its *Teacher Assistance Program* (TAP) to districts for local induction programs that support beginning teachers during their first year in the classroom. District participation is voluntary and requires annual reapplication.

Local school districts are responsible for designing their own programs. State funds are provided to help districts give the beginning teachers mentors, additional training, and

opportunities to observe other teachers. The program also aims to support the development of individual *Professional Growth Plans* (PGPs) and teaching portfolios, which are expected to guide teachers training choices throughout their professional career.

State efforts to strengthen district induction programs have focused on providing districts guidance and training options. In 2005, OSPI and the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession, with support from the Paul G. Allen Family Foundation, developed a set of voluntary induction standards for districts. Since 2001, OSPI has offered a four-day summer academy for mentor teachers with follow up sessions during the school year. This academy provides small districts with cost-effective training.

Developing a Culture of Evidence

TNE institutions are expected to develop a culture of evidence in their teacher education programs. High-quality statewide data systems are needed to help institutions track their teacher graduates and determine their effectiveness through the achievement of their students. State leadership is needed to create the conditions and incentives that encourage the development of cultures of evidence in teacher preparation programs. And state actions and investments are required to ensure the adequacy of the data systems needed to provide teacher preparation programs with meaningful information about the location and performance of their graduates.

Encouraging Evidence-Based Practice. New state policies regarding teacher licensure and program approval for teacher preparation programs emphasize evidence-based practices and require both teachers and IHEs to demonstrate that their professional choices

result in improved student learning.

State officials consider the new program standards a major step towards cultivating a culture of evidence across teacher preparation programs. “Instead of course units or seat time requirements of the old process,” explained one administrator, “programs should be redesigned around the competencies—whatever it takes to help the teacher candidate demonstrate proficiency.”

During accreditation site visits, officials have noted a “heightened interest in assessments of all kinds” among teacher education faculty. Under the traditional model, individual teacher candidates were responsible for the quality of their performance, and traditional means of course exams and papers were the primary methods for demonstrating achievement. Now IHEs must consider their contribution to the progress and performance of their teacher candidates. Explained one official, “We do not have a comprehensive plan just yet, but we are trying to look at data to see if our programs are effective.”

Both OSPI and IHE faculty recognize that the mapping of courses to standards represents only a first step in a complex transition to a performance-based system. Conflicting messages and inadequate resources hamper the process and underscore a system in transition, from state agency to IHEs. One state official expressed frustration with the pace of change: “Getting the university system to think in this new terminology of competencies instead of credit hours is a slow process. It is hard when the currency is to count everything in college credits. It is a challenge to think in terms of [teacher] competencies.” A university administrator pointed to state memos that continue to use the old language of inputs: “Universities and even the departments don’t think and don’t operate in terms of competencies. We are about courses, but we

are trying. But then even memos from OSPI reference courses as the unit of analysis. It's confusing. Everyone is all over the place."

Many stakeholders recognize that additional attention is needed to foster "a new mindset" or "way of doing business" that positively contributes to an emerging culture of evidence in Washington's teacher preparation community. To this end, stakeholders need more opportunities to share insights about the ongoing challenges—and successes—they are encountering.

Building High-Quality State Data Systems.

State policies play a critical role in creating conditions that foster evidence-based practice, and in providing IHEs with meaningful data that contribute to program improvement. These policies include data collection, management, and archival practices regarding teacher and student information at both the state and local level. IHEs need help tracking their graduates within the state, and need access to reliable longitudinal data that includes background and performance data for teacher graduates and their K-12 pupils.

State officials and administrators are well aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their current data systems. In 2004, the state sponsored a data summit on the redesign of state data collection and archival practices that started statewide conversations and produced an initial costestimate for upgrading the current data system. But this momentum seems to have stalled, and the next steps are unclear. In Washington, there is widespread agreement that the technical, political, and ethical issues associated with developing a genuinely viable data system, and accompanying policies to ensure responsible use, require state leadership. The next steps towards a performance-based system must address issues associated with (1) developing rich student and teacher data systems that can

be linked for analysis and (2) adjusting policies to prioritize and routinize IHE access to appropriate data.

Teacher Data. A major challenge is developing data systems that allow teacher preparation programs to locate and track their graduates across the state. A strength of the current teacher data system is that each teacher has a unique identifier through his or her assigned certification number. This feature could enable IHEs to track and locate their graduates.

A number of challenges remain. The first is integrating teacher information collected and stored for different purposes by two state agencies. OSPI maintains a *licensure database* which holds information about teacher certifications. OSPI also maintains a *staffing or personnel database* (called S-275) which contains annual reports from districts about teacher workplace information. These two databases are linked; however, the quality and type of data collected could be improved to support IHE needs. For example, the staffing database, originally designed for financial and compliance reporting, includes useful information about teacher salaries, education levels, and experience, but does not include the grade level or subjects taught. The licensure data is also limited with no information on college majors, as older certification records contain no data about teacher subject area endorsements; under the old "generalist certification," teachers could teach all subjects and grades.

Another important source of data rests with the public higher education system. Currently, individual IHE systems maintain distinct databases that includes undergraduate and graduate enrollment, course taking, and achievement. These databases could be linked using basic enrollment information. A unified higher education data system will become

particularly important as teachers return to IHEs to earn their Professional Certificate; graduates may or may not return to their original preparation program for this certification. HECB is interested in creating a unified data system that is sensitive to the need to link individual teacher records. But at this time, it is not possible to link individual IHE databases with state staffing and licensure databases.

Student Performance Data. A second challenge concerns access to state-level student performance data by IHEs. Teacher preparation programs are designing their own assessments to capture pupil learning, but these assessments have their limits. Student performance on state-level assessments represents an important resource for IHEs. One university faculty member explained, “Our larger vision includes this idea of gathering data in P-12 classrooms around what teachers do and what students need to be learning and to have that come back to inform our work. That is an important vision. Implicit is the state saying that if you give university people hard data about what is going on in classrooms, they will design programs to address teacher needs. So we need data from K-12 [students]. Is that happening? I don’t think it is.”

Many institutions are interested in using value-added approaches to examine the impact of their programs on K-12 student learning. These approaches require student data across multiple years and at an individual level. Washington currently archives student performance data from three different standardized assessments: the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL), the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) administered in grades 3 and 6, and the Iowa Test of Educational Development (ITED) administered in grade 9. On the web, student data are available as far back as 1996-97.

These tests are administered in alternate years and are not linkable, which presents a serious barrier to IHEs interested in using a common measure for examining growth in student achievement.

Washington policymakers have expressed interest in a more coherent testing system that includes linked assessments across multiple grades to the annual growth in student learning. The requirements of NCLB are fueling this interest. Steps in this direction are visible in the state’s recent decision to drop the ITBS and to assign each student a unique identifier to track student learning over time.

Linking Data Systems. A third challenge is developing the capacity to link these state databases. Specifically, the state’s current data collection protocols do not enable a reliable linking of student and teacher data. Currently, the only teachers that can be linked to particular students are those listed as proctoring the assessment.

Until state databases are strengthened through new policies or adjustment to current data collection practices, IHEs must work with individual districts to locate their graduates in particular schools, access student performance data on state assessments, and link teachers and students. UW is currently working with the Seattle Public Schools to develop a joint database of baseline information about its graduates and student performance. Most of these data are accessible at the district level, but typically are available only in paper form. Next steps include exploring value-added models of analysis.

Accessing student and teacher data via districts provides IHEs with short-term solutions at best. Since graduates of most preparation programs are scattered across the state, access to a state-level system would provide a more comprehensive and stable source. Until the

state can improve its state data systems, the capacity of institutions, as a group and individually, to move towards the state vision for teacher preparation is highly dependent upon district will and capacity to provide them with both teacher and student data. It also depends upon district interest in maintaining a long-term relationship around datasharing with multiple IHEs.

Facilitating IHE Access to Data. Yet another challenge centers on the accessibility of the data collected by the state. First, not all data collected by the state have been fully automated. The records of teachers certified prior to 1987 are in microfiche or paper form and are not part of existing digital files. Also, there is no information about endorsements for these teachers, who may constitute about one-sixth of the workforce, because they were exempted from new requirements as the certification system evolved. Second, the software used to access and archive data is considered outdated and difficult to navigate, described by one user as “a little clunky.” Finally, if IHEs are to become evidence-based, they will need timely access to state data. Faculty report that OSPI staff are responsive to their ideas about how to use data, but note that OSPI lacks the resources to conduct analysis on their behalf, or to respond to their data requests. Given its limited resources, OSPI may need to adopt new procedures that expedite IHE requests and facilitate long-term access, while providing for data security.

Effective Engagement of Arts and Sciences Faculty

Stronger collaborative relationships between arts and sciences faculty and teacher education faculty can help teacher education programs strengthen the content knowledge of their graduates. Washington’s policies offer institutions few supports or incentives to

strengthen relationships across these distinct faculties. New licensure requirements and program approval aim to strengthen teacher content knowledge through closer alignment with K-12 needs, but do not consider directly how collaboration between arts and sciences faculty and education faculty could be strengthened.

Ensuring Strong Teacher Content Knowledge. Through new residency certification and accreditation policies, Washington has recently taken steps towards addressing the adequacy of teacher content knowledge. Washington teachers must now demonstrate competence in one or more subject “endorsement” areas, e.g., elementary education, history, middle-level math, and English language arts. Since 2002, the competencies underlying each endorsement have been revised to ensure close alignment with Washington’s K-12 content standards (EALRs) and national professional subject association standards. Moreover, as mentioned above, since September 2005, Washington requires teachers to pass a test of their content knowledge for certification, the WEST-E/Praxis II assessment. This assessment plan provides policymakers and IHE leaders a common measure for considering program quality within the state. As the WEST-E system is fully implemented, teacher candidate passing rates will be reported to individual teacher preparation programs and to the public.

State officials consider the program approval process and standards another mechanism for gauging the adequacy of teacher content knowledge. Specifically, Standard 5 focuses on the prospective teachers’ knowledge and skills, which include subject matter expertise. Institution reviews to date, however, have not focused on specific endorsement or subject area program components, in part because of the composition of the review team. Explained

one official, “Washington does not really take a content-specific look at programs. When we go in and look at the evidence that the programs provide, we do not bring people with an eye for specific content that can look at that material. In other states, they actually look at content methodology when they do their site visit. Our concern was that there just is not enough of this kind of content evaluation.” State administrators are considering how to improve this process to look at teacher learning opportunities and their demonstration of appropriate subject expertise.

Facilitating Collaboration With Arts and Sciences Faculty. One mechanism for ensuring stronger teacher content knowledge is through increasing the participation of arts and sciences faculty in teacher preparation programs. Again, both state officials and IHE faculty point to the program approval process as the principal policy mechanism for supporting this kind of collaboration. “All of the secondary endorsements are controlled by other schools outside of education,” explained one faculty member, “so we must have a relationship with those schools. It is regulated through the approval process.” Program approval standards, however, are indirect mechanisms for facilitating such collaboration. They seem likely to produce cross-school interactions that are superficial in nature, reflecting paper reviews of coursework, not the redesign of disciplinary courses or the ongoing collegial exchanges about teacher understanding of disciplinary knowledge and related pedagogical approaches that are needed.

Many faculty speculate that the variation in the nature and depth of collaboration is reflective of university traditions and the individual faculty interests and personal relationships, and is not easy to change. One A&S faculty member at UW described the idiosyncratic development of A&S faculty interest in

education over the years: “In the past 15-20 years, you see lots of links—grassroots work mostly—between A&S and educators and even the college of education. There have been a lot of individual efforts at the faculty level, but never anything at the institution level.” The math department, for example, has long worked with the College of Education through a National Science Foundation grant. For many years, physics and biology faculty have been running summer K-12 teacher training programs that draw from across the country, but do not include education faculty. Federal Title II professional development grants, which aim to strengthen content knowledge of practicing teachers, represent more recent mechanisms for strengthening existing ties and possibly forging new relations across these colleges within the university.

For a handful of Washington IHEs that offer only a master’s-level certification program, finding a “natural bridge” to connect the college of education and A&S faculty is challenging. At UW, efforts are under way to build that bridge through the development of an undergraduate program. UW is convening teams of education and A&S faculty and PreK-12 educators to reconfigure academic majors and to develop a shared definition of pedagogical content knowledge and ways to ensure its development, while incorporating the state K-12 content standards. One groundbreaking goal is for A&S faculty to co-teach subject-specific methods course with education and PreK-12 faculty, to supervise interns and beginning teachers.

Outside of the program approval standards and the allocation of federal grant monies, state policies have not explicitly addressed the involvement of A&S faculty in the development of teacher content knowledge. At UW, some A&S faculty were aware of national professional association standards, but not Washington’s K-12 content standards

(EALRs) or the state's new teacher subject test (the WEST-E/Praxis II). Explained one professor, "You see, I just do not have an intuition about how [the education field] works to go look for or ask for these things." State officials might consider information-sharing strategies that include not only college of education faculty, but also IHE leadership and A&S faculty. For example, ensuring that performance reports on the WEST-E/Praxis II reach all parties would help raise awareness and encourage joint responsibility.

Conceptualizing Teaching as a Clinical Practice

Another design principle of TNE is increased emphasis on teaching as a clinical practice profession. University faculty should be actively guiding teacher candidates in clinical settings, e.g., schools and classrooms, directly honing candidate skills in assessing student needs and designing effective curriculum and pedagogy. Institutions with a strong conception of teaching as a clinical practice develop residency or induction programs and take responsibility for improving the performance of beginning teachers.

Encouraging Teaching as a Clinical Skill.

Again, Washington program approval standards, specifically the field experience component, emphasize teaching as a clinical practice profession and are reflective of TNE goals. In Washington, IHEs are afforded broad authority to define the type, structure, and duration of teacher candidates' field experiences, and by extension, the array of clinical experiences—modeling, observation, teaching, and reflection—that would provide teacher candidates opportunities to learn in clinical settings.

With the shift towards a performance-based system, the state no longer sets minimal requirements for teacher candidates' field

experiences. Rather the state's performance standards envision field experiences that are integrated throughout the preparation program, including early observation through the formal student teaching period, and are supervised by accomplished "clinical faculty" who serve "as mentors, supervisors, and demonstrators of the skills, knowledge, and dispositions of highly accomplished school professionals." The state encourages IHEs to provide teacher candidates with opportunities to collect, analyze, and act upon data about student learning in classroom settings.

According to OSPI, most institutions consider field experience an essential component of teacher preparation and far surpass the previous state requirements of a 10-15 week practicum. These experiences are highly valued by graduates as well. OSPI's most recent survey of beginning teachers reveals that teachers with longer field experiences (15 weeks or more) rated their programs more highly than teachers whose student teaching was 10 weeks or fewer.

Other state actions that aim to strengthen teaching as a clinical practice focus on the development of a common pedagogical assessment for examining student teaching during the field experiences. When it is coupled with the new teacher subject test, state officials expect the pedagogical assessment to provide a more comprehensive view of a teacher candidate's emerging competence.

At the request of OSPI, Washington teacher preparation institutions are collaborating on the development and piloting of the assessment tool. The development process is described by faculty as foregrounding this element of the program. As the development process continues, some IHE faculties see a foundation emerging for a continuing dialogue across preparation programs. It has led to cross-school conversations about conceptions

of “good teaching” and the kinds of evidence needed to determine candidates’ readiness for certification. In turn, concerns about the appropriate use of the assessment tool have raised the need for common training across institutions for field supervisors who advise teacher candidates. Other shared concerns have focused on the importance of pedagogical content knowledge not assessed by the new tool. The state might consider sponsoring the development of a second generation of assessment tools for individual endorsement areas to address candidate’s pedagogical content knowledge. The development of these tools would provide another mechanism for engaging A&S faculty in teacher preparation.

Once fully implemented, the pedagogic assessment will provide teacher training institutions with a common measure for reviewing their candidates and an important new source of data for considering those program features, from coursework to clinical supervision, that positively contribute to candidates’ readiness for certification. The new assessment tool might eventually provide OSPI officials with a common measure for comparing field experience programs across the state.

Supports for Teacher Induction. TNE challenges IHEs to take responsibility for the performance of their graduates by developing two-year induction programs that support their transition into the classroom. In Washington, state policies supporting teacher induction have not fostered IHE involvement. Currently, Washington school districts take responsibility for supporting beginning teachers in their first year in the classroom. The state provides some financial support to districts through its *Teacher Assistance Program (TAP)*, voluntary induction standards to help guide local program development, and training for mentor teachers.

State officials are supportive of IHEs continuing to work with graduates as they enter the classroom. Many state officials are worried about the wide variation in district programs and are aware of “the gap” in teacher support, from the second year of teaching through enrollment in a professional certification program in year four or five. IHEs may be well positioned to help bridge that gap, providing a stable, continuous resource for beginning teachers. Through their preservice program, teachers have already developed portfolios and professional growth plans with IHEs that could provide a foundation for induction and professional development decisions. Also, most teachers appear to be returning to their initial preparation institutions to earn professional certification, suggesting the link would be natural for teachers. Program directors report that alumni comprise 50-90% of their enrollment. At least one IHE offers a free course voucher as an incentive for its graduates to return.

Strengthening the involvement of IHEs in induction would enhance continuity in teacher development and provide a stronger link to professional certification, which is based upon a different but related set of teacher standards. IHEs could facilitate beginning teachers’ use of these standards as a foundation for their professional growth plans and ongoing conversations about improving instructional practice.

Efforts to bridge the gap in teacher support are now under way at UW, where faculty members are designing a two-year residence program that includes three learning opportunities:

- In-person mentoring that complements school district support systems;

- Online and teleconferencing study groups led by A&S and education faculty; and
- Initial and ongoing training for mentors.

Prospective teachers will create and update electronic portfolios during their preservice program. These portfolios will become their state-required professional growth plans when they enter the workforce.

Current state policies and resources provide a mix of opportunities and constraints for UW and other IHEs seeking to provide support during the induction years. One challenge is locating their graduates in a timely manner. To design services and plan for delivery costs, IHEs will need help from both state and district officials to determine the distribution of their graduates in the state. Designing services for graduates concentrated in nearby districts will be different from offering support to graduates scattered across the state.

A second challenge is integrating IHE residency programs with existing district approaches to induction. OSPI estimates that at least 90% of Washington's beginning teachers participate in district induction programs, although these local programs vary widely in stability, structure, and quality. IHEs seeking to support graduates in larger districts, such as Seattle, will likely encounter stable, structured programs designed to support large annual cohorts of new teachers. IHEs reaching out to graduates in smaller districts may find less formal arrangements. In either situation, IHEs may find their efforts in competition with local programs. Ideally, IHE services should complement local programs. Smaller districts may welcome IHE support as a substitute for local programs, while larger districts may wish to work with IHEs to share responsibilities for beginning teachers.

Even if IHEs are able to design both virtual and in-person supports for new teachers, they will need new financial resources to support their involvement in teacher induction.

Currently, districts receive state TAP resources, but these allocations, about \$800 per teacher, do not adequately cover training and stipend costs, particularly in small districts. If IHEs are to support beginning teachers, the state might consider expanding the TAP program to provide support for interested institutions to do so. Institutions could apply for funding on the basis of the number of graduates they can locate in the state and are capable of supporting.

Towards Supporting, Spreading, and Sustaining TNE Reforms

New state policies in Washington regarding teacher licensure and program standards, and beginning teacher induction are generally supportive of the TNE principles and the work under way at the University of Washington. 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, IHE leaders, and stakeholder groups responsible for ensuring teacher quality in the state.

Addressing IHE 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 IHE 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 IHEs could be improved. Clearly, state data

collection policies and archival practices are influencing how IHEs approach program improvement. In considering this issue:

- What is the fit between data available from state agencies and the emerging research questions and study designs that IHEs hope to pursue?
- How can state data collection and archival practices be redesigned with the understanding that IHEs are valuable consumers of these data?
- How can the state, IHEs, and local school districts collaborate to develop a comprehensive data system in support of teacher and student learning?

Expanding the Role of A&S Faculties in Teacher Preparation to Strengthen the Quality of Teacher Content Knowledge.

Washington's new teacher assessment system and program approval standards represent important steps toward 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 Washington's teacher preparation community. IHE leadership is also needed to ensure that A&S involvement in teacher preparation is valued and rewarded. In considering this issue:

- How can IHE 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 IHE incentive system, such as faculty load, tenure requirements, and the university and college mission to support this strategic collaboration?

Encouraging a Role for IHEs in the Induction of Beginning Teachers.

Washington policymakers and state officials have long recognized 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, the provision of induction standards to guide local program design, and the availability of mentor training. It is widely acknowledged that the induction of beginning teachers across the state is highly variable and could be strengthened. IHEs appear uniquely positioned to provide a valuable contribution to supporting teachers in this transition to the classroom. However, the role IHEs might play needs to be explored with full consideration to IHE capacity and complimentary with existing district programs. In considering this issue:

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

Resources for Additional Information:

Teachers for a New Era
www.teachersforanewera.org

Teachers for a New Era at the University of
Washington: The Washington Center for
Teaching and Learning (WCTL)
www.depts.washington.edu/wact;/index.html

The Center for Strengthening the Teaching
Profession (CSTP)
<http://www.cstp-wa.org>

Washington Office of the Superintendent of
Public Instruction (OSPI)
www.k12.wa.us

Washington Professional Educators Standards
Board (PESB)
www.pesb.wa.gov

Washington Higher Education Coordinating
Board (HECB)
<http://www.hecb.wa.gov>

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